



MINUTES

Coburg Planning Commission

May 19, 2021 7:00 P.M.

Coburg City Hall

91136 N Willamette Street

Via Virtual Conference

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Paul Thompson, Jonathan Derby, Seth Clark, John Marshall, Marissa Doyle.

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: William Wood

STAFF PRESENT: Ann Heath, City Administrator; Megan Winner, Planning & Economic Development; Nancy Bell, City Council Liaison; Jacob Callister, LCOG; Henry Hearley, LCOG.

1. Call Meeting to Order

Chair Thompson called the meeting at 7:01 P.M.

2. Roll Call

Commissioner Thompson called roll and a quorum was present.

3. Agenda Review

There were no changes made to the agenda.

4. Public Testimony

There was no public testimony.

5. Approval of April 21, 2021 Meeting Minutes

MOTION: Councilor Derby moved, Councilor Marshall seconded a motion to approve the minutes from the April 21, 2021 Coburg Planning Commission meeting as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Commission Business

- **Coburg Creek Subdivision**

Mr. Hearley began his presentation on planning updates. He shared that the development agreement for the Coburg Creek Subdivision, which was approved by the Commission in December, had been signed by the applicant and the City. He noted that the civil engineer had submitted their second round of public improvement reviews and they were now being conducted. He said that Ms. Winner was beginning to formulate potential addresses for those future lots. Mr. Hearley concluded that overall, the subdivision was progressing just fine.

- **Annexation & Zone Change (ANX 01-20 and ZC 01-20) Application**

Mr. Hearley shared that the applicant was still conducting the significant effects analysis traffic study required by Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). He said that they had added the open space requirement to the annexation agreement, noting that the entire 20% would be added to the property up-front and that the existing tree line of the eastern property boundary would be most of the required open space. He said this was because the City wanted to develop a cohesive open space and not one that is developed piecemeal.

Mr. Hearley said that the applicant, the City, and the Parks and Tree Committee had met last week and found the proposal acceptable.

He shared that recently the applicant had agreed to provide frontage improvements along Van Duyn including sidewalk, curb and gutter, and roadway widening to match future traffic needs such as an additional eastbound lane, in addition to an internal roadway to provide access. These improvements came at the direction of the City engineer.

Mr. Hearley reiterated that the City Council had elected to have the Planning Commission review this application first for recommendation, which will be forwarded onto City Council for final action. The timeline of this was dependent on the results of the traffic study.

Councilor Marshall asked what was involved in the traffic study. Mr. Hearley answered that this was not a traditional traffic study but a significant effects analysis which looks at worst case scenarios of what could happen on the property with parameters determined by the city. The results of this would be included in the findings for the transportation planning rule goal #12 and then reviewed and commented on by the city engineer. He clarified that state law required this analysis whenever an annexation took place.

Chair Thompson asked if there was any link back to the interchange area management plan in place which controlled traffic impact for the interchange. Mr. Hearley responded yes, annexation that occurs in that zone triggered the traffic study, and that ODOT also wanted the significant effects analysis completed. He added that it was possible but unlikely that ODOT would want a full traffic study.

Chair Thompson asked for any other questions on these updates.

Ms. Heath asked if these parcels would each have to be master planned with a traffic analysis as they are sold. Mr. Hearley answered yes, and that this would have to be revisited each time a parcel is developed.

Councilor Marshall asked what kind of input there was on the traffic analysis. Ms. Heath said that the engineer was required to participate and had a lot of input.

- **Transportation System Plan (TSP) Updates & Purpose**

Mr. Callister thanked the Commission for its time. He shared that Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) appreciated the opportunity to work hands-on with a member agency.

Mr. Callister began to give some background on the TSP. He shared that in 2014 the City of Coburg did a comprehensive update on its TSP from the late 1990s, which included some analysis of an in-process Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) expansion including areas to the northwest, south, and north of Coburg. He noted that the TSP and UGB were bundled together for efficiency and were approved by the county but were appealed locally and sent back to the city for revision. He noted that this was a frustrating loss of momentum which halted progress between 2015-2019 and that the TSP was stuck in limbo.

