



# Staff Report and Findings

## Metro Plan Type II Amendment- Type IV (Legislative) Procedure

### Springfield Transportation System Plan Implementation

---

<b>Project Name:</b>	Springfield 2035 Transportation System Plan (TSP) Implementation
<b>Project Proposal:</b>	Amend the Springfield Development Code (SDC) to implement the policies in the TSP.
<b>City of Springfield Case Number:</b>	811-17-000165-TYP4 Development Code Amend.
<b>Lane County Case Number:</b>	PA 1359
<b>DLCD Notification Date:</b>	December 19, 2017 & October 15, 2019 (rev.)
<b>Joint City of Springfield and Lane County Planning Commissions Hearing:</b>	January 23 and February 6, 2018
<b>Lane County Board 1<sup>st</sup> Reading:</b>	October 15, 2019
<b>Joint City Council and Board of County Commissioners Hearing:</b>	November 4, 2019

#### I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

##### COMPONENTS

##### 1. Development Code Amendment

The Springfield Transportation System Plan (TSP) was jointly adopted by the City of Springfield and Lane County in March of 2014. Through that process the City of Springfield determined how the transportation system is currently used and how it should change to meet the long-term (20-year) needs of Springfield's residents, businesses, and visitors. Through coordination with community members and affected public agencies, the City of Springfield developed a TSP for improvements of all modes of transportation in Springfield, including the roadway, bicycle and pedestrian, transit, and rail networks. The plan also includes a transportation improvement and financing plan. Since the TSP has been adopted, the City is now amending the Springfield Development Code (SDC) to implement the TSP policies.

Chapter 2 of the TSP contains Goals, Policies, and Action Items to provide direction for the next 20 years. The TSP Goals reflect the community's vision for Springfield's future transportation system and offer a framework for policies and action items. The policies, organized by goal, provide high-level direction for the City's policy and decision-makers and for City staff. The policies will be implemented over the life of the Plan. Specifically, many of these policies are implemented through the Springfield Development Code

(SDC). These newly updated policies provide baseline direction for the revisions and updates to the SDC and the Springfield Engineering Design Standards and Procedures Manual (EDSPM).

Chapter 7 of the TSP provides direction for the implementation updates included in this ordinance, including a reference to Appendix I.

Appendix I of the TSP provides a proposed outline of sections of the Springfield Development Code (SDC) to be amended to implement the TSP. This list has guided the development of the changes. The SDC revisions offer language to amend portions of the SDC furthering TSP implementation. In the attached Springfield Development Code Amendments (Exhibit A), existing language in relevant sections of the SDC is presented with new text underlined. Deleted text is shown in ~~strikethrough~~ format. Relevant TSP policies and implementation actions applicable to Code changes are cited at the beginning of each Code section, along with explanatory findings.

## II. BACKGROUND

The progress of this update was guided by the Project Management Team (PMT) made up of City of Springfield staff, under the direction of the project Oversight Team. The project Oversight Team is comprised of managers from various divisions within the Development and Public Works Department. The project was also guided by a Technical Review Team (TRT), Stakeholder Sounding Board (SSB), the Planning Commission, and the City Council.

The TRT provided guidance on technical aspects and consisted of representatives from affected governmental entities and regional partners. The SSB ensured that the needs of people in the community of Springfield were incorporated in the process. The SSB consisted of Springfield residents and other community stakeholders who provided input throughout the draft amendments development process.

After a thorough planning process involving the general public, stakeholders, other agency staff, and local and regional appointed and elected officials, staff prepared this report evaluating the changes. The report includes findings which address relevant approval criteria as described in this report. These findings provide a basis for concluding that the adoption of the changes meets the approval criteria found in SDC Sections 5.6-115 and 5.14-135 (as described below) and Lane County Code Section 12.225.

## III. FINDINGS

### Procedural Requirements

Finding: The *Metro Plan* describes itself as a framework plan that is intended to be supplemented by more detailed city-specific plans, programs, and policies (Metro Plan p. I-6).

Finding: The proposal includes amendments to the TSP and amendments to the Springfield Development Code (SDC). The TSP is a single subject plan that is a type of functional plan of the Metro Plan. The procedural requirements for amending the Metro Plan are provided in Metro Plan Chapter IV and SDC 5.14-100. Because the amendments apply only within Lane County and the City of Springfield, this Metro Plan amendment is a “Type II” amendment under SDC 5.14-115, requiring approval by the governing bodies of the City of Springfield and Lane County. Springfield is the “home city” for this amendment. Lane

County is included because the amendments may apply to unincorporated land within the Springfield UGB.

