

Approved 5/26/93

BOOK 153 PAGE 0268 MINUTES

Joint Public Hearing
Eugene City Council
Springfield City Council
Lane County Board of Commissioners

Library Meeting Room--Springfield City Hall
225 East 5th Street, Springfield

February 4, 1993
5 p.m.

EUGENE COUNCILORS PRESENT: Shawn Boles, Randy MacDonald, Kaye Robinette, Bobby Green, Paul Nicholson, Barbara Keller, Kevin Hornbuckle

EUGENE COUNCILORS ABSENT: Nancy Nathanson

SPRINGFIELD COUNCILORS PRESENT: Ralf Walters, Larry Shanz, Jesse Maine, Stu Burge

SPRINGFIELD COUNCILORS ABSENT: Bruce Berg, Rob Adams

LANE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Steve Cornacchia, Chair; Ellie Dumdi, Jerry Rust, Jack Roberts, Marie Frazier.

I. DINNER AND INTRODUCTION OF NEWLY ELECTED PUBLIC OFFICIALS

His Honor Springfield Mayor Bill Morrisette welcomed those in attendance. Councilors and commissioners introduced themselves.

II. JOINT INITIATION OF METROPOLITAN PLAN AMENDMENTS

Board Chair Steve Cornacchia called the Lane County Commission to order. Eugene Mayor Ruth Bascom called the Eugene City Council meeting to order. Mayor Bill Morrisette called the meeting of the Springfield City Council to order.

- A. An amendment to the Metropolitan Plan to change the land use designation on a portion of the Kokkler property adjacent to the Eugene Airport (City of Eugene, MA 92-4, Board Order 93-2-4-1)

- B. An amendment to the Metropolitan Plan to expand the urban growth boundary to include a portion of the Vajgert/Rossi property (City of Eugene, MA 92-5, Board Order 93-2-4-2)

Cathy Czerniak of the Eugene Planning Division provided the staff report. She said that the amendments in question require initiation from all three elected bodies. The Eugene City Council had approved the initiation of the two amendments related to changes in its urban growth boundary on January 13. Ms. Czerniak noted that the initiation action did not indicate support for the proposal, and a full analysis of the proposals would be prepared for examination by the joint planning commissions and referral to the elected officials.

Ms. Czerniak said that redesignation to the government and education zoning district of 20 acres of property adjacent to the Eugene Airport currently designated airport reserve would allow the use of the property for airport operations. Development plans call for the construction of an air cargo facility.

Ms. Czerniak said that the second amendment proposal was a minor expansion of the urban growth boundary (UGB) proposed to remedy the erroneous issuance of a building permit by the City of Eugene for a property outside the UGB. The UGB would be moved 140 feet to the south to allow the provision of services to the residence and the issuance of a final certificate of occupancy.

- C. An amendment to the Metropolitan Plan to expand the urban growth boundary to include five parcels in the 3900 block of Hayden Bridge Road (City of Springfield Jo. No. 93-01-12, Board Order 92-2-4-3)

Greg Mott of the Springfield Planning Department provided the staff report. He said that the initiation request concerned five coterminous tax lots outside the UGB. Two of the tax lots are developed with residences. Mr. Mott said that the initiation was requested to remedy a situation in which Springfield had issued building permits for properties outside the UGB.

Mr. Maine moved, seconded by Mr. Burge, to approve the initiation of MA 92-4 and MA 92-5. The motion passed unanimously, 4:0.

Ms. Frazier asked about the impact of the Vajgert/Rossi amendment to the plan on other properties outside the UGB but within the urbanizing area. Ms. Czerniak said that the impact of the amendment on other properties would be discussed in the staff analysis. Mr. Rust reminded Ms. Frazier that the initiation had originated with the Board of County Commissioners due to the fact that the Lane County Public Works Department had dealt with the property owner.

Responding to a question from Ms. Frazier, Ms. Czerniak said that the City of Eugene was in possession of the Kokkler property as a result of a court order and was negotiating on a price with the property owners.

