



Springfield 2030 UGB Study

College View/South Franklin Study Area Working Group

February 11, 2015 Meeting Notes

Attendance

Staff: Linda Pauly, Loralyn Spiro, Judy Castleman

Working Group: John and Normandy Helmer, Rob Castleberry, Gale Landt, Jim Straub, Jeff Schwartz, Corbin McBride, Betsy Schultz, Tom LoCascio, Nicole Ankeney, Mark Rust, Tom Scates, David Helton

SWG Resource Group: Dan Terrell, Jo Niehaus, Merlyn Hough

Public: Cecile Haworth

CALL TO ORDER. Meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by staff Linda Pauly

Linda welcomed the group and noted they were appointed by the Community for Citizen Involvement, and she thanked them for volunteering. Linda also told the group the meeting is being recorded. Staff will post the meetings on the website. Linda reviewed the purpose for this group - the City seeks their input regarding the proposed Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). There has been a lot of dialog with the neighborhood, including some members of this group, through previous meetings in the Seavey Loop area. Linda said she didn't know if there had ever been meetings like this where there were people at the table that might have different points of view about the City of Springfield's proposal. The purpose of this group is to have those conversations, to allow a place for that to happen in a respectful way and also to learn more from each other about the study area being considered.

Each member of the group was given a folder containing

- List of group members
- Agenda
- Themes from Public Input
- Springfield 2030 Comprehensive Plan Economic Element. She said this policy document has already been vetted through Springfield City Council (not yet adopted) and a lot of

work has been done to refine it with perhaps more to come after the final Economic Opportunities Analyses. This document is included because the group might want to see what the City's goals are for economic development and see how they might jibe (or not) with the goals of members, organizations and businesses.

- Map/ aerial photo that shows the location of the study area as it relates to I-5 in Springfield and Eugene (College View/South Franklin Corridor)
- Soils map

A Resource Group was also invited to share information. LRAPA, Willamette Water Company, and others will attend meetings

Most of today's meeting is for each person to introduce themselves to one another and talk about what is important to them in terms of their vision and the visions of their organizations/ businesses they represent. Maps provide by Chris Orsinger, Director of Friends of Buford Park are also available. Chris submitted a study that is also available to those who are interested. Linda brought the Willamette River Open Space and Rivers to Ridges vision maps that were endorsed by Lane County, Springfield, and Eugene several years ago. If anyone has maps they want to share with this group feel free to bring them to the meetings or e-mail to Linda at (lpaully@springfield-or.gov) and she will bring to the group.

Introductions

Betsy Schultz: Represents the Board of Realtors. Mostly came to learn and listen; realtors care deeply about homeownership and protecting private property rights and also want to see Springfield be a thriving community.

Jeff Schwartz: President of Johnson Crushers, International (JCI) on Franklin Boulevard since July 2014 and is fairly new to this process including several parcels of property that are potentially affected by this study. Jeff has been trying to get up to speed and is very curious to know what the feelings are of this group and eventually share some thoughts and ideas.

Normandy Helmer: Along with her husband John own a small farm on Seavey Loop. She is active in Friends of Buford Park and the arboretum and has always valued the natural area around them. She patronizes all the local farmers, have livestock of their own, and two kids. She is really interested in seeing the values of the Seavey Loop area and Mt. Pisgah parks protected for the generations to come.

John Helmer: Along with wife Normandy have been in neighborhood for 27 years. Their property is located on the border of the area but not included in the proposed UGB study. They are interested in what this means regarding the value of their property. John picks up trash on street, serves on the board of the arboretum, volunteers with the Friends of Buford Park, acts as tour guide for nature conservancy, chairs the County's large events task force. Lots of involvement and cares about the area. He's a big fan of Springfield but would like to see

Springfield grow in natural ways. Also thinks overtime there will continue to be a real gem of a place which is the recreation area, Nature Conservancy and the surrounding farms – “central park” of the region.

Corbin McBride: A student at LCC in the watershed and science program. When Corbin first heard about the meeting he decided to come and see what it was about; then saw that it would be a really awesome educational experience for him. So he signed up and is here to learn, listen, and give his input where he see is viable.

Nicole Ankeney: Landscape architect for Willamalane Park and Recreation District is here to learn and find out what the future holds. Willamalane’s vision is parks and recreation and open space.

David Helton: Transportation planner with ODOT, David is here to represent the agency and primarily to serve as a resource. ODOT does not have any specific plans for any improvements in this portion of I-5 or the associated roadways so he doesn’t have much to say in terms of ODOT’s future vision for the area. He noted that as transportation planners we look to the local governments – in this case the cities and the county – to establish the land uses that will be allowed in the area and then ODOT plans the transportation system to serve those land uses.

