



Comprehensive Plan Map Clarification Project

Discussion Summary

Key Questions for Project Advisory Committee & Technical Resource Group Meetings 1 through 3

The Project Advisory Committee and Technical Resource Group each met three times from July through October 2022 to discuss key technical and policy questions and to provide insight and suggestions to staff on desired outcomes for the map. The Project Advisory Committee consists of people who live or work in Springfield as well as several land use planning experts in the private sector. The Technical Resource Group consists of staff from Lane Council of Governments, Lane County, City of Eugene, Springfield Schools, Springfield Utility Board, Willamalane Park & Recreation District, and the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development.

Following is a list of questions and a high-level summary with key takeaways from discussions held by each group. Both groups play an advisory role and have not been asked to come to consensus or make a recommendation about the questions discussed.

Overlays

NODAL DEVELOPMENT

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 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 interactive version of the map.

- d. Would your thoughts on display differ between a PDF version and an interactive, Geographic Information Systems (GIS) web research tool?

PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- Initial general agreement that it would be better to show what was officially adopted – helpful from a user perspective to know that in addition to the base designation there is something else applied to the property that needs research
- However, desire for a consistent approach across Springfield where possible, with preference for representing as an overlay so the base designations are familiar (residential, commercial, etc.) and so map maintenance/display is easier

TECHNICAL RESOURCE GROUP DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- Point is to make the map clear to property owners about what they can do
- Some liked idea of compressing/flattening to bring any areas with Nodal Development overlays into the base plan designation while others liked the idea of overlays
- There was also conversation about the benefits of the map reflecting what is adopted
- Eugene will likely retain Nodal Development overlay as documentation but ideally would not retain Nodal Development as overlays and instead implement them through base plan designation and new zoning to remove layers of complexity

WILLAMETTE GREENWAY

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:



PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- Agreement that the Willamette Greenway should stay on the map, and that a green outline is perfect
- Suggestion to coordinate with City of Eugene so that there are commonalities across both cities' GIS and there is consistency in map display across jurisdictions

TECHNICAL RESOURCE GROUP DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- Approach in Eugene is to continue to show since it's currently on the Metro Plan diagram; trying to be specific that they're clarifying where the boundary is and not changing it
- General agreement that showing it on the Comprehensive Plan Map is a good idea / helpful to partners, acknowledgment that display may be different between GIS and PDF
- Ideas for display included solid line, diagonal stripes / hatched

Neighborhood Refinement Plans

REFINEMENT PLAN DISPLAY

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 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 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.

PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- General agreement that the ideal outcome is for consistent lexicon = Option 4, with acknowledgment that it would require some additional work (refinement plan amendments)
- Interim possibility that could be achieved now (no refinement plan research for needed text changes) = Option 3
- From user perspective, simplicity and navigability are key – having things link is preferred, collapsing and consolidating differences

TECHNICAL RESOURCE GROUP DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- General preference for Options 3 and 4 over Options 1 and 2
- People liked Option 3 because it shows existing conditions without the need to refer to other maps or amend refinement plans, while Option 4 would create more work but would be the most streamlined/legible for the public in general
- Keep in mind original purpose of the project – Option 3 aligns better with “we’re just clarifying and cleaning up,” while Option 4 may cross a line into “we’re amending refinement plans”
- Several supported Option 3 to complete work sooner with the possibility of moving to Option 4 later to create something that’s easier to read
- From Eugene’s perspective, Option 3 seems the most straightforward for Springfield to document existing conditions on one map, but also need to think about need to amend the Comprehensive Plan map every time you amend a refinement plan designation

Addressing Gaps

RIGHTS-OF-WAY DISPLAY

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?
 - o **Note:** The Metro Plan shows many rights-of-way as designated
 - o **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?

PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- No reason to show from a public-facing, user standpoint; Metro Plan currently shows as black lines in some areas
- Appears no legal reason from planning documents to show, and like consistency with approach to zoning when right-of-way vacations occur
- If City willing to make administrative/text changes, not designating or showing on the map is another step toward user-friendliness and map modernization
- Misleading to show a designation color over right-of-way on the map – start with a blank slate

TECHNICAL RESOURCE GROUP DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- Eugene generally does not zone right-of-way so is planning to not designate
- Important to think about clear definition of whether plan designation applies to property boundary or to the centerline of right-of-way; also define designations (and zoning) elastically to account for when property lines adjust
- Distinguish between map data maintenance and map cartography – just because right-of-way centerlines go to middle doesn't mean you have to show that way on map

DESIGNATING WATER RESOURCES

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?

PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- Agreement with recommendation in the memo

TECHNICAL RESOURCE GROUP DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- No objections to recommendation in the memo
- In GIS, meanings of "ordinary high water" and "centerline" seem conceptually simple but can be difficult to pin down in practice – suggestion to establish an official adopted way to determine ordinary high water and centerline over time; there can be a delay between cartography and legal descriptions changing (sometimes not properly changed for years)

DISPLAYING WATER RESOURCES

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?

PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- Including landmarks improves map legibility, but there should be a limit to which waterways are shown on the map to avoid unnecessary clutter; if showing, need clear criteria for what is/is not shown
- Potential confusion if someone looks at map and thinks they're looking at a complete list of water resources; concern could be addressed with a note on the map stating that the waterways aren't exhaustive and/or directing viewer to other relevant resources
- Suggestion to try showing waterbodies as an experiment on draft map for review and discussion

TECHNICAL RESOURCE GROUP DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- In general, more context is better to help orient as long as map remains legible
- Distinction between interactive web map, where layers can be toggled on and off, and PDF, where legibility is important and can be more difficult
- There may also be situations where people need more information on how water resources (e.g., wetlands) impact developability of a property, although this can make maps become complex quickly and it's important to note that there are different implications for data maintenance

Tradeoffs of Specificity v. Generalization

FLEXIBILITY OF PLAN DESIGNATION BOUNDARIES

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 (e.g., outside city limits but within the pre-expansion UGB areas, publicly owned land, etc.)?

PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- General agreement that this flexibility (or ambiguity as emphasized) is not beneficial
- Only time this seems beneficial is when moving waterlines affect a property line

TECHNICAL RESOURCE GROUP DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- Some support for keeping designations vague/flexible in some cases (e.g., open space along waterways, EmX/transit corridors, public land/use, government, parks/open spaces/natural areas)
- Eugene has taken the approach to adopt a specific plan designation for properties inside the UGB but outside city limits that only applies upon annexation
- Counterpoints: Specificity important, especially if related to a Buildable Lands Inventory or land needs analysis justifications; specificity also fits better with Statewide Planning Goal 14: Urbanization

Data Coordination & Ongoing Boundary Changes

OTHER AGENCY INFORMATION

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?

PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- The Project Advisory Committee was not asked to discuss this question (the Project Advisory Committee's lens was more policy/user-experience focused)

TECHNICAL RESOURCE GROUP DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- Discussed idea of including language in Springfield's Comprehensive Plan stating how line is to be determined and resource being used

MINOR SHIFTS OVER TIME

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.

- 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?
- 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?

PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- The Project Advisory Committee was not asked to discuss this question (the Project Advisory Committee’s lens was more policy/user-experience focused)

TECHNICAL RESOURCE GROUP DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- Put language in Springfield’s Comprehensive Plan so that there’s no process where you have to guess intent of map’s lines; include processes relating to map/data maintenance
- Lines based on other agencies’ determinations have different levels of precision and it’s not always clear – include understanding of precision in language

Accessible Information

IMPROVEMENTS TO USER EXPERIENCE

What about your experience with finding information about a property’s land use planning requirements would you like to improve, whether on the City’s interactive map ([MapSpring](#)), PDF maps, or requests for information from staff?

PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- Discussion centered on user-friendliness and navigability of Springfield’s website
- Agreement that MapSpring is an excellent tool that should be easy for people to find
- Ideally, click on a parcel and it opens a set of links to all relevant plans and resources

TECHNICAL RESOURCE GROUP DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- The Technical Resource Group was not asked to discuss this question (the Technical Resource Group’s lens was more technical/agency focused)

LEGIBILITY

What are your recommendations (if any) for displaying map information clearly and understandably for a wide variety of audiences and needs?

PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- Using standard colors across jurisdictions and planning professions (e.g., American Planning Association land use color categories), including some landmarks, and using a uniform lexicon would help legibility
- Translate jargon and simplify language

TECHNICAL RESOURCE GROUP DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- Utilize tools to ensure ADA accessibility
- Where possible, minimize text and rely more on iconography, color, symbols
- Continue to make maps that can be viewed as a PDF and printed in addition to providing interactive maps

OUTREACH

What are your recommendations (if any) for spreading the word about the project when a draft map is available for public review and comment?

- **Note:** The goal is to have this occur well before the adoption/public hearing process.
- **Note:** The City has an approved Community Engagement Plan [available for reference](#).

PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- General agreement that the City should promote this tool and make it widely available. Ideas included:
 - Update to City Council
 - Promote on project website
 - Share through online newsletters
 - Share to interested parties, including local architects, planners, contractors, builders, realtors
 - Staff speaking tour to affiliated development professionals, focus/interest groups
 - Include info about it in other outreach/tabling events
 - Promote on social media (e.g., LinkedIn)

TECHNICAL RESOURCE GROUP DISCUSSION SUMMARY

- City of Eugene has had some success using virtual information sessions (record live Q&A and post on website with a survey or a way for people to interact with it on their own time); drop-in sessions and virtual office hours are also helpful
- Partner with planned events (e.g., school events, grocery stores, etc.)
- Important to identify underserved communities that may generally be out of the loop