

Carla McLane Consulting, LLC
170 Van Buren Drive
Umatilla, Oregon 97882
541-314-3139
mclane@eoni.com

MEMORANDUM

To: Echo City Council
cc. Dave Slaght, City Manager
From: Carla McLane, Contract Planner
Date: June 29, 2025
RE: City Council Public Hearing
Comprehensive Plan
Zoning Map

This memorandum is provided as an outline for the July 8 City Council Public Hearing serving two purposes – to summarize and respond to the public comment received at the June 24 Planning Commission Public Hearing and to provide an overview to the City Council discussion concerning the DRAFT Comprehensive Plan and PROPOSED Zoning Map.

Meeting Packet:

For this second Public Hearing and first Public Hearing before the City Council I suggested to the Mayor and City Administration at the conclusion of the June 24 Public Hearing that we only focus on the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map to better focus the discussion and keep the meeting to a reasonable length. For this reason, you have only been provided with the following documents:

Comprehensive Plan:

- Comprehensive Plan staff report (07012025) – the formal analysis of the Comprehensive Plan against the current criteria for amendment.
- 7 Comprehensive Plan FINAL REDLINE (05182025) – the redline of the current Title 7 showing all the proposed changes.
- 7 Comprehensive Plan CLEAN (05182025) – a clean version of Title 7 to allow for easier reading of the proposed Comprehensive Plan.

Zoning Map:

- Zoning Map staff report (07012025) – the formal analysis of the Zoning Map against the current criteria for amendment.
- Draft Proposed Zoning Map (Aerial Basemap)
- Draft Proposed Zoning Map (Streets Basemap)
- Draft Proposed Zoning Map with Floodplain

Summary and Response to June 24 Public Comments:

At the June 24, 2025, Public Hearing eleven members of the community provided comment (two of these were written and read into the record) in three categories: those in support, those in opposition, and those with neutral comment.

Support: Five members of the community provided comments in support ranging from general support and some with specific comments or requests. Two comments focused on the area between the two canals supporting the private property rights of those that own that property, understanding and supporting the need to change that zoning to Residential, which is in alignment with both the staff recommendation and most of the PAC members. The other three commentators were speaking in general support of the proposed changes, albeit with some acknowledgement by one that additional work is most likely needed.

Opposed: Four members of the community provided comments in opposition, two generally and two with specific inquiries into how property is proposed to be zoned. The two members of the community that spoke generally in opposition focused their comments on the process up to the public hearing process. This perceived inadequacy was addressed in real time at the Public Hearing by both me and the City's attorney, David Blanc, indicating that the work of the PAC was always intended to be concluded with a public hearing process that is the appropriate venue for the types of questions that were being asked. The following responses are to specific comments:

- ✓ Why no survey: The Technical Assistance grant did not scope a survey, and one was not included in the request to the Department of Land Conservation and Development. Would a survey have been beneficial? Possibly. Could the City Council complete a survey on one or more of the topics covered by the Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Map, or components of the proposed Development Code? Certainly. In fact, the Goal 1 policies within the Comprehensive Plan encourage the City Council to do just that type of work.
- ✓ Change the golf course: No functional change to the golf course is suggested or recommended. In fact, the actions proposed both within the Comprehensive Plan, Development Code, and Zoning Map protect the current golf course and are put forth to create a future opportunity, when the golf course expands, to do so to allow residential use along the fairways of the expanded golf course.
- ✓ Commercial Zoning of the Church: The 1978 Comprehensive Plan Map had six properties (the cemetery, golf course, school property, city hall and the adjoining park, the fire station, and a church) that were called out as "public and semi-public" uses with no clear development standards for those uses within the Zoning Administrative Regulations (Title 9). The intent of amending the Zoning Map and converting those properties to either Residential or Commercial, based on their locations, was to accomplish two things – first clearly identify the property's zoning to be consistent with adjoining properties and second to create development standards that those uses would need to be consistent with at the time of development or redevelopment. There was no intent to see those uses be changed, relocated, or denied.
- ✓ Commercial Zoning of a Home: This comment led to some further investigation to determine where that assertion came from. As shared previously the City Administrator has worked from the 1978 Comprehensive Plan map with no clear understanding of what zoning was applied to many individual properties or groups of properties. What has been identified is a zoning layer used by Umatilla County available through the assessment maps that have incorporated zoning into them. It may be that staff need to further investigate where this zoning information has come from, but it is inconsistent with what the City Administrator understands. It remains the recommendation of staff that the zoning of the blocks on either side of Main Street be zoned for commercial use but some level of protection needs to be incorporated into the proposed Development Code to protect those structures now and into the future should they be destroyed by fire or other calamities. To this end a change of text will be incorporated into the Downtown

Commercial allowed uses to confirm that current residential use can continue and be replaced if destroyed, until redevelopment occurs.