Finding: The Metro Plan and code amendments were initiated by the City of Springfield Development and Public Works Director (Director). The amendments are not site-specific and therefore are a legislative action.

Finding: SDC 5.14-130.A requires the City to provide notice to other relevant governing bodies. Notice was given to the City of Eugene and Lane County on December 19, 2017.

Finding: SDC Section 5.2-115 and Lane County Code Section 12.040 require legislative land use decisions be advertised in a newspaper of general circulation, providing information about the legislative action and the time, place, and location of the hearing. Notice of the public hearing concerning this matter was published on Friday, January 12, 2018 in the Eugene Register Guard, advertising the first evidentiary hearing before the joint City of Springfield and Lane County Planning Commissions on January 23, 2018, a continued joint Planning Commission hearing on Tuesday February 6, 2018. Notice of the joint Springfield City Council and Lane County Board of Commissioners public hearing held on November 4, 2019 was published on Wednesday, October 23, 2019. The content of the notice complied with the requirements in SDC Section 5.2-115 and Lane County Code 12.040 for legislative actions.

Finding: The Director is required to send notice to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) as specified in OAR 660-18-0020. A “DLCD Notice of Proposed Amendment” was submitted in accordance with DLCD submission guidelines via the FTP website to the DLCD on December 19, 2017 alerting the agency to the City’s proposal to amend the Metro Plan by amending the Springfield 2035 TSP, to adopt the Conceptual Street Map into the Springfield 2035 TSP, and to amend the Springfield Development Code. The notice was mailed more than 35 days in advance of the first evidentiary hearing as required by ORS 197.610 (1). A revised notice was provided to DLCD in accordance with the DLCD submission guidelines via the Post Acknowledgement Plan Amendment (PAPA) website on October 15, 2019 describing the changes made by the Planning Commissions after their public hearing and the Council Alternatives that Springfield City Council developed to put out for public hearing alongside the Planning Commissions’ Recommendation during the November 4, 2019 joint public hearing.

Finding: ORS 227.186 requires the local government to mail a notice to every landowner whose property is proposed to be “rezoned” as a result of adoption or amendment of a proposed ordinance (also known as “Ballot Measure 56” notice). Property is “rezoned” under ORS 227.186 when a city adopts or amends an ordinance in a manner that limits or prohibits land uses previously allowed in the affected zone. The TSP and development code amendments may physically reduce the amount of land available for private uses in some circumstances and therefore may “rezone” property under ORS 227.186. The City mailed a notice complying with ORS 227.186 to every land owner within the City of Springfield urban growth boundary on December 14, 2017.

## **1. DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENTS – APPROVAL CRITERIA**

The applicable approval criteria for the development code amendments to implement the TSP are provided in SDC 5.6-115:

In reaching a decision to adopt or amend the Springfield Development Code, the Council must adopt findings that demonstrate conformance to the following:

- (1) The Metro Plan;
- (2) Applicable State statutes; and
- (3) Applicable State-wide Planning Goals and Administrative Rules.

**CODE AMENDMENT**

**CRITERION #1: SDC 5.6-115 A.1 CONFORMANCE WITH THE METRO PLAN**

Finding: The Metro Plan is the DLCDC acknowledged long range comprehensive plan for the City of Springfield. The 2035 Springfield Transportation System Plan (TSP) was adopted by Ordinance 6314 on March 13, 2014, and is the acknowledged Transportation Element of the Metro Plan for the City of Springfield.

Finding: Chapter 7 of the TSP addresses future amendments to the Springfield Development Code needed to implement the TSP. The specific changes that may be needed to implement the 2035 Springfield TSP are provided in the TSP Volume 2, Appendix I. The changes address the following:

- Needs of the transportation dependent and disadvantaged;
- System connectivity;
- Ways of supporting and promoting walking, biking, and taking transit;
- Treatment of transportation facilities in the land use planning and permitting process; and
- Update and adopt the Conceptual Street Map.

Finding: The TSP policies and implementation actions that are applicable to the code changes are cited at the beginning of each Code section in the Springfield Development Code (SDC) Amendments, along with specific findings for each set of code amendments.

**CONCLUSION:** Based on the findings above, including the findings in the attached Springfield Development Code Amendments, the amendments are consistent with the Metro Plan. SDC 5.6-115 Criterion B is met.

**CODE AMENDMENT**

**CRITERION #2: SDC 5.6-115 A.2. CONFORMANCE WITH STATE STATUTES**

Finding: ORS 197.610 requires local jurisdictions to submit proposed comprehensive plan or land use regulation changes to Department of Land Conservation and Development. As noted in the Procedural Findings on page 3 of this staff report, notice of the proposed implementing amendments to the Springfield Development Code was provided to DLCDC more than 35 days in advance of the first evidentiary hearing concerning the amendments.