Mr. Rust moved, seconded by Mr. Roberts, to adopt Board Order 93-2-4-1 (City of Eugene MA 92-4), Board Order 93-2-4-2 (City of Eugene MA 92-5), and Board Order 93-2-4-3 (City of Springfield 93-01-12). The motion passed unanimously, 5:0.

Mr. Green moved, seconded by Mr. Robinette, to approve the initiation of Springfield Jo. No. 93-01-12, Board Order 92-2-4-3. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Mr. Maine moved, seconded by Mr. Burge, to approve the initiation of Springfield Jo. No. 93-01-12, Board Order 92-2-4-3. The motion passed unanimously, 4:0.

III. PUBLIC HEARING: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE METROPOLITAN PLAN AMENDMENT PROCESS (MA 92-3, CA 92-4)

Noting that the public hearing was not scheduled to begin until 7 p.m., Mayor Morrisette suggested that the elected officials briefly discuss the issues in the 50 minutes left before the hearing. Those in attendance concurred.

Jan Childs, Eugene Planning Director, said she represented the metropolitan planning directors. She noted that Roy Burns, Michael Copely, and Jacquyn Mikalonis of Lane County and Greg Mott and Susan Daluddung of Springfield were also present.

Ms. Childs said that the proposed revisions to the amendment process were the result of an evaluation of the existing process conducted by the Joint Planning Commission Committee (JPCC) at the request of the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC). Based on that review, JPCC forwarded recommended revisions to MPC, which forwarded the revisions with some adjustments to the joint planning commissions for a public hearing conducted on September 21, 1992. Ms. Childs reported that the Springfield Planning Commission had proposed an alternative approach to the process at the hearing. She referred the elected officials to the Springfield proposal, which was included in the meeting packet.

Ms. Childs said that in subsequent independent deliberations, the Springfield Planning Commission continued its support for the alternative approach it had suggested at the hearing; the Lane County and Eugene planning commissions had expressed support for the proposed revisions considered at the public hearing, with the provision that the time frame for the amendment process be no more than 180 days. She said that the proposed revisions to the plan text and ordinance under consideration by the elected officials were those considered by the joint planning commissions, and did not include the shorter time frame due to the differences in the planning commission recommendations. However, Ms. Childs said staff believed that the time frame could be shortened.

Responding to a question from Mr. MacDonald, Ms. Childs said that the process proposed in the revisions could take up to 360 days.

Ms. Childs continued her presentation, reporting that the metropolitan planning directors had presented a status report regarding the revisions to the MPC, which directed the planning directors to move forward and schedule the joint elected officials public hearing.

Ms. Childs said that all three jurisdictions were required to adopt identical versions of the plan text language. In order for the revisions to be implemented through each jurisdiction's zoning and development codes, it would be necessary for each jurisdiction to act to amend its code as there was no common zoning code for the three jurisdictions. Ms. Childs said the elected officials have different ordinances amending their respective jurisdiction's code.

Ms. Childs reviewed major changes in the plan amendment process, including a reduction in the amendment categories, a recommendation for concurrent processing of all plan diagram amendments and related refinement plan text amendments, and an "opt-in" provision for Category 2 amendments (all plan diagram amendments not affecting the UGB). Ms. Childs noted that any amendment in an unincorporated area would require participation by both Lane County and the affected city.

Ms. Childs referred the elected officials to the letter distributed prior to the meeting from Michael J. Rupp, Plan Review Manager of the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD). She said that the region was required to notify DLCDC of proposed amendments to the Metropolitan Plan or zoning codes within 45 days of public hearing.

Ms. Childs said that the meeting packet also included a response to written testimony submitted by Allen Johnson authored by Springfield City Attorney Joe Leahy.

Responding to a question from Mr. Cornacchia, Ms. Childs confirmed that the decision to "opt in" must be made by a jurisdiction's elected officials. If a jurisdiction failed to respond to a referral within a set time, the referring jurisdiction could proceed with the amendment. Responding to a question from Mr. Cornacchia regarding the need for findings, Ms. Childs said that there was a need for findings of significant effect on a jurisdiction to justify the jurisdiction's decision to "opt in."

