



Comprehensive Plan Map Clarification Project

Questions for the Technical Resource Group

September 9, 2022

Neighborhood Refinement Plans

1. Should the Springfield Comprehensive Plan map show information about the adopted refinement plans? Is there potential to make things easier and clearer by incorporating that information onto the map, or would it be best to leave things separate? Options (and tradeoffs) to consider for these questions are:
 - **Option 1:** Apply the cleaned-up Metro Plan Diagram designations as currently named with property lines, but not for the properties where an adopted refinement plan applies. The map would show outlines where the refinement plan boundaries are around white space (basically “holes”).
 - **Option 2:** Apply the cleaned-up Metro Plan Diagram designations as currently named with property lines for *all* properties throughout Springfield without showing any information about refinement plans. This option would mean no boundary lines or “holes” for where the refinement plan boundaries are to clue people into a need to look elsewhere for more information.
 - **Option 3:** Bring all various refinement plan designations into the map where applicable without changing any names of the refinement plan designations. All variations of designations (e.g., Mixed Use 2, 2a, 2b, 3) would be brought over onto the map.
 - **Option 4:** Bring the refinement plan designations into the map where applicable but consolidate designation names to streamline and minimize the legend items. This option may require amending the text of affected refinement plans.

Addressing Gaps

2. Should Springfield designate public rights-of-way (e.g., streets)? If so, should the map show designations for public rights-of-way, or should the map show rights-of-way in white/as blank space?
 - a. Should there be a written policy to reflect the map approach?
 - **Note:** The Metro Plan shows rights-of-way as designated.
 - **Note:** Designations for rights-of-way are shown on the Glenwood Refinement Plan Diagram. Explanation for result: The local street network was conceptual, so it did not make sense to use actual right-of-way as a boundary for the districts/designations.

- o **Note:** Currently, the zoning map shows some rights-of-way as zoned, but the approach is inconsistent throughout Springfield.
 - b. Should our decision on whether or not to designate public rights-of-way match how we handle zoning in public rights-of-way?
3. Please refer to the May 22, 2022 memo from the City Attorney's Office for guidance on the City's approach to assigning plan designations (or not) to streams and rivers. For properties adjacent to and including these water areas, this guidance would result in plan designations applying to the edge of a property up to the ordinary high watermark for navigable waterways (Willamette and McKenzie Rivers) and to the centerline of a stream for non-navigable waterways (e.g., the Mill Race, creeks). Are there reasons we should consider an alternative approach?
 4. Plan designations must generally apply to waterbodies that are not navigable waterways (e.g., naturally occurring wetlands, artificially created ponds). Should the map show these water resources in the spirit of an interest in providing useful information, or keep them off?

Tradeoffs of Specificity v. Generalization

5. Any examples of where it might help to leave the plan designation boundaries flexible? In other words, not precisely define where the plan designations fall in an area of Springfield by showing tax lot lines (for example, outside city limits but within the pre-expansion UGB areas, publicly owned land, etc.)?

Data Coordination & Ongoing Boundary Changes

6. How do we address designations made based on other agencies' information? For example, the Natural Resource designation in the North Gateway UGB expansion area was based on the extent of the floodway established by FEMA. Do we shift the designation once we get new information, or do we leave it as-is based on the date adopted?
7. How should we handle minor shifts to property boundaries over time for maps like our Comprehensive Plan Map, which are "for information only" and are not official survey or plat maps that come from property line adjustments or land divisions? Specifically, what leniency should the GIS team have to make minor adjustments to the map's features as they change over time? Examples of minor shifts considered for this situation: if a river meanders or if there is a slight difference in how property lines show up on a computer screen due to electronic adjustments.
 - a. Any advice on which legally authoritative documentation to use to let GIS make these changes without having to formally adopt amendments to the map every time? For example: By ordinance? Text in the Comprehensive Plan document? Text in the Development Code or Municipal Code? Or a combination of these sources?
 - b. Related to shifting water boundaries: Could we follow a tax map as opposed to a deed if the County has a mechanism to recognize that change? How might we handle this with Assessment & Taxation? Or, could we follow the Department of Geology and Mineral Industry's updates to its channel migration study?

Accessible Information

8. What are your recommendations (if any) for displaying map information clearly and understandably for a wide variety of audiences and needs?
9. What are your recommendations (if any) for spreading the word about the project when a draft map is available for public review and comment?
 - o **Note:** The goal is to have this occur well before the adoption/public hearing process.
 - o **Note:** The City has an approved Community Engagement Plan [available for reference](#).

PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED QUESTIONS

Overlays

10. Many of the Nodal Development areas throughout Springfield incorporate Nodal Development as base designation instead of having a Nodal Development overlay apply. Staff are researching the extent of the designations' adoption history and appropriate terms (whether overlays or base designations). The term "Nodal Development Overlay" for a plan designation likely no longer makes sense for the majority or all of these areas.
 - a. What do you think about making Nodal Development part of a property's base designation name and moving away from using the term "overlay" for this plan designation (not zoning) when we adopt the Comprehensive Plan map?
 - b. Would a separate map of nodal development areas in general make better sense as opposed to putting this information on the Comprehensive Plan map?
 - c. For areas where Nodal Development overlays (not base plan designations) may still apply, how would this overlay show up best on the Comprehensive Plan map? Do you like the outline approach of the Metro Plan Diagram (shown in red) when considering there are other overlapping sets of information in this example (e.g., the diagonal lines for a Mixed Use overlay)?



- o **Note:** This may not be a question for the PDF version of the map we adopt if we choose the "holes" option for the areas of our map within neighborhood refinement plans. However, this will matter for our online

11. The project team is leaning toward continuing to show the Willamette Greenway on Springfield's future Comprehensive Plan map. Can you think of reasons to not continue to show it on the map? What is your preference?
- a. If we show it, would a line/outline or as another type of shape or symbol be best?
- o **Note:** The Metro Plan Diagram currently shows it as a solid green line:

