MINUTES

Eugene City Council
McNutt Room—City Hall—777 Pearl Street
Eugene, Oregon

April 21, 2010
5:30 p.m.

COUNCILORS PRESENT: Mike Clark, Betty Taylor, Chris Pryor, George Poling, George Brown, Alan Zelenka, Andrea Ortiz, Jennifer Solomon.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

A. WORK SESSION:
Resolution 5004 Concerning the Eugene Comprehensive Lands Assessment Project's 20-Year Need Determination

Planning Director Lisa Gardner provided an overview of the Eugene Comprehensive Lands Assessment (ECLA) process. She recognized members of the ECLA Community Advisory Committee (CAC) for their work on the project and introduced Jason Dedrick, Planning and Development Department, to present the results of the ECLA process.

Mr. Dedrick distributed a document entitled *Eugene Comprehensive Lands Assessment – Community Advisory Committee Concluding Statement, April 13, 2010.* He used a slide presented to outline the work of the CAC, which was convened to vet the information produced by ECLA and provide a recommendation on the final results. He said the CAC, by consensus, accepted the results of ECLA for use in the Envision Eugene process. He reviewed the CAC's specific findings, discussion items and recommendations contained in the document that was distributed. He said the CAC particularly wanted the following key policy issues carried forward into Envision Eugene:

- Nodal development
- Plan designations
- Wetlands
- Market trends
- Housing affordability

Mr. Dedrick said small groups were formed to address outstanding issues and the consensus statements and recommendations from those groups were included in the agenda packet. He said the only significant change to data presented in December 2009, related to park land need that resulted from a change in the methodology for calculating that need. He said rather than basing the need on the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan (PROS), it seemed more appropriate to base park land need on the Project and Priority Plan. He said any additional protection of drainage-ways and the 25-year floodplain were factors that could impact land need in the future.

Continuing, Mr. Dedrick pointed out that the table of assumptions for ECLA remained virtually unchanged from the one presented in December 2009, with the exception of parks. He summarized the key land needs, based on the population forecast of 34,000 new people by 2031:

- 15,000 new dwelling units
- 4,800 new dwelling units need land in excess of supply
    - Low density – 1,244 acres
    - Medium density – 72 acres
    - High density – 94 acres
- Commercial land – 388 acres
- Industrial land – 0 acres

Mr. Dedrick explained that while there was no shortage of industrial land, the majority of that land was in small parcels. Envision Eugene would need to consider the regional economic development plan and site needs of specific industries that would be targeted in the future and that could impact the industrial land need determination.

Mr. Clark asked what unemployment rate was assumed in the projection of 32,000. Mr. Dedrick said the projection was based on the employment forecast and unemployment was factored in by recognizing that some of those jobs would be located in current structures to fill vacancies created by jobs that were lost.

Mr. Clark felt the projection should take the opposite approach and assume that more space was needed to accommodate new jobs that were needed to lower the unemployment rate. Regarding park land, he asked if the City had an acknowledged refinement plan for parks. Mr. Dedrick replied that the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) had indicated it was appropriate to use the PROS or Project and Priority plan as the basis to establish park land need. He said one of the small groups had suggested the City examine whether it needed a more formally adopted parks plan. City Attorney Emily Jerome said the need for a parks refinement plan was an element of the Metro Plan update adopted by the City Council in 2004; the requirement for the plan was self-imposed, not required by the State. She said the data being used to determine park land need was very reliable and she did not feel a parks refinement plan was necessary.

Mr. Clark stated that the primary purpose of incorporating the stormwater manual in the Eugene Code during the minor code amendment process (MICAP) was to define drainage-ways and protect them from development. He was concerned that the CAC's recommendations indicated the drainage-ways were developable. Mr. Dedrick said Public Works had not yet completed the process of defining drainage-ways, mapping them and setting forth specific protections. He said when that work was completed, whether during Envision Eugene or after, the City would have to make findings regarding impact on the land supply and if the land was determined to be unbuildable it would be removed from the buildable lands inventory.

Ms. Piercy asked if ECLA had accounted for out-migration and a shift to higher density living as the population aged. Mr. Dedrick said the Portland State University population forecast for Lane County took into account a multitude of demographic factors, including in-migration and out-migration. He said the CAC also discussed density and housing choices and whether it was a moment in time when demographics, housing needs and environmental concerns were shifting housing trends, but it was difficult to speculate on a specific outcome. Envision Eugene would consider community housing and density preferences as part of ways to meet the land need.

Ms. Piercy said questions had been raised about the location of industrial land and whether changes in land designations were necessary. Mr. Dedrick agreed that one approach to looking at land need was to examine the current land designations, particularly commercial and industrial land.

Mr. Pryor appreciated the baseline figures that would be moved forward to inform Envision Eugene. He recalled the neighborhood character discussions that affirmed envisioning the community related to more than just an acreage count. He was encouraged with ECLA as an incremental step toward the envisioning process.

In response to a question from Mr. Zelenka, Mr. Dedrick said the base employment forecast was adjusted downward to account for jobs lost in the community.

Mr. Zelenka said it was appropriate for Envision Eugene to take a "reduce, reuse and recycle" approach to land in the community.