Responding to a question from Mr. Boles, Ms. Childs said that the ordinance provides a referral period of 45 days; shortening the time frame would reduce the referral period to 20 days. Mr. Boles observed that the councils were often in recess for periods exceeding 20 days.

Ms. Childs said that DLCDC indicated opposition to the Springfield proposals because joint adoption of UGB amendments in areas with shared UGBs was required by Statewide Goals 2 and 14. DLCDC favored the "opt in" approach for plan diagram amendments and site-specific text changes. DLCDC wanted more detail regarding the revisions process for plan text.

Mayor Morrisette asked what was required for a finding of significant effect. Ms. Childs said that the planning directors had not attempted to define "significant effect." Mr. Rust suggested that a jurisdiction would have to state and define "significant effect" in the findings to justify the decision to "opt in." Mayor Morrisette said that the definition seemed subjective. Mr. MacDonald pointed out that disagreement between jurisdictions on the right to "opt in" could be referred to MPC.

Responding to a question from Mayor Morrisette regarding DLCDC's concern about Statewide Goals 2 and 14, Ms. Childs said that the concern was specific to the urban growth boundary. DLCDC staff was concerned that the UGB was a regional boundary, and eliminating participation in decisions concerning the boundary would require restructuring of the area's metropolitan planning process.

Responding to a question from Mr. Maine, Ms. Childs confirmed that separate metropolitan plans was an option for Eugene and Springfield. Mr. Rust observed that the State required that the County participate with the cities in metropolitan planning. Mr. Maine said that Springfield did not object to the participation of Lane County in its metropolitan planning process.

Responding to a question from Mr. Boles, Ms. Childs said if one of the jurisdictions refused to participate in an UGB change, the change could not go forward as that participation was required by the plan. Mr. Maine said that in such an instance, no amendments could be processed. Ms. Childs agreed.

Mr. Rust pointed out that it would be very expensive to pursue a new planning model. He encouraged the elected officials to consider the "bottom line" and to keep in mind the large investment the community had in the Metropolitan Area General Plan.

Mr. Maine said that Springfield was concerned about the cost of the process but was willing to consider all options available to it if it could not reach consensus with Eugene and Lane County. He said that it was not Springfield's intention to "wing it," but it wished to have acceptance of its proposal.

The meeting recessed at 7 p.m. and reconvened at 7:15 p.m.

Mayor Morrisette reconvened the meeting and welcomed audience members to the hearing.

Mayor Morrisette opened the Springfield City Council public hearing.

Commissioner Cornacchia opened the Board of County Commission public hearing.

Mayor Bascom opened the City of Eugene public hearing.

Eileen Stein, Springfield staff, called the Springfield City Council roll.

Mr. Cornacchia provided the second reading of Public Hearing Ordinance PA 1031/In The Matter of Amending the Policy Section of Chapter IV of the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan to Streamline and Clarify the Plan

Amendment Process, and adopting a severability clause. Mr. Cornacchia provided the second reading of Public Hearing Ordinance 2-93/In The Matter of Amending Lane Code Chapter 12 to Conform to Revisions in Chapter IV of the Eugene/Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan Concerning the Plan Amendment Process.

Ms. Stein reported that the first item before the Springfield City Council was the revision of the policy section of Chapter 4 of the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan to streamline and clarify the plan amendment process, and adopting a severability clause--first reading, and the second item was an ordinance amending Article 7 Metro Plan Amendments of the Springfield Development Code--first reading.

Ms. Childs said that the public hearing concerned ordinances amending the Metropolitan Plan text and each jurisdiction's development and zoning codes. She said that each jurisdiction must adopt an identical ordinance amending the plan text, while each jurisdiction must independently adopt amendments particular to its zoning and development codes. For the benefit of the audience, Ms. Childs again reviewed the changes proposed to the amendment process.

Ms. Childs reported that notice of the hearing was provided to all parties on the interested parties list developed for the joint planning commissions hearing and the DLCD. She referred to the correspondence from DLCD regarding the changes, and said that the letter does not state the region was precluded from adopting two separate plans; rather, it indicated that the participation of all three jurisdictions was required as long as the current jointly adopted Metro Plan was in force.