- ✓ State Comprehensive Plan: One commentor indicated that the State has a Comprehensive Plan and inferred that the City of Echo Comprehensive Plan should be aligned with it. No specific citation was provided, and a search of the Department of Land Conservation and Development's website provides no clear indication that the state actually has its own Comprehensive Plan. What the website does provide is a clear requirement that Oregon jurisdictions, cities and counties, are required to have a Comprehensive Plan. It is also home to numerous resources and opportunities for local communities to obtain information about how to adopt a Comprehensive Plan, what grant resources are available to a community, several documents concerning the 19 statewide planning goals, 14 of which are applicable to the City of Echo and are addressed in both the current and proposed Comprehensive Plan.

Neutral Comments: Two comments were presented as neutral with the first focusing on involvement and the second about the need for open space. I will address both here:

- ✓ Involvement: The Mayor appointed the Public Advisory Committee, or PAC, well over a year ago with six members – two City Councilors and four members of the public. All six were conduits for information to flow from the PAC to the general community. This could have occurred formally with reports to the City Council if requested by presentations from either the consultant or PAC members or more informally through inquiry 'around town.' It appears that those approaches did not readily occur and eventually led to significant amounts of misinformation being shared with community members.

Should other approaches have been taken? Very likely but as shared at the June 24th Public Hearing by both me and the City's Attorney the best place for public involvement is during the public hearing process which we have now entered. Questions were raised by the community at the June 24 Public Hearing, many answered within the public hearing, with follow-up conversations that evening clearly indicating that much of that misinformation was clarified and dispelled.

- ✓ Open Space: This comment presented a concern that open space was being lost. The open space that is currently mapped as such does not fit the common definition of open space as none of it is accessible to the public nor does it have a natural feature, key components of most open space definitions. All the land that is currently zoned as Open Space in the City of Echo is in private ownership and would not be accessible to the public. Even the two properties that are proposed to be retained as Open Space are, to some extent, problematic should the public perceive them to be accessible when they are not based on ownership.

If the City of Echo desires to create open space opportunities, then a program should be developed that would initially identify what the objectives would be, move to identifying appropriate land, move to an acquisition effort, and conclude with development of the Open Space. Once owned by the City of Echo and developed appropriately it could be designated as an open space and developed into parks, trails, or other space that would be accessible to the public.

July 8 Public Hearing:

The following is a suggested outline for the City Council to follow for the discussion of the DRAFT Comprehensive Plan and Proposed Zoning Map. It is not definitive but is provided as a

mechanism for the Council to follow to be productive in their review and comment on the two elements proposed for discussion.

Comprehensive Plan: At the Joint Work Session, the text of the DRAFT Comprehensive Plan was reviewed at a high level, touching on major components of the document without getting into a lot of detail. That followed with a discussion of the Staff Report which addressed the substantive criteria for review at the June 24 Public Hearing. It is proposed that the discussion on July 8 provide an opportunity for the City Council to ask questions of me and staff and delve into the document itself.

Proposed Outline:

- Staff Report and the Substantive Criteria
- DRAFT Comprehensive Plan
 - Introductory Components (Authority, Plan Purpose and Implementation Measures, Technical Reports, Availability of the Plan)
 - 14 Statewide Planning Goals (Goals, Findings and Policies)
 - Concluding Components (Plan and Implementation Measure Review, Plan Amendment, Severability)

Zoning Map: As with the Comprehensive Plan, the proposed Zoning Map was reviewed at a high level at the Joint Work Session followed by a review of the Staff Report at the June 24 Planning Commission Public Hearing. This next Public Hearing provides the opportunity for the City Council to delve deeper into the proposed Zoning Map, how the proposed Zoning Map was arrived at, and the one remaining question about the land between the two canals. The city Council could use the same outline above focusing initially on the applicable substantive criteria followed by a discussion of the map itself.

There is one component of the Proposed Zoning Map that I do want to provide some details about as to not create further confusion related to the mapped Floodplain. One of the maps provided does depict the Floodplain that is currently in force and, to the best of my knowledge, has been adopted by the City of Echo. The action that will conclude this process for the map will be to adopt the digital layers that include the Floodplain. That digital layer of the Floodplain simply represents the current paper maps that were previously adopted.

Proposed Development Code: While no discussion is proposed for this Public Hearing it does not mean that the City Council or the public could not ask questions as part of the public testimony or discussion. The Staff Report nor the Draft Development Code has been amended for this Public Hearing but will be prior to the Public Hearing that will be set to discuss in more depth the Proposed Development Code.