Gayle Landt: Agriculture business owner of 33 acres on South Seavey Loop. Her business plan for investing in property and being able to keep it really depended on the rural character of Seavey Loop. She boards horses and one reason is close proximity to urban areas. Thinks we have an economic ecosystem that is functioning very well on Seavey Loop right now. Since the possibility of greater development came up she has talked to lots of people in Lane County and a large number of people who go to Mt. Pisgah and the park and on their way their or going home they stop at Me and Moore’s. Her concerns are not destroying economic ecosystem there; its important and beautiful, an investment in the future. People’s fashioned idea of continuing to have large amounts of industrial property (such as car plants), she says we need some but thinks Springfield as well as Eugene already have inventories of that kind of plan. It would be a great loss to people who live in the area in the future to make decisions that maybe impact the quality of life. Having said that she is very interested to hear what people can work out – it’s not always obvious when something is important to a person or what might be possible that can accommodate a variety of interests and needs. Sincerely wants participate and help.

Jim Straub: Represents the Straub Family Trust as well as Oak Management LLC and third generation property owner in that area. The family started collecting property in the Seavey Loop area over 60 years ago and resided there in various form and functions. He and his father were raised there and parents still reside on one of the larger parcels. Only have about 50ish acres or so that is included in this study. As lifelong resident he’s here to participate.

Tom Scates: Lives within the proposed urban growth boundary at the south end of Twin Buttes Road and main reason for being here is to find out what other people were thinking about. He too

was originally was interested because there was an awful lot of information out there that he felt might be misinformation. He came to be part of the meeting to find out why he thought was misinformation. Like to be corrected or if he is right then ok. Would like to know what's going on. Say we're in the system economically for him so go for it – build up out there. His land isn't good for much of anything except for growing grass.

Rob Castleberry: Has lived adjoining the study area for almost 35 years. He has operated his own business from there self- employed in a rural residential setting and has been involved in various neighborhood activities over the years trying to protect the livability for all creatures 2-legged and more. Rob values very highly the open space and proximity to the park. He has been involved in Friends of Buford Park and Mt. Pisgah Arboretum. Sees possibilities for connectivity to ridgeline trails and to Willamalane's activities on the other side of the river and also feels very protective of the farm community and what's there in terms of residential.

Mark Rust: Lane County Planning Department he is here primarily as a resource for the group. Lane County does have to ultimately co-adopt the UGB expansion together with the City and Board of County Commissioners. Mark has also been involved with tracking the City of Eugene's UGB expansion, their study area on the other side of the freeway and for a number of years involved with the Goshen area project county has been working on. Grew up here and raising kids here. Did live in Central Oregon and for a while went through UGB process there. He worked on both public and private side of that process and continues to track it. UGB processes in general in Oregon have been very difficult and hopefully this one won't drag on for 10-15 years. He is happy to offer information and answer questions.

Tom LoCascio: Site manager for Mt. Pisgah Arboretum and caretaker of the park. He is also a local property owner on Seavey Loop Road. Tom has been involved with organizations that have been trying to put together a place that really vibrates a lot of the Oregon values that he thinks people who move here are really important and cherish. Nature conservatory has some great work going on so when the City came along and started talking about industrial zone his first thought was his whole life he's watched one piece of land after another be gobbled up and he has so appreciated the fact that as a community we've been able to preserve that little iconic piece of Oregon. His experience with industrial land is it tends to be the worse – the most polluting, have the most impact on the place and are not very pretty places quite often. People can start off with a lot of good intents but in the end when the economy changes or things turn, history speaks for itself. His challenge for the City is to really do some deep soul searching and ask is this in fact the right place for it. He knows there are a lot of reasons why it's desirable but given everything that's going on out there is this the right place?

Resource Group

Dan Terrell: Law office of Bill Kloos representing the Willamette Water Company. He is here because they have water lines and would likely be providing water service to any future

development in the area. Personally he is also a Springfield resident and this UGB expansion process tends to go back and forth and his interest is in hoping his City can find a way to go through this process once and do it right. Unfortunately there are certain constraints but he hears everyone at the table wanting to find a good workable solution that works for everyone within the legal frameworks but only have to get this process once. Thank you for serving

Jo Niehaus: Lane Regional Air Protection Agency (LRAPA)

Merlyn Hough: Director of LRAPA office in Springfield. Merlyn has also commented on some UGB concerns of boundary expansions under considerations by the City of Eugene and South Eugene and Lane Community College (that one in particular). In addition to stringent pollution controls on industrial sources that LRAPA is directly involved with they also have an interest in efficient transportation systems so people have choices walking, biking, driving, transit and making sure those are friendly places which ever mode people choose.