Finding: ORS 227.186 requires the local government to mail a notice to every landowner whose property is proposed to be “rezoned” as a result of adoption or amendment of a proposed ordinance (also known as “Ballot Measure 56” notice.) As noted in the Procedural Findings on page 3 of this staff report, notice complying with ORS 227.186 was mailed to every property owner within the Springfield UGB.

**CONCLUSION:** Based on the findings above, the code amendments are consistent with applicable state statutes. SDC 5.6-115 Criterion B has been met.

**CODE AMENDMENT**

**CRITERION #2: SDC 5.6-115 C. CONFORMANCE WITH STATEWIDE PLANNING GOALS AND ADMINISTRATIVE RULES**

*Statewide Planning Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement:*

This goal outlines the citizen involvement requirement for adoption of Comprehensive Plans and changes to the Comprehensive Plan and implementing documents.

Finding: An extensive and significant public outreach process occurred during the TSP update project that contributed to the Goals and Policies which were eventually adopted in the TSP and are now being used for the basis of this implementation process. For this implementation process this goal has been met through additional public outreach and an involvement process.

A Public Involvement Program for the implementation of the TSP was developed in preparation of the Project. This Program was reviewed and endorsed by the Committee for Citizen Involvement (i.e. the Springfield Planning Commission). The Program outlined the information, outreach methods, and involvement opportunities available to the citizens during the process.

The outreach and public involvement process included the following engagement opportunities:

- Involvement on the Stakeholder Sounding Board
- Involvement of the Springfield Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
- Information conveyed through the project website
- Mailed notice to every property owner in the Springfield UGB
- Public open house for stakeholders to see proposed changes, learn more, and provide feedback
- Published notice in the newspaper
- Public hearing process at the Planning Commission
- Public hearing process at the City Council

As a result of this public involvement process, the proposed amendments meet the requirements of Goal 1.

*Statewide Planning Goal 2 – Land Use Planning:*

This goal outlines the land use planning process and policy framework. The Metro Plan and TSP have been acknowledged by DLCDC as being consistent with the statewide planning goals.

*Statewide Planning Goals 3 & 4: Agricultural Lands and Forest Lands*

Finding: These statewide planning goals relate to agricultural and forest lands in Oregon and are not applicable to these amendments.

*Statewide Planning Goal 5 – Natural Resources*

This goal requires the inventory and protection of natural resources, open spaces, historic areas and sites.

Finding: The City is currently in compliance with the State’s Goal 5. The amendments do not alter the City’s acknowledged Goal 5 inventories or land use programs. No changes will occur directly to current natural resource protections as a result of these amendments. Individual transportation project impacts are required to conduct a Goal 5 analysis during each project development phase. As a result, the amendments are in compliance with Goal 5 process requirements.

*Statewide Planning Goal 6: Air, Water, and Land Resources Quality*

To maintain and improve the quality of the air, water, and land resources of the state.

Finding: The City is currently in compliance with Statewide Planning Goal 6. The amendments do not alter the City’s acknowledged land use programs regarding water quality and flood management protections. As a result, the amendments are in compliance with Goal 6.

*Statewide Planning Goal 7 – Areas Subject to Natural Hazards*

To protect people and property from natural hazards.

Finding: The City is currently in compliance with Goal 7. The amendments do not alter the City’s acknowledged land use programs regarding potential landslide areas and flood protection.

*Statewide Planning Goal 8 – Recreational Needs*

This goal requires the satisfaction of the recreational needs of the citizens of the state and visitors and, where appropriate, to provide for the siting of necessary recreational facilities including destination resorts.

Finding: The City is currently in compliance with Goal 8. The TSP includes some multi-use paths that meet a recreational need in addition to transportation need (see Willamalane Comprehensive Plan for paths that help meet recreational needs). As further explained in the findings in the Springfield Development Code (SDC) Amendments, the code amendments address these facilities by specifically permitting linear parks as a permitted use in various zoning districts and by establishing new improvement standards for multi-use paths in SDC 4.2-150. The code amendments are consistent with Goal 8.

*Statewide Planning Goal 9: Economic Development*

To provide adequate opportunities throughout the state for a variety of economic activities vital to the health, welfare, and prosperity of Oregon’s citizens.