Linda Raybould, 1125 North 58th Street, said she represented the Springfield Planning Commission and wished to indicate the commission's continued support for its proposals.

Ken Tollenaar, Eugene Planning Commission, said that the commission supported the revisions to the amendment process as proposed and endorsed the Lane County Planning Commission's recommendation for a shortened time frame of 180 days for amendment processing. Mr. Tollenaar said that the revisions substitute a clear and simplified classification system for the existing system, eliminate a step in the current process, simplify the approval criteria by eliminating the need to find an amendment was not a plan update amendment, and limit the need for cross-jurisdictional participation in diagram amendments and site-specific text changes through the "opt in" alternative.

Mr. Tollenaar said that the Eugene Planning Commission has discussed the Springfield proposals with representatives of the Springfield Planning Commission. The Eugene commission believes the Springfield proposals are important and should be considered in connection with the plan update. Mr. Tollenaar pointed out that failure to approve the revisions to the amendment process would return the area to the current amendment process.

Joyce Lorenz, 1509 Cottonwood Street, said she supported the effort to streamline the amendment process. She submitted three questions to the joint officials and requested clarification: 1) will property owners located between the UGB and Metro Plan boundaries work with the County in amendment initiation or the cities; 2) were one jurisdiction to chose to "opt in" to the other jurisdiction's amendment process, would that jurisdiction be limited to the specific findings for significant effect through the remainder of the process; and 3) will fees go down if the process was streamlined.

Ms. Lorenz requested that the public record be kept open for an additional seven days.

Allen Johnson, 3970 University Street, said he was available to answer questions regarding his written testimony. Mr. Johnson said he was pleased that the elected officials were beginning to take a fundamental look at the relationship between the jurisdictions. He referred to the 1981 direction from the Land Conservation and Development Commission stipulating that the jurisdictions must adopt a single metropolitan plan and termed the result a "polygamous shotgun marriage."

Mr. Johnson responded to statements in the letter from DLCD staff, and said that it was his experience that the DLCD was sometimes right and sometimes wrong. He called the response a "lower staff level letter," and suggested that a different response might have been received from the director or LCDC. Mr. Johnson did not agree that it would be necessary to restructure the metropolitan planning model as had been suggested, pointing to the Portland metropolitan planning system overseen by the Metropolitan Service District (MSD) as an example for the community to consider. He said that MSD has the responsibility for establishing urban growth boundaries and maintains a common data base, but individual jurisdictions adopt individual plans.

Mr. Johnson suggested that an alternative to the current planning model was the existing State planning appeal system: one jurisdiction could take the decision of the other jurisdiction to LUBA or the DLCD.

Mr. Johnson called the DLDC opinion wrong and reiterated his belief that the cities did not have to continue joint participation in urban growth boundary changes. He said that it was important for Springfield to make a decision about how it wants to govern itself, as he considered the issue one of governance as well as planning. Mr. Johnson concurred with Mr. Tollenaar's suggestion to pursue the Springfield proposal in the periodic review process.

Ms. Childs responded to Ms. Lorenz' questions. She said that property owners located outside the UGB but within the planning boundary would work with Lane County staff to initiate plan amendments. Regarding Ms. Lorenz' question about whether jurisdictions would be limited to the findings developed in conjunction with a decision to "opt in" during the amendment process, Ms. Childs said no. The purpose of opting in was to determine whether a jurisdiction has an interest in the proceedings; a decision on an amendment must be based on the record of the hearings process. Regarding fees, Ms. Childs said that the current fee structure was based on the current categorization system,

and as part of the implementation differential fees will be established based on the number of jurisdictions involved in the process. She added that elected officials have the option of raising fees if they choose.

Ms. Childs noted that the hearing did not concern a quasi-judicial matter so the elected officials were not obligated to hold the record open, but could if they desired.

The elected officials agreed by consensus to hold the record open for seven days.

