



UGB / Commercial Industrial Buildable Lands (CIBL)
Stakeholder Committee

Meeting Minutes

Monday, January 5th, 2009

6:00pm – 8:00pm

Springfield City Hall
225 Fifth Street, Springfield, OR
Library Meeting Room

I. Attendance:

Stakeholders: Donna Lentz, Brianna Huber, Mike Kelly, George Grier, Lee Beyer, Kari Westlund, Johnny Kirschenmann, Naomi Campollo, Dave Marra, Doug McKay, Dan Egan, Guy Weese, Steven Yett, Philip Farrington

Staff: David Reesor; Linda Pauly; Dave Winterowd; Beth Goodman; Bill Grile; John Tamulonis; Mark Metzger

II. Greetings / Routine Business

1. Roll Call
2. Review of Minutes – Minutes approved as written
3. Public Testimony – None noted

III. Presentations

The following Powerpoint presentations were made to the Stakeholder Committee. Key ideas from each presentation are shown below. The slides from each presentation are attached as separate files.

Bill Van Vactor, City Attorney: *Safe Harbor Population Forecast*

Under state law, counties have the responsibility for preparing and maintaining a coordinated population forecast. Under 2007 legislation, the counties have six months within which to respond to cities requesting a coordinated population estimate for their community. If the county fails to provide a population forecast within the six months, the city is free to move ahead using the “safe harbor” methodology for projecting future population growth.

On May 19, 2008, the City Council formally requested that Lane County provide a coordinated population forecast for the City. On December 25, 2008, the six month window for Lane County to respond to the City's request expired.

The City of Springfield, after notice to Lane County Local Governments, may now adopt the safe harbor forecast into appropriate planning documents.

Allen Johnson, Attorney: *Adopting Springfield's UGB and UGB Adoptions around the State*

UGB Adoption:

The process is a hybrid of the legal process used for approving "Post Acknowledgement Plan Amendments (PAPAs) and Periodic Review.

Proposed changes in the UGB totaling more than 50 acres require review by DLCD/LCDC "in the manner provided for periodic review."

- Similar timeline at DLCD/LCDC as LUBA, except that it is routinely exceeded
- Much longer timeline for appeals to Court of Appeals
- Courts have held that DLCD/LCDC have substantially more power than LUBA to micromanage details of local plans and implementing ordinances with detailed prescriptive instructions in remand orders.

Boundary Location:

The location of the urban growth boundary and changes to the boundary shall be determined by evaluating alternative boundary locations consistent with ORS 197.298 and with consideration of the following factors:

- (1) Efficient accommodation of identified land needs;
- (2) Orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services;
- (3) Comparative environmental, energy, economic and social consequences; and
- (4) Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural and forest activities occurring on farm and forest land outside the UGB.

Establishment and change of urban growth boundaries shall be based on the following:

- Demonstrated need to accommodate long range urban population, consistent with a 20-year population forecast coordinated with affected local governments; and
- 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 the need categories in this subsection (2) of ORS 197.298.

ORS 197.298(3)

Land of lower priority . . . may be included in an urban growth boundary if land of higher priority is found to be inadequate to accommodate the amount of land estimated [to be needed] for one or more of the following reasons:

- (a) Specific types of identified land needs cannot be reasonably accommodated on higher priority lands;
- (b) Future urban services could not reasonably be provided to the higher priority lands due to topographical or other physical constraints; or
- (c) Maximum efficiency of land uses within a proposed urban growth boundary requires inclusion of lower priority lands in order to include or provide services to higher priority lands.”

The Experience of Other Communities

Mr. Johnson highlighted the experience of other cities who have recently gone through the UGB expansion process or who are still in that process. These included: Adair Village, Woodburn, Bend, and McMinnville.

His observations conclude that being conservative about population projections and the amount of land sought in any proposed expansion may lengthy delays in the approval process that other cities have faced.

IV. Review of Potential Employment Opportunity Areas

Ten different opportunity areas were discussed by the Stakeholder Committee. The notes below summarize the discussion regarding each site.

Site #1 North Gateway Area

Constraints Discussion:

- Floodplain and floodway issues in the area.
- How much of the area (in acres) is affected by flood hazards?
- Much of the Wicklund property is designated as a “Natural Resource Area” in addition to being subject to floodplain and floodway issues.
- The Committee should be careful to avoid choosing expansion sites that cannot realistically be developed because of topographical or environmental constraints that were not an issue when the original inventory of industrial lands was compiled.
- The cumulative effects of building in the floodplain must be considered. Such development is going to take a problem and move it somewhere else.
- The TAC indicates that Johnson Rd. provides some potential access. Why is this so?
- There are significant limitations on the traffic capacity in the Beltline-Gateway vicinity may affect the North Gateway site.
- ODOT says there is a potential limitation on the density of buildout in the area (Trip cap).

Opportunities Discussion:

- The site is popular and visible from I-5 and is near other industrial development.
- Has the large parcels (25-50 acres) that are needed.
- Future improvements to I-5/Beltline and Gateway could expand transportation capacity in the area.
- EMx is extending service into the area.