Finding: The code amendments implement acknowledged TSP policies to provide a multi-modal transportation system to meet the needs of the community into the future, including accommodating economic growth. The motor vehicle parking code amendments help implement TSP Policy 2.7 Action 1 by increasing developable area by right-sizing parking requirements. The code amendments are consistent with this goal.

*Statewide Planning Goal 10: Housing*

To provide adequate housing for the needs of the community, region, and state.

Finding: The amendments implement acknowledged TSP policies to provide a multi-modal transportation system to meet the needs of the community into the future, including accommodating its housing needs.

Finding: Goal 10, OAR 660-008-0015, generally requires clear and objective approval standards regulating the development of needed housing on buildable land, or the provision for an alternative discretionary review procedure that complies with the rule. The code amendments that affect needed housing are written in clear and objective terms, including the street network standards in SDC 4.2-105E, requirements for motor vehicle parking SDC 4.6-110 and 4.6-125, and requirements for bicycle parking in SDC 4.6-145 through 4.6-155 that apply to residential uses. The code amendments are therefore consistent with Goal 10.

*Statewide Planning Goal 11: Public Facilities and Services*

To plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development.

Finding: The amendments do not reduce any requirements for the extension or provision of public facilities or services during development review procedures and will have no effect on adopted and acknowledged public facilities plans. Additionally, adoption of the code amendments assists with infrastructure planning and construction as identified in the PFSP project lists, because the street network standards in SDC 4.2-105 assist with as-yet dedicated and constructed streets that provide infrastructure corridors for planned stormwater, sanitary sewer, water and electricity facilities. The code amendments are therefore consistent with Goal 11.

*Statewide Planning Goal 12: Transportation*

To provide and encourage a safe, convenient, and economic transportation system.

TPR Requirements	Springfield TSP Implementation
<b>660-012-0045 Implementation of the Transportation System Plan</b>	
(1) Each local government shall amend its land use regulations to implement the TSP.	The amendments implement the TSP in compliance with this section.
(2) Local governments shall adopt land use or subdivision ordinance regulations, consistent with applicable federal and state requirements, to protect transportation facilities, corridors and sites for their identified functions. Such regulations shall include:	The City of Springfield is adopting land use regulations to meet these standards by adopting the amendments.
(a) Access control measures, for example, driveway and public road spacing, median control and signal spacing standards, which are consistent with the functional classification of roads and consistent with limiting development on rural lands to rural uses and densities;	New or revised provisions are addressing the public road spacing through block perimeter requirements (SDC 4.2-1105D.4 and 4.2-105E.4), medians (SDC 4.2-105F), and other measures in conformance with this provision.

TPR Requirements	Springfield TSP Implementation
(b) Standards to protect future operation of roads, transitways and major transit corridors;	New or revised provisions address street connectivity and minimum right-of-way and paving requirements (SDC 4.2-105C), minimum block length and block perimeter (SDC 4.2-105D.4 and SDC 4.2-105E.4), special street setbacks to preserve future connections (SDC 4.2-105M), and other measures consistent with this provision. SDC 4.2-120B supports access management on higher classification streets by requiring driveways to take access from lower classification streets when there is an option available. SDC 4.2-130C Exception allows for adjustments to vision clearance in accordance with the AASHTO Green Book in situations with safety concerns.
(c) Measures to protect public use airports by controlling land uses within airport noise corridors and imaginary surfaces, and by limiting physical hazards to air navigation;	There are no airports existing or planned within the City of Springfield; therefore this provision is not applicable.
(d) A process for coordinated review of future land use decisions affecting transportation facilities, corridors or sites;	SDC 5.1-130 through SDC 5.1-140 require all Administrative, Quasi-Judicial, and Legislative land use decisions to be forwarded to a Development Review Committee for review and input. For applications that impact transportation facilities and services, the Development Review Committee includes outside transportation and transit agencies such as Lane Transit District, Lane County, and the State Highway Division. No changes to these provisions are included in the amendments.
(e) A process to apply conditions to development proposals in order to minimize impacts and protect transportation facilities, corridors or sites;	The City has existing processes built into the Springfield Development Code to address impacts to and protect transportation facilities. These processes are contained in Chapter 5 of the SDC and include Ministerial, Administrative, and Quasi-Judicial review processes that provide for review of Land Division, Site Plan review, and other application types.