Bill Van Vactor, Acting Lane County Administrator, cautioned the commission that were the record to remain open, it might wish to remain circumspect about the scope of its deliberations. The commission briefly discussed Mr. Van Vactor's counsel. Mr. Cornacchia suggested that given Mr. Van Vactor's advice, the elected officials might wish to reconsider holding open the record. He said he believed there was considerable value in the ability of the three elected bodies to be able to discuss the issue thoroughly.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Van Vactor about his reasoning. Mr. Van Vactor pointed out that additional written information could come to the elected officials; were the deliberations to lead to a decision, an objection to the decision could be based on the lack of consideration of the written testimony in the findings. He suggested that any commission decision be tentative.

Mayor Morrisette closed the public hearing of the Springfield City Council.

Mayor Bascom closed the public hearing of the Eugene City Council.

Mr. Cornacchia closed the public hearing of the Lane County Board of Commissioners.

Ms. Frazier asked representatives of the Springfield City Council what events had spurred the Springfield proposals. Mr. Maine responded that the Blue Water Boats proposal had been the catalyst. The company's proposal meant about 100 additional jobs to the community. The process had been delayed for reasons he did not believe were valid. Mr. Maine said that Eugene's position on the proposal had arbitrarily delayed the process. He did not wish to go through the same process in the future, adding he did not believe Springfield could support the current planning model.

Ms. Keller observed that a failure to approve the revisions to the amendment process would return the community to the existing system, and asked if Springfield was willing to accept that situation. Mr. Maine said that unless the jurisdictions reached a solution that Springfield could accept, he believed the council was not inclined to adopt the revisions.

Mr. Cornacchia recalled that concerns raised by him and Lee Beyer of the Springfield City Council in the past about the timeliness and cost of the process had led to the changes in the amendment process. He had advocated at the time those changes were made for many of the currently proposed changes.

Mr. Cornacchia said he would like for the jurisdictions to take advantage of the improvements represented by the revisions, and expressed a willingness to commit to further discussion of the Springfield proposals at either the MPC level or through another process. He asked his fellow commissioners and representatives of Eugene to indicate their similar commitment to further discussion.

Mr. Nicholson asked if separate planning processes would still require joint action on urban growth boundary changes. In response, Allen Johnson said that he believed that two boundaries based on the same data base could be established, and changes to one jurisdiction's boundary could be appealed by the other jurisdiction. Mr. Johnson did not believe separate boundaries would require separate metropolitan planning documents.

Mr. Rust suggested that were the jurisdictions to discuss the Springfield proposals, he believed they should consider the possibility of a single planning commission and zoning code for the entire metropolitan area.

Mr. Rust observed that the three jurisdictions participate in many joint endeavors, including the Wastewater Treatment Plant and transportation planning. He pointed out that the Lane County Board of Commissioners had opposed the Good Neighbor Care project, but as in the case of Eugene, the commission had reconsidered that project, which had gone forward. Mr. Rust said that he believed losing the opportunity to make the amendment process less costly and complicated because of a decision with which Mr. Maine disagreed was a mistake.

Mr. Maine said his concern focused on the possibility of future Springfield projects and how they would be addressed in the planning process.

Mr. Green said he appreciated Springfield's concerns regarding economic development as Eugene shared those concerns. However, he questioned whether those concerns were best addressed by costly separate planning processes.

Mr. Boles said he had voted against the Blue Water Boats proposal because of his belief that it was not rational land use planning. He pointed to the availability of existing industrial land within the urban growth boundary. Mr. Boles did not believe that land use planning should be occur through an ad hoc approach, and did not approve of changes to the urban growth boundary because of speculation regarding projects that would be sited outside the boundary. Mr. Boles indicated his support for a Metropolitan Plan update, and suggested that it was Springfield's unwillingness in the past to participate in an update process that led to the impasse facing the jurisdictions. He endorsed Mr. Rust's comments regarding a joint planning commission and zoning code as a rational means to address metropolitan planning issues. Mr. Boles said many of the problems facing the community rose from the existing "dual government" structure.

Mr. Nicholson said separate planning processes would not eliminate the functional interdependence between the jurisdictions. Mr. Nicholson suggested that it was easy to be attracted by the short-term economic gain that resulted

when developers were allowed to buy and develop cheap land outside the urban growth boundary. He believed that to allow one jurisdiction to do so would mean that the other jurisdiction would pay a price through the impact on municipal systems. Mr. Nicholson maintained that a single Metropolitan Plan provided the area with fairness, consistency, and a rational approach to development.