Ms. Taylor asked if the current growth management policies would be replaced as a result of Envision Eugene. Ms. Gardner said there would be an opportunity to add new policies that addressed land use efficiencies. Mr. Ruiz assured the council there was no intent to change current growth management policies, only consider whether new policies were needed to avoid the need to expand the urban growth boundary (UGB).

Ms. Taylor asked if ECLA had considered the trend toward telecommuting. She also commented that vacant and underutilized commercial land existed throughout the community. Mr. Dedrick said telecommuting was factored into ECLA assumptions regarding land need. He said there were 98 acres of vacant commercial land, primarily in smaller parcels; ECLA did not extensively analyze the issue of underutilized commercial land as that was a somewhat subjective assessment, but allowed for some redevelopment of currently developed commercial land.

Ms. Taylor preferred the corrected motion, which removed the word "basis" and simply indicated ECLA data would be used in the Envision Eugene process. She noted a similar language change was needed in the ordinance.

Ms. Ortiz asked if ECLA had considered the 360 acres of the railroad yard. Mr. Dedrick said that land had been an early consideration, but the railroad had been unable to give any type of assurance that the land would be available during the 20-year planning period. The land was currently listed as committed to another use and unavailable for development.

Mr. Clark said the CAC's drainage-way findings indicated that the results of Public Works tasks would be taken into account if and when they were available, but that meant if the work was not completed the inability to build on those lands would never be considered. Ms. Jerome replied that any land use action had to include findings. If land in the inventory was rendered unbuildable by the regulations Public Work developed, that would be deducted from the land supply. She said any land removed from the buildable lands inventory had to be replaced under State law.

Mr. Clark disagreed with the CAC's findings related to transportation, specifically the second recommendation under Item 7, Traffic Impact Analysis/Transportation Planning Rule. He said an assessment of Beltline by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) two years ago, indicated that it was a failing facility in terms of its capacity. He questioned how vacant property in North Eugene could be developed when there was no ability to increase transportation capacity. Mr. Dedrick replied that transportation was a complex issue and a moving target. He said the CAC created a map of all the areas that were potentially transportation-limited and examined the developable land in those areas; the product was that there were not many developable acres remaining in those areas. He acknowledged that development could occur in close proximity and any change in plan designations or expansion of the UGB

would require specific findings that assure the necessary transportation infrastructure would be in place at some point during the 20-year period.

Mr. Zelenka remarked that he hoped to see a plan that was flexible and included triggers for periodic reviews and possible updates. Regarding the issues that were being forwarded to the Envision Eugene process, he asked how much could reasonably be accomplished during the established timeframe.

Mr. Pryor concurred that the plan should be as flexible as possible, but asked how that flexibility could be assured if the plan had to contain specific numbers. Mr. Dedrick replied that the State's numbers afforded jurisdictions flexibility through the periodic review process that allowed the community to review its progress and determine consistency with its buildable land study.

Mr. Clark commented that in the past, 14 years had elapsed between the City's periodic reviews, and asked if the State would now compel those reviews to occur every seven years. He asked where within the City's organization, responsibility for completing reviews resided. Ms. Jerome said State law and administrative rules established a schedule for periodic review, but DLCD did not necessarily require jurisdictions to follow that schedule. She said the City could determine its own schedule. Mr. Ruiz added that the City Manager had ultimate responsibility for assuring the City's compliance, but the Planning and Development Department was responsibility for the review process.

Mr. Clark disagreed that the City had the transportation capacity to develop the lands it identified as redevelopable and vacant. Mr. Dedrick said the ECLA process took a high level view of the scope of transportation issues and how they might inhibit development; it did not allow a close examination of every potentially developable parcel and speculate on what use might occur. He said ECLA provided the best estimate of achievable density within the time and cost constraints of the process.

Mr. Clark said his purpose in raising issues at this point was to clarify assumption and avoid future disputes after a plan was adopted.

Mr. Zelenka asked for a list of the issues that would be addressed within the February timeframe and the level of examination that would be possible. He said if the council disagreed with staff's assessment of the scope of work it could provide additional direction.

Ms. Ortiz said she did not assume that the City's growth would be in a particular direction and understood the process was to determine what would be the natural pattern of growth.

> Mr. Clark, seconded by Ms. Taylor, moved to adopt Resolution 5004 that accepts the Eugene Comprehensive Lands Assessment Executive Summary and directs City staff to use the estimates and data documented in that Executive Summary in the Envision Eugene Project.

Mr. Clark clarified that he did not assume a particular growth pattern; his concern was the addition of 15,000 new dwelling units. He wanted to assure that there were certain protections afforded during the Envision Eugene process, such as to the Santa Clara drainage-ways. He intended to propose an amendment that included the CAC's specific recommendations, along with the basic assumption, in the Envision Eugene process.

> Mr. Clark, seconded by Ms. Taylor, moved to amend the motion to include in the Envision Eugene process the Community Advisory Committee's

recommendations as set forth in Attachment B to the Agenda Item Summary. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Ms. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Clark, moved to strike the words "as a basis for its work" from Section 1 of Resolution 5004. The motion passed, 8:0.

The main motion as amended passed, 8:0.

The meeting adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Ruiz
City Manager

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)