TPR Requirements	Springfield TSP Implementation
<p>(f) Regulations to provide notice to public agencies providing transportation facilities and services, MPOs, and ODOT of:</p> <p>(A) Land use applications that require public hearings;</p> <p>(B) Subdivision and partition applications;</p> <p>(C) Other applications which affect private access to roads; and</p> <p>(D) Other applications within airport noise corridors and imaginary surfaces which affect airport operations; and</p>	<p>SDC 5.1-130 through SDC 5.1-140 require all Administrative, Quasi-Judicial, and Legislative land use decisions to be forwarded to a Development Review Committee for review and input. For applications that impact transportation facilities and services, the Development Review Committee includes outside transportation and transit agencies such as Lane Transit District, Lane County, and the State Highway Division. No changes to these provisions are included in the amendments.</p>
<p>(g) Regulations assuring that amendments to land use designations, densities, and design standards are consistent with the functions, capacities and performance standards of facilities identified in the TSP.</p>	<p>Consistency with the Metro Plan is a criteria of approval for all development code amendments (SDC 5.6-115.A), zoning map amendments (SDC 5.22-115.C), and Metro Plan diagram amendments (SDC 5.14-135.B). The TSP is a component of the Metro Plan, and therefore these criteria comply with this provision of the TPR. No changes to these criteria are included in the amendments.</p>
<p>(3) Local governments shall adopt land use or subdivision regulations for urban areas and rural communities as set forth below. The purposes of this section are to provide for safe and convenient pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular circulation consistent with access management standards and the function of affected streets, to ensure that new development provides on-site streets and accessways that provide reasonably direct routes for pedestrian and bicycle travel in areas where pedestrian and bicycle travel is likely if connections are provided, and which avoids wherever possible levels of automobile traffic which might interfere with or discourage pedestrian or bicycle travel.</p>	<p>The street network standards in SDC 4.2-105 implement this section of the rule, in addition to the amendments to the infrastructure standards in SDC Chapter 4 outlined below.</p>
<p>(a) Bicycle parking facilities as part of new multi-family residential developments of four units or more, new retail, office and institutional developments, and all transit transfer stations and park-and-ride lots;</p>	<p>The bicycle parking requirements in SDC 4.6-155 Table 4.6-3 require bike parking facilities for all the identified uses.</p>

TPR Requirements	Springfield TSP Implementation
<p>(b) On-site facilities shall be provided which accommodate safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle access from within new subdivisions, multi-family developments, planned developments, shopping centers, and commercial districts to adjacent residential areas and transit stops, and to neighborhood activity centers within one-half mile of the development. Single-family residential developments shall generally include streets and accessways. Pedestrian circulation through parking lots should generally be provided in the form of accessways.</p> <p>(A) "Neighborhood activity centers" includes, but is not limited to, existing or planned schools, parks, shopping areas, transit stops or employment centers;</p>	<p>SDC 4.2-160 already provides for pedestrian accessways to allow pedestrians and bicyclists convenient linkages to adjacent streets, residential areas, neighborhood activity centers, industrial or commercial centers, transit facilities, parks, schools, open space, or trails and paths where no public street access exists; these requirements are not proposed to be repealed. Amendments to SDC 4.2-105D.4.c. allow accessways to be required instead of a street connection for certain exceptions to block length and perimeter standards. Amendments to SDC 4.2-105E.3.c. allow accessways to be required at a cul-de-sacs or dead-end-streets that are not stubbed streets to shorten the walking and biking distance from a cul-de-sac or dead-end street to a Neighborhood Activity Center. Amendments to SDC 4.2-120A.3 may require abutting parking areas within the same zoning district to provide driveway connections or pedestrian connections internal to the sites to provide efficient connectivity and provide more direct walking and biking routes. The amendments to SDC 4.6-145 through 155 require bicycle parking facilities for the uses described in this section of the rule. Amendments to SDC 4.7-195 improve pedestrian circulation on school sites between bicycle parking facilities and the main buildings on the site.</p>
<p>(B) Bikeways shall be required along arterials and major collectors. Sidewalks shall be required along arterials, collectors and most local streets in urban areas, except that sidewalks are not required along controlled access roadways, such as freeways;</p>	<p>Amendments to SDC 4.2-105 and Table 4.2-1 clarify that bike lanes are required on all arterials, major collectors, and non-residential zoning district minor collectors and setback sidewalks on both sides of the street for all arterials, collectors, and local streets &lt;15 slope, except where specific facility plans identify another requirement. Table 4.2-1 also requires sidewalks on both sides of the street for local streets &gt;15 percent slope, without the planting strip.</p>
<p>(C) Cul-de-sacs and other dead-end streets may be used as part of a development plan, consistent with the purposes set forth in this section;</p>	<p>The amendments to SDC 4.2-105 require dead end streets to provide adequate bike and pedestrian connections.</p>