Mr. MacDonald said that the community needed a mechanism to gauge its willingness to pursue major planning projects to completion. He concurred with Mr. Cornacchia regarding the need for further discussion of the Springfield proposals, and suggested it was appropriate to do so in the context of the Metropolitan Plan update. Mr. MacDonald urged the elected officials to approve the revisions to the amendment process.

Mayor Bascom said that Eugene was cognizant of Springfield's concerns and was committed to the organic evolution of the area's planning efforts. She said failure to approve the revisions would represent a waste of time and effort, and endorsed a move toward process simplification. Mayor Bascom indicated willingness for further discussion of the Springfield proposals.

Mr. Robinette said he had supported the Blue Water Boats proposal and was sensitive to Springfield's desire for further economic development. However, he believed that the joint planning effort was protection for such development, as the alternative was head-to-head competition with Eugene. Mr. Robinette questioned whether Springfield wished to enter into such competition.

Mr. Roberts said that he did not perceive the proposed revisions to the amendment process as inconsistent with Springfield's desires. He said that the changes made sense. Mr. Roberts said he did not think it likely that the LCDC would accept the Springfield proposal, adding further that local government did not have the resources for a new planning effort. He said coordinated planning was a sensible approach as the actions of one jurisdiction impacts the other jurisdictions.

Mr. Roberts disagreed with the statements made by Mr. Rust and Mr. Boles regarding the need for a single planning commission. He said that the cultures and needs of the communities of Springfield and Eugene are different. He did not support "mega-government" as he did not think integrating all levels of government into a single superstructure was necessarily the most efficient or best approach. Mr. Roberts said that, as imperfect as it was, coordinated planning was best for the community. He said that the Blue Water Boats proposal had been resolved to Springfield's satisfaction, and suggested that it had been a successful proposal not because the Eugene council was convinced it was the right decision, but because the council recognized the importance of the intergovernmental relationship and the need for good will.

Responding to Mr. Robinette's remarks, Mr. Maine said that Springfield was not afraid to compete with Eugene and could hold its own in such competition. He said that he appreciated the comments made by those in attendance and stressed that Springfield did not wish to destroy the metropolitan planning process.

However, Mr. Maine continued to be concerned about what he perceived as the unilateral veto power of one jurisdiction over the actions of the other jurisdiction. He was supportive of a coordinated approach that restricted participation to the affected city and Lane County, but reiterated that Springfield was not interested in a partnership where one jurisdiction holds veto power over the other. He said Springfield wanted to establish a foundation in which it acted as an equal partner. Mr. Maine stressed the importance of the issue to Springfield and said he did not want to wait upon the update process for resolution.

Mr. Nicholson said that the planning process was a consensus process. He agreed with Mr. Roberts' analysis of the Blue Water Boats decision. Mr. Nicholson questioned whether an appeals process as suggested by Mr. Johnson would serve the goals of Springfield. He said it was appropriate that each jurisdiction has a veto power when it feels its substantive interests are seriously threatened by the land use decisions of another.

Mr. Rust referred to Mr. Maine's comment regarding the need for an equal partnership and questioned how the existing arrangement constituted an unequal partnership. Mr. Maine responded that he believed in the majority vote. He did not think the partnership was equal for either city.

Responding to a question from Mr. Green, Mr. Maine said that the result of the current process was a "quid pro quo" situation wherein one city would veto the decisions of the other city because of a previous veto. He said he had never seen the situation work another way, citing Awbrey-Meadowview, the Gateway Shopping Center, and Blue Water Boats in support of his statement.

Ms. Keller said she approached decision making from a consensus position, citing as a benefit of consensus the need to consider the long-term relationships between the communities. She said inherent in consensus was the concept of "standing aside," which was how Eugene addressed the Blue Water Boats proposal. Eugene decided the relationship was more important than the issue and recognized the importance of the issue to Springfield in order to reach closure. Such a consensus approach meant that there were no "losers" in the process, although Ms. Keller suggested that from a planning perspective Eugene could be considered the "loser" in the Blue Water Boats proposal. Eugene was not responding to that "loss" by fighting Springfield on other proposals; that was not part of the consensus process. Ms. Keller said that the current process brings the communities together to work for planning goals.