Cecile Haworth: Property owner with husband in the proposed UGB study area, near Tom Scates. They are living on property that husband grew up on and his parents owned. Cecile grew up in Eugene so she's had the opportunity to see lots of change and feels that planned and controlled change is preferable so she is very interested in this process. Like Tom Scates mentioned there has been a lot of misinformation that she's heard since the process began and she is confused about what the truth is and what is not true at this point. She also feels like from the beginning of the process it sounded like the land would not necessarily have to be used for industrial purposes so she is thinking that there is a possibility to allow for growth but not necessarily industrial.

ROUND TWO

Linda recognized a couple of people who were not in attendance: Ed Moore is with the Department of Land Conservation and Development. He will be available to help with any questions that arise about the procedural aspects of UGB decisions. Between Mark Rust and Linda they can cover that as well. Not really ready to talk about that this session but what rather what the visions are that different people have; what are the plans for their businesses. Linda had a hard time getting business people to participate in this because they are working and it's hard for them to attend meetings. Dan Kuske who owns the Latus Motors business on College View said he would like to participate but it is difficult for him to come to meetings so Linda is going to try to find a way to get his input in this process.

Another missing category that is really important is someone that represents farming. Linda has not been successful at this point in finding someone that can participate in this. She asked if anyone knows of someone that might be able to participate or if you can share information with people that you know that are out there farming that would be great.

Ross Pennhallegon, OSU Extension: Agriculture expert/Springfield Groundwater Guardians will be a great resource for the group as well.

Brett Rowlett: Another person that's on the resource group and also is the public relations person for LCC wasn't able to attend. He is serving on the Main-McVay Transit Study stakeholder group.

Linda feels we don't have enough representation from the business community – she tried to make that happen but was not successful. She said if anyone had contacts or anyway to help fill that gap she would appreciate it. Some commercial business owners just don't have time out to even attend by phone or Skype when they have customers at the door.

John wondered if Linda could explain the status of the idea of including Goshen in the study which he believed now is off the table. When he spoke with Lane County Commissioner Faye Stewart about that it looked like a very intriguing idea. Linda replied that back in July at the end of a work session (a joint meeting between the Lane County Board and Springfield City Council on another matter), Commissioner Stewart asked the City Council if they would be interested in considering Goshen GREAT plan area in Springfield's UGB study. The City considered the concept but chose not to include Goshen in the study. There are a lot of reasons and it would add a lot more complications to an already complicated process. The Metro Plan essentially divides the jurisdictional boundaries of the Metro Plan area between Springfield/Eugene/Lane County down I-5. The land that is on the west side of I-5 is considered to be in Eugene's jurisdiction and the land on the east side of I-5 is considered to be in Springfield's jurisdiction for the area that is in the Metro Plan. Policies in the Metro Plan were recently updated because both cities are now doing their own comprehensive plans. There were unique circumstance with the Metro Plan – most communities have their own comprehensive plan that plans for their 20-year land supply for homes and jobs within their own UGB. Springfield and Eugene shared a boundary for a long time and that is not common in Oregon. The Mayor wrote a letter to the County and said that Springfield would not be studying an expansion to Goshen at this time.

The land use rule are very complicated –looking at land on that side of the freeway would probably include everything on that side of the freeway not just Goshen so the way it works is when you are going to urbanize your community land will be annexed incrementally. How would you get from Glenwood to Goshen? To annex land it must be contiguous to your city limits.

John said he's not trying to put it back on the table, he thought it had a lot of merits and you'd need that long corridor to get there, but if the prize is Goshen. Springfield could swap that land with land that is more controversial. Conservation easement could create buffer between industry and farms.

Mark added that early on when Goshen ideas were explored about how that land could serve a regional need for industrial land, even discussions with the state and up to the governor's office

it would be a very out of the box idea with regulations as they are today. The industrial land in Goshen could help both the City of Springfield and City of Eugene meet their industrial land needs. That didn't really go anywhere. Although all the studies to date have found that there is a need and specifically a need for large site industrial uses – even a portion of that need could be found to be met in Goshen even though it were outside the UGBs because it is a regional asset maybe that would help alleviate the need for the cities land use issues. Food for thought - has been talked about.

Linda said she often hears questions about “why this area?” Two major reasons why Springfield is looking at this area: First, it is the law that we have to look at this area because it has exceptions area, not all exclusive farm use (EFU) land and the rules require that we study this area first to see if it can meet our need. This is the closest area to the city that has exceptions area zoning. Most people understand this but don't want to hear it and say they don't like the law. The second reason is the I-5 location. There are other areas the City considered and decide I-5 is seen to be an important feature to have for economic land supply. Lane County has no sites along I-5 for economic development. This has been studied since 2008 – when a stakeholders group met about 10 times and that was one of the things that came out of it as being really important. Since then the City has had an economic development consultant that specializes in industrial lands who also confirmed that this area is the kind of site that the City should have in its inventory if it wanted to attract certain industries. Doesn't mean necessarily these industries are going to be coming in from elsewhere – they might be local industries that need a site that has good freeway access or a good freeway exposure. Linda said she believes that is why our City Council is focused on two areas primarily – North Gateway site and this area. Council is also considering land that Springfield Utility Board recently purchased from Knife River which is in the area of 28th and Main Streets. Pointed to the map of that area and showed the parks and open space proposal.