TPR Requirements	Springfield TSP Implementation
<p>(D) Local governments shall establish their own standards or criteria for providing streets and accessways consistent with the purposes of this section. Such measures may include but are not limited to: standards for spacing of streets or accessways; and standards for excessive out-of-direction travel;</p>	<p>The street network standards in SDC 4.2-105 implement the TSP policies regarding connectivity and SDC 4.2-160 provide standards for accessways and comply with this section of the rule.</p>
<p>(E) Streets and accessways need not be required where one or more of the following conditions exist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Physical or topographic conditions make a street or accessway connection impracticable. Such conditions include but are not limited to freeways, railroads, steep slopes, wetlands or other bodies of water where a connection could not reasonably be provided;</li> <li>(ii) Buildings or other existing development on adjacent lands physically preclude a connection now or in the future considering the potential for redevelopment; or</li> <li>(iii) Where streets or accessways would violate provisions of leases, easements, covenants, restrictions or other agreements existing as of May 1, 1995, which preclude a required street or accessway connection.</li> </ul>	<p>The street network standards in SDC 4.2-105 implement the TSP policies regarding connectivity and comply with this section of the rule.</p>
<p>(c) Where off-site road improvements are otherwise required as a condition of development approval, they shall include facilities accommodating convenient pedestrian and bicycle travel, including bicycle ways along arterials and major collectors;</p>	<p>Amendments to SDC 4.2-105 and Table 4.2-1 clarify that on-street bike lanes are required on all arterials, major collectors, and non-residential zoning district minor collectors unless otherwise provided in a specific facility plan for those improvements (such as inclusion of an off-street multi-use path as part of a planned project identified in the TSP).</p>

TPR Requirements	Springfield TSP Implementation
(e) Internal pedestrian circulation within new office parks and commercial developments shall be provided through clustering of buildings, construction of accessways, walkways and similar techniques.	Standards for internal pedestrian circulation and access for new developments is provided in SDC 5.15-100 Minimum Development Standards and SDC 5.17-100 Site Plan Review for new commercial development. The code amendments do not include substantive changes to these provisions.
(4) To support transit in urban areas containing a population greater than 25,000, where the area is already served by a public transit system or where a determination has been made that a public transit system is feasible, local governments shall adopt land use and subdivision regulations as provided in (a)–(g) [of this rule]	The City of Springfield is served by Lane Transit District. The transit and pedestrian-oriented regulations required by this rule are implemented through the Springfield Development Code Nodal Overlay District in SDC 3.3-1000 and specific mixed-use development standards by zoning district. The code amendments do not include changes to these standards.
(5) In MPO areas, local governments shall adopt land use and subdivision regulations to reduce reliance on the automobile which:	
(a) Allow transit-oriented developments (TODs) on lands along transit routes;	The Springfield Development Code implements transit-oriented development through the mixed-use plan districts and nodal overlay development standards. The code amendments do not contain substantive changes to these provisions.
(b) Implements a demand management program to meet the measurable standards set in the TSP in response to OAR 660-012-0035(4);	As outlined in the findings in the Springfield Development Code Amendments, the amendments implement TSP policies that adopt standards for increasing transportation choices and reducing reliance on the automobile.
(c) Implements a parking plan which [meets standards (A)-(D) identified in the rule]:  (d) As an alternative to (c) above, local governments in an MPO may instead revise ordinance requirements for parking as follows:	The code amendments implement subsection (5)(d) of this rule as outlined below.

TPR Requirements	Springfield TSP Implementation
(A) Reduce minimum off-street parking requirements for all non-residential uses from 1990 levels;	The amendments to SDC 4.6-110 include new motor vehicle parking space reduction credits for bike parking, proximity to identified Frequent Transit Corridors, and for contributions to ADA facilities not otherwise required for a particular development. SDC 4.6-110L allows for a cumulative maximum reduction of 20% of the minimum off-street parking required in Table 4.6-2. SDC 4.6-110M. allows further reductions based upon the average peak period parking demand or peak parking demand identified by the applicant and supported with information that a reasonable person would rely upon, such as transportation demand management or a parking study for a similar development. These reductions apply to any non-residential development outside of the Downtown Exception Area and Glenwood Mixed-Use Plan District (where there are no adopted parking minimums), and effectively reduce the minimum off-street parking requirements to below 1990 levels.
(B) Allow provision of on-street parking, long-term lease parking, and shared parking to meet minimum off-street parking requirements;	SDC 4.6-110 currently allows shared parking and a ½ space credit for on-street parking to meet minimum parking requirements; the on-street parking provision remains for locations where there is no adopted plan to remove the on-street parking (i.e. where a there is a planned bike lane on a collector street).
(C) Establish off-street parking maximums in appropriate locations, such as downtowns, designated regional or community centers, and transit-oriented developments;	The changes to SDC 4.6-125 include an off-street parking maximum of 125% of the identified minimum parking requirement for all non-residential uses unless increased pursuant to a parking study.
(D) Exempt structured parking and on-street parking from parking maximums;	The parking maximum in SDC 4.6-125 is not applicable to on-street parking. Structured parking may be exempt from the maximum parking standard pursuant to a parking study to determine the parking demand.
(E) Require that parking lots over 3 acres in size provide street-like features along major driveways (including curbs, sidewalks, and street trees or planting strips); and	Adopted parking lot landscaping standards in SDC 4.4-105.F already comply with this subsection, and no changes to these requirements are included.