Mr. Cornacchia said that the discussion had been useful. However, he said that failure of the Springfield City Council to accept the process revisions would be largely symbolic, and questioned what would be accomplished by such an action. He encouraged the elected officials to accept the revisions and reiterated his suggestion that jurisdictions commit to further discussion of the Springfield proposal.

Mayor Bascom agreed with Mr. Cornacchia's remarks.

Mr. MacDonald said that the region coordinates its planning efforts in order to jointly market residential, industrial, and commercial lands, and to save costs. He believed that approach benefited the community and was a motivation for continued coordination. Mr. MacDonald acknowledged the wide variety of intergovernmental efforts, and encouraged the elected officials to work toward a resolution that avoided dissolution of those efforts.

Responding to comments from Mr. Robinette, Mr. Burge said that Springfield was capable of competing in any area. Mr. Burge expressed concern about the willingness of Eugene to compromise sound land use planning considerations for the sake of intergovernmental relations. He said that compromise did not serve the public interest. Mr. MacDonald responded to Mr. Burge's remarks by pointing out that he had moved to reconsider the issue as one of the prevailing councilors in the original vote. He said he would still vote against the proposal, but the reconsideration had allowed a councilor absent from the first vote to change the results.

Mr. Walters said that the issue was a philosophical one: was Springfield capable of charting its own destiny? He said that he believed it was. The Springfield council feels shackled to Eugene in its efforts to achieve its goals. The Springfield City Council had identified several areas, such as additional high-end housing and job creation, for work over the next few years. Springfield wanted to move forward with its goals. Mr. Walters said Springfield did not want to be entangled in lengthy land use processes. The council was agreed on its future and wanted to achieve its vision for Springfield. Mr. Walters said he could not support the amendment revisions.

Mayor Morrisette claimed that the two councils had different philosophies, terming the Springfield council a "business" council and the Eugene council a "environmental" council. Referring to the Blue Water Boats proposal, Mayor Morrisette said that the amendment process only worked if one jurisdiction deferred to the wishes of the other jurisdiction, unless there was a very good reason not to defer. Gridlock would result from the failure of one jurisdictions to defer to the wishes of the other. Mayor Morrisette said that the Springfield council has the perception that the Eugene council was going in a very different direction from it. He said that continued cooperation was his goal, and he believed it was essential for the communities to work together. However, Mayor Morrisette pointed out that the Springfield council, not him, would make the final decision on the amendment revisions.

Mr. Boles pointed out that the development community seeks predictability. Mayor Morrisette responded with the rejoinder that people who try to be the most consistent are often the least consistent, and if Mr. Boles was judging the Eugene council on predictability he believed it was very inconsistent. Mayor Morrisette believed that the Springfield council was attempting to be true to its feelings, and suggested that would lead to greater consistency in the long run.

Mr. Rust questioned why the meeting had been held if the Springfield City Council was already resolved in its decision to reject the amendment revi-

sions. Mayor Morrisette said that the resolution was not a foregone conclusion.

Mr. Cornacchia expressed disappointment in the three jurisdictions' failure to act on the revisions to the amendment process.

Ms. Frazier said that each board member represented different districts with different views. Typically, when a decision related to an individual district was considered, the commission refers to the district's commissioner for advice regarding the decision due to that commissioner's superior knowledge of the district. Ms. Frazier said that people from Eugene do not know Springfield as well as the Springfield council. She agreed that the current system was not working, and said that Springfield's concerns should be respected and acted upon.

Mr. Rust moved, seconded by Mr. Roberts, that the commission defer the third reading on the amendment revisions until February 17. The motion passed unanimously, 5:0.

Mayor Bascom noted that the Eugene City Council would consider the revisions to the amendment process on March 1, 1993. Mayor Morrisette indicated that the Springfield council would consider the revisions on March 15, 1993.

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Micheal Gleason
City Manager

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)
jeo04.023