Mr. Callister said that one of the variables tied to the TSP was the east-west connector, which was part of the UGB expansion and was an opportunity to divert primarily commuter freight traffic from Harrisburg on an alternate route crossing over to Coburg Industrial Road and bypassing Willamette Street. He noted that this proposal was highly popular and that one of the consequences of backing away from the UGB expansion meant functionally backing away from the concrete project of the east-west connector. He added that for the first time, the east-west connector had been essentially demoted from what could have been a capital project to just a study on county land.

Mr. Callister explained that population forecasts were foundations for expansion and showed how much Oregon communities would grow. He said that in 2019 the forecast numbers for Coburg went way down mostly due to over-forecasting in 2009 which said that Coburg would triple in size in 20 years. He added that the recent forecast was much more realistic in its prediction.

Mr. Callister shared that the Council was leaning towards letting the remand go and not pushing the UGB expansion as infrastructure was being strained and this would free up the TSP to now be addressed again. He explained that staff and Council directed LCOG to do a basic upgrade of the TSP, functionally returning to where it was in 2015 and allowing them to pivot forward with incorporating changes they knew needed to happen.

Mr. Callister recalled the changes that arose from the pandemic in 2019 and 2020, noting the changes in traffic patterns which made traffic modeling difficult. He shared that due to the unique circumstances they were allowed to use the model numbers from 2015 and that they would have the modified draft version of the TSP within the next few months. He said that as

soon as the Mayor and Ms. Heath felt it was possible, the TSP could be brought forward with some other long-range planning, possibly related to the annexation. Mr. Callister added that once they had an acknowledged TSP they could then use things like grants and buildout scenarios, and would be in a better position to move forward.

Chair Thompson thanked Mr. Callister and Mr. Hearley for their presentations and asked for any further updates.

Mr. Hearley added that the Kendall Auto permit had been issued and they were moving forward with their development.

Mr. Callister shared that the City had been encouraged to submit a Transportation and Growth Management (TGM) grant, which he said was good news. Councilor Clark asked what type of grant this was, Mr. Callister answered that it was used to update TSPs by looking at transportation land use and could be incorporated with TSP components.

Chair Thompson said it sounded like the City hadn't decided exactly what it would apply for funding for. Ms. Heath responded that the City pre-applied to look at the TSP and the development code and align them, specifically to do a form-based code which included transportation elements, and that this was discussed in the community buildout.

Chair Thompson disclosed that he had served on the advisory committee to the TGM program and grant process for over a decade.

Chair Thompson asked for any questions.

Councilor Marshall asked if the TSP was not required due to Coburg's size, but was done to be eligible for grant money. Mr. Callister answered that one of the requirements of the 2014 update was Coburg's relationship with the Metropolitan Planning Office (MPO), and that the benefits seen from the MPO were greatly facilitated by having a proper TSP and gave Coburg a seat at the table with larger entities. He added that communities of Coburg's size did similar plans and that it was a great opportunity to receive help from the MPO in current projects, but that state law did not require communities of this size to conduct complete TSPs. Chair Thompson added that cities under 5000 were not required to complete a TSP but said that there were benefits to having a TSP when applying for state funding and possibly being awarded funds for transportation projects.

Councilor Marshall asked if they had seen results from having a TSP. Mr. Callister answered that the TSP from 1999 had been effective in guiding decisions around access and project priorities, and that more direction from the TSP could be helpful. He said that the current update from 1999 to 2015 would just be the beginning. Mr. Callister added that developing the TSP would be helpful in working with neighboring jurisdictions and the state.

Chair Thompson said that the state updated much of the transportation planning rule especially the requirements of TSPs. He shared that he had served on that advisory committee when recommendations were shelved at the last minute due to concerns about creating new laws around climate change and carbon, and from Republicans walking out. He added that the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) had started a new round of rulemaking focusing on climate change, greenhouse gas emissions, and equity, which impacted the development of TSPs. He said these rules were expected to be drafted and presented for adoption around January and that they would require more work from cities around developing new ordinances and regulations. Chair Thompson added that the Eugene-Springfield-Coburg metropolitan area had been chosen to pilot this process.

Mr. Callister thanked the City for the cup he was drinking out of.

The Commission again thanked Mr. Callister and Mr. Hearley for their presentations.

7. City Updates

Ms. Winner noted that the administration report was provided for information only and Ms. Heath offered to answer any questions.