TPR Requirements	Springfield TSP Implementation
(F) Provide for designation of residential parking districts.	The amendments to the parking standards in SDC 4.6-125 establish standards for residential uses that are separate from the requirements for non-residential districts and uses.
(e) Existing development shall be allowed to redevelop a portion of existing parking areas for transit-oriented uses, including bus stops and pullouts, bus shelters, park and ride stations, transit-oriented developments, and similar facilities, where appropriate;	SDC 4.6-110.B currently allows redevelopment of existing excess parking for any permitted use, which includes transit-oriented uses. The amendments allow motor vehicle parking reduction credits that may further decrease the parking requirements for existing uses.
(f) Road systems for new development shall be provided that can be adequately served by transit, including provision of pedestrian access to existing and identified future transit routes. This shall include, where appropriate, separate accessways to minimize travel distances;	SDC 4.2-160 currently provides for pedestrian accessways for new development to provide convenient linkage to transit facilities (among other uses and facilities). The amendments to SDC 4.2-105D.4 and SDC 4.2-105E.4 block length and perimeter standards also provide for pedestrian accessways when block lengths exceed the identified maximums, to minimize pedestrian travel distances in all new development.
(g) Along existing or planned transit routes, designation of types and densities of land uses adequate to support transit.	As outlined in the findings in the Springfield Development Code Amendments, the amendments implement adopted TSP policies to support transit-oriented uses. SDC 4.6-110I-J allow for higher densities of land use in close proximity to Frequent Transit Corridors by reducing the motor vehicle off-street parking requirements.
(e) Require all major industrial, institutional, retail and office developments to provide either a transit stop on site or connection to a transit stop along a transit trunk route when the transit operator requires such an improvement.	Existing standards that apply to Site Plan Review (SDC 5.17-100) and Master Plan Review (SDC 5.13-100) comply with this section of the rule, and the code amendments do not substantively alter these requirements.

TPR Requirements	Springfield TSP Implementation
<p>(6) In developing a bicycle and pedestrian circulation plan as required by OAR 660-012-0020(2)(d), local governments shall identify improvements to facilitate bicycle and pedestrian trips to meet local travel needs in developed areas. Appropriate improvements should provide for more direct, convenient and safer bicycle or pedestrian travel within and between residential areas and neighborhood activity centers (i.e., schools, shopping, transit stops). Specific measures include, for example, constructing walkways between cul-de-sacs and adjacent roads, providing walkways between buildings, and providing direct access between adjacent uses.</p>	<p>The amendments provide for more direct, convenient, and safer bike and pedestrian travel, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addition of linear parks as permitted uses in various zones;</li> <li>• Amendments to the network standards in SDC 4.2-105;</li> <li>• Amendments to the minimum street standards in SDC 4.2-105 to clarify standards for pedestrian and bicycle facilities as required elements of certain street classifications (e.g. setback sidewalks and bike lanes);</li> <li>• Amendments to SDC 4.2-105 to require dead end streets to provide adequate bike and pedestrian connections;</li> <li>• Amendments to SDC 4.2-105D.4 block length standards to allow the Director to require pedestrian accessways when a block length or perimeter would exceed the applicable maximum;</li> </ul> <p>Amendments to infrastructure standards for site access and driveways (SDC 4.2-120A.3), sidewalks (SDC 4.2-135), lighting (SDC 4.2-145), multi-use paths (SDC 4.2-150), accessways (SDC 4.2-160), bicycle parking (SDC 4.6-145 and 4.6-150), and pedestrian access to and from school bicycle parking (SDC 4.7-195A.8).</p>