Site #2 Hayden Bridge Area

Constraints Discussion:

- The area seems to be confined with the adjacent steep sloped lands, and the rivers. Is it affected by floodplain issues?
- There appear to be significant areas of hydric soils that are a sign of wetland issues.
- May not be developable for industrial uses.
- May be better for future residential development.

Opportunities Discussion:

- May be easy to service with nearby infrastructure (south side of Hayden Bridge).
- Good connection to I-5 via Hwy 126.
- TAC thinks the area is compatible with future office or retail development. What was the thinking of the TAC? There is no surrounding residential base to support retail development.

Site #3 North McKenzie Highway

George Grier declared that he has a potential conflict of interest related to this site, given that he owns land in the vicinity. He indicated that he would keep his comments factual and objective.

Constraints Discussion:

- Significant floodplain and floodway problems. The 1996 flood inundated a number of areas on the map that are shown to be outside the floodplain. The floodplain maps are not accurate for this location.
- SUB groundwater protection regulations are an absolute constraint on this land. There are nearby wellheads that would limit commercial and industrial development.
- Cedar Creek is the receiving body for much of the stormwater runoff for North Springfield. City studies indicate that Cedar Creek is at capacity and will be challenged to accommodate future runoff from urban development within the existing UGB.

Opportunities Discussion:

- None discussed.

Site #4 Far East Springfield Area

Constraints Discussion:

- Stormwater constraints. This area drains to Cedar Creek. Development proposed on the Gray property which is inside the existing UGB was constrained by the stormwater capacity limitations of Cedar creek.
- Steep slopes are also an issue in this area which would constrain development.
- The area would probably be best considered for residential development.

Opportunities Discussion:

- None discussed.

Site #5 Wallace Creek Area and Site #6 West Jasper/Jasper Bridge Area

Constraints Discussion:

- Site #5 has some steep slope issues. The ridge separating the Wallace Creek basin includes areas of thin soils covering basalt outcroppings that prevented the extension of the Bob Straub Parkway to Wallace Creek as originally planned.
- Site #6 has floodplain issues and is affected by the Willamette Greenway which requires riparian setbacks from the river.

Opportunities Discussion:

- The Bob Straub Parkway provides an improved access route to Hwy 126 and I-5 from this area. Is this a logical extension of the Jasper-Natron area?
- Development within the Jasper Natron area along the Bob Straub Parkway may spur future development in this area.
- The Weyerhaeuser Haul Rd. provides a connection to the Wallace Creek from Jasper Natron.
- There is an existing industrial site just south of Jasper that should be considered.

Site #7 Clearwater Area

Constraints Discussion:

- Floodplain should be respected. If you don't build around the flood channels running through the area there will be problems.
- The area is part of a SUB ground water protection area (Willamette Wellfield).
- New rules for lending in floodplain areas are not favorable to homeowners.
- This area should be considered for residential development. Some neighborhood scale commercial would be appropriate.

Opportunities Discussion:

- The school district owns some land along Clearwater Lane.

Site #8 South Millrace Area

Constraints Discussion:

- Is within the 0-5 year time of travel zone. The Willamette Wellfield (wellheads) is a prominent part of the area. Development can occur within time of travel zones,

but mitigation is necessary and would restrict the used of certain chemicals by commercial and industrial users.

- The rail crossing at 28th St. is a choke point for emergency access when trains are moving through the area.

Opportunities Discussion:

- There is a substantial amount of publically owned land in Site #8. The City, Willamalane and Sub all control parcels in the area which may help guide future development in a positive way.
- There is nearby industrial development. Integration of this area with existing urban development to the north makes sense.
- Some residential development may be acceptable.

Site #9 Seavey Loop Area and Site #10 Goshen Area

Constraints Discussion:

- Floodplain and wetland issues are apparent in this area.
- ODOT indicates that 30th and I-5 interchange has capacity constraints.
- Much of the area has Class I and Class II soils which are “low priority” for inclusion in urban areas under state planning rules.
- Mt. Pisgah is a sensitive recreational/environmental area.

Opportunities Discussion:

- Glenwood provides Springfield with a nexus to Site #9. Sewer connections to the area through Glenwood may be possible.
- There is a significant industrial and commercial development in the area already, especially along I-5 in both Site #9 and Site #10.
- The proximity to I-5 and 30th Ave. are beneficial for transportation access.
- ODOT has plans to improve the I-5/ 30th interchange.
- Would expanding Site #10 to include that portion of Goshen west of I-5 be feasible and or allowed under the Metro Plan? The Metro Plan governs the boundary between Eugene and Springfield within the Metro Plan boundary. Goshen is outside of the Metro Plan area. None the less, there may be push back if Springfield seeks to incorporate land west of I-5.
- Wildish owns land near Mt. Pisgah that it has proposed for residential development.

VI. Next Steps

The Technical Advisory Committee will review the sites reviewed by the Committee on January 9th and add their observations about the opportunities and constraints for each site. The City Council and Planning Commission are schedule to hold a joint hearing to review the findings of the Stakeholder and Technical Advisory Committees.

Next meeting scheduled the Stakeholder Committee is January 22nd.

VII. Meeting Adjourned

Approximately 8:30pm