She shared that the water project was ongoing and that they were working to connect to the pipe already under the freeway. She remarked that the annexation process had a lot of pieces occurring at the same time, and that water was expected to complete around Spring 2022.

Ms. Heath said that City Council had been working on the Transportation Utility Fee (TUF) and would be addressing it in June with a second reading in July. She added that they had been distributing brochures to the community so that public comment could be heard.

She said that the City was trying to complete a land swap for a piece of Pavilion Park which was privately owned as they wished to own the whole park.

Ms. Heath shared that the first Budget Committee meeting had been the previous night and that it went well.

Councilor Marshall asked about house bill 3115 regarding setting ordinances on parks and open spaces, and Ms. Heath answered that legal councilor Ann Davies had been following it and that there were current ordinances not being followed as they were not sure they were legal to enforce. Councilor Marshall asked if the city was looking into defining a reasonable alternative to camping. Ms. Heath responded that they were having discussions and tracking these things, but that most people were in transition and did not have services available to them. She said a fund was developed to help these people get to their destinations and that this was working well so far to address their needs.

Chair Thompson asked about the lease on the Oddfellow Hall and the decision process for how it was used. Ms. Heath answered that the lease started June 1st for the downstairs and parking

lot only, saying that initially the request was for just the parking lot, but that the hope was to be able to raise revenue by renting out the building. She added that a grant was being sought to make it ADA compatible and that a committee was being formed to determine the policies for use of the building. She explained the opportunity of making the kitchen a community makerspace for rent and the need for a community meeting space.

Chair Thompson asked about the two water main breaks and if they had a significant impact on the budget and were a worry to the City. Ms. Heath responded that the water main had already been scheduled to be replaced and that they were trying to align it with street work so they only had to dig the street up once.

Chair Thompson asked for any further questions.

Councilor Marshall asked if the annexation would increase traffic due to the added jobs from the light industrial area and hoped that the City was looking into the impact of current police staff. Ms. Heath said that this was complicated because the City had neglected to include Van Duyn Road in the UGB, but that they were looking at options to bring the road in to be able to apply city standards. She added that they were working with regional partners, and that the City needed to address standards such as a collector road with two lanes heading east from the freeway to the industrial and residential areas. Ms. Heath said they had talked with the property manager who was very willing to work with the City. She shared that discussion had happened with county transportation about forming a partnership to apply for funding for the analysis and design work of the east-west connector. She noted that they needed to find out if MPO funding would cover this work and said that work on transportation issues was being done every day.

Ms. Heath shared that state figures projected Coburg's population growing by 750 by 2045 and that this would equal about 150 new houses. She was hopeful to build momentum to deal with both ends of town.

Councilor Clark asked if the City had enough buildable land for 150 houses and Ms. Heath said no, that this would require a UGB but added that there were interested property owners that would qualify. She said that this was expensive and would have to be started by the property owners. She noted that the City had to plan for 20-year growth and suggested considering the properties that did not put more stress on the transportation system.

Councilor Marshall asked how the annexation would affect policing, Ms. Heath said that one goal was to develop a community buildout which would look at where the community would grow and how it would affect every department. Part of this included identifying properties that would provide growth to the city and deciding how to address them through additional staffing and policing.

Chair Thompson and Ms. Heath thanked the Commission for their questions.

Chair Thompson asked when the next meeting would take place and Ms. Winning responded that it would be June 16th, and added that she was not aware of any land use applications but that they were trying to be consistent with meetings. In response to inquiry from Chair Thompson, Ms. Winning said she did not think there would be anything related to the annexation process before then. Ms. Heath added that this would probably be August or September at the earliest.

Chair Thompson asked for any input on training or suggestions for the June agenda. Ms. Winning suggested having a follow-up and asked for any feedback.

Chair Thompson asked Ms. Heath to bring back any further development on transportation related projects.

Councilor Marshall shared that he would be out of town on the 16th.


8. Adjournment


Hearing no further discussion, Chair Thompson adjourned the meeting at 8:05 P.M.

(Minutes recorded by Jayson Hayden)

APPROVED by the Planning Commission of the City of Coburg on this 10th day of October 2021.

ATTEST:


Sammy L. Egbert, City Recorder


Paul Thompson, Commission Chair