TPR Requirements	Springfield TSP Implementation
<p>(7) Local governments shall establish standards for local streets and accessways that minimize pavement width and total right-of-way consistent with the operational needs of the facility. The intent of this requirement is that local governments consider and reduce excessive standards for local streets and accessways in order to reduce the cost of construction, provide for more efficient use of urban land, provide for emergency vehicle access while discouraging inappropriate traffic volumes and speeds, and which accommodate convenient pedestrian and bicycle circulation. Notwithstanding section (1) or (3) of this rule, local street standards adopted to meet this requirement need not be adopted as land use regulations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amendments to SDC 4.2-105 and Table 4.2-1 regarding minimum right-of-way and paving widths are intended to allow more flexibility for certain design elements that reduce paving width. For example, the current minimum right-of-way and paving width requirements do not distinguish between streets that provide on-street parking and those that do not. The changes permit narrower streets than currently permitted when no on-street parking is planned or when planned for only one side of the street. The minor collector in residential zoning districts allows for narrower streets by not requiring separated bike facilities.</li> </ul>
<p><i>660-012-0060 Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments</i></p>	
<p>(1) If an amendment to a functional plan, an acknowledged comprehensive plan, or a land use regulation (including a zoning map) would significantly affect an existing or planned transportation facility, then the local government must put in place measures as provided in section (2) of this rule, unless the amendment is allowed under section (3), (9) or (10) of this rule. A plan or land use regulation amendment significantly affects a transportation facility if it would:</p>	<p>As outlined below, the code amendments merely implement the adopted TSP and do not significantly affect a transportation facility as defined by this rule.</p>
<p>(a) Change the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility (exclusive of correction of map errors in an adopted plan);</p>	<p>The code amendments do not alter the functional classification of any existing or planned facilities.</p>
<p>(b) Change standards implementing a functional classification system; or</p>	<p>The code amendments implement, but do not alter, the TSP's adopted standards for implementing the functional classification system.</p>

TPR Requirements	Springfield TSP Implementation
<p>(c) Result in any of the effects listed in paragraphs (A) through (C) of this subsection based on projected conditions measured at the end of the planning period identified in the adopted TSP. As part of evaluating projected conditions, the amount of traffic projected to be generated within the area of the amendment may be reduced if the amendment includes an enforceable, ongoing requirement that would demonstrably limit traffic generation, including, but not limited to, transportation demand management. This reduction may diminish or completely eliminate the significant effect of the amendment.</p> <p>(A) Types or levels of travel or access that are inconsistent with the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility;</p> <p>(B) Degrade the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility such that it would not meet the performance standards identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan; or</p> <p>(C) Degrade the performance of an existing or planned transportation facility that is otherwise projected to not meet the performance standards identified in the TSP or comprehensive plan.</p>	<p>The code amendments implement TSP policies. They do not alter the performance standards for any existing or planned facilities identified in the TSP.</p>

*Statewide Planning Goal 13: Energy Conservation*

Land and uses developed on the land shall be managed and controlled so as to maximize the conservation of all forms of energy, based on sound economic principles.

Findings: The TSP provides direction for the City regarding transportation improvements, including strategies to reduce vehicle miles traveled and single occupancy vehicle trips and includes policy direction and facility improvements intended to provide improved high frequency public transit efficiency and connectivity. All of these improvements and strategies are intended to reduce energy consumption associated with the transportation system. The code amendments implement these policies. As a result, the code amendments are consistent with Goal 13.

*Statewide Planning Goal 14: Urbanization*

To provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use, to accommodate urban population and urban employment inside urban growth boundaries, to ensure efficient use of land, and to provide for livable communities.

Finding: Goal 14 requires cities to estimate future growth rates and patterns, and to incorporate, plan, and zone enough land to meet the projected demands. The amendments do not repeal, replace, or void existing code provisions regarding urbanizable land or annexation. The code amendments are consistent with Goal 14.

*Statewide Planning Goal 15: Willamette River Greenway*

To protect, conserve, enhance, and maintain the natural, scenic, historical, agricultural, economic, and recreational qualities of lands along the Willamette River as the Willamette River Greenway.

Finding: The amendments do not change the City's existing standards for development with respect to the Willamette River Greenway. The Greenway provisions allow development of permitted uses in the underlying zone, provided that all other Greenway requirements are satisfied. The code amendments are consistent with Goal 15.

*Statewide Planning Goals 16 - 19: Estuarine Resources, Coastal Shorelands, Beaches and Dunes and Ocean Resources.*

Finding: These statewide planning goals relate to coastal lands in Oregon and are not applicable to the amendments.

**CONCLUSION:** Based on the findings above, the code amendments are consistent with the Statewide Planning Goals and administrative rules. SDC 5.6-115 Criterion A.3 has been met.