Gayle asked if it is the number of stop lights trucks have to stop at as they get to I-5; what are the factors that make being right by the freeway really important to industry?

Linda replied it is all about time, distance, number of truck turns; cost of transportation is a huge factor for some of our target industries. She will bring data to the next meeting.

Tom Scates asked John where he considers the gateway to Mt. Pisgah; the river, Franklin Blvd., Glenwood. The south intersection by JCI?

John said he considers it everything more or less east of Franklin Blvd., around Seavey Loop, around JCI. He is personally interested in meeting multiple needs and seeing a way to preserve what is there while letting some things happen. It's complicated. It's difficult for citizens to have a handle on this rule bound process.

Linda said she lived in the area since 1985 and been to Mt. Pisgah thousands of times. She thinks it's a confusing area to know which way to go to go there. She asked around the table to

say where they think the entrance to this neighborhood or this corridor that goes to Pisgah, Burford, and all the farms are. What is peoples' perception of where it starts?

Tom LoCascio said the west end starting right at the train trestle bridge BRING side/Turtle Flats/Confluence he thinks there is going to be a lot of public things happening around that area within the next 10-20 years. On south end of that he would define it as most of the properties including the Straub's on the eastside of the road at least up to JCI. Look to east towards Pisgah and rolling farmland.

Tom asked Hwy 58? Tom doesn't see Hwy 58 as bringing that many of the population density that the other areas do and considers it secondary entrance. People from Pleasant Hill access Pisgah from backside. It's twisty, winding residential area. When you turn by Blossom you start to take in a sense place.

Tom answered he is concerned where it was; the trestle, the intersection at the top of 30th Ave. or is it Creswell?

said she comes from Hwy 58 coming from up Pleasant Hill Stuff ___ is jarring, on left is OK, most on the right is OK.

Tom said he thinks Hwy 58 and south intersection.

Normandy: You're up and you get that view over the farmland and into the mountains is incredibly beautiful, really important to that sweep all the way.

Betsy is from east Springfield McKenzie side agrees that it's confusing and she always gets lost.

Jeff said new to area (4 years) when driving in he views Pisgah when he goes past EPUD and turns down Seavey Loop it's a natural spot. Admits it's nice to drive underneath the trestle and not see a parking lots of cars like we used to in summer time, now you see that fence. There's a vision there. Not as much from 58, but when you come into the lowlands. He added that he is completely open to the study. Talked to Commissioner Stewart. He said things were written in the paper about what their expectations are. He is completely open with the process, they are not cemented into a plan. Is very curious to where it goes.

Corbin said the gateway starts at the gas station on College View.

Nicole lives in south Eugene and said they coming in from the Pleasant Hill sSide.

David: NW entrance of old Franklin Blvd, might be back by the trestle. The turn off from Old Franklin Blvd to Seavey Loop, but it may be back at the trestle somewhat. He's never come in from the Goshen exit because he doesn't live that way and thinks not many people connect College View or southern portion of the Goshen area with Pisgah very much. Didn't realize it was there because he went to Pisgah. Didn't associate College View with Mt. Pisgah.

Gayle: Her 33 acres is on South Seavey Loop and she sees a lot of people on weekends on bikes and motorcycles, with dogs etc. on that part of Seavey Loop coming from the Hwy 58 direction. They are thinking it's a place to come and recreate.

Jim said he always traditionally considered the gateway to be at the intersection at Seavey and Franklin on the NE side – owns the land there on the corner where the welcome to our world sign is. The house burned down in '83 and they chose not to rebuild. Idyllic setting and last remaining oak trees -it's very picturesque. Couldn't take that step to construct a residence there. From 58 you go through mobile home parks – Hoya where it opens up and has character. By Walsh and Brooks- he doesn't really connect that to Mt. Pisgah. It is what it is. That whole corridor there – he doesn't see that as that Gateway. Doesn't see further industrialization of that area as conflicting with what he sees as the gateway to Pisgah.

Rob agreed saying as you're approaching the trestle and Franklin/Seavy Loop is the entrance, but as you are coming back he thinks what's happening to the west and south is significant to your experience of Seavey area. What's done to kind of buffer is important. Looks at map and sees the industrial area comes up to where a lot of people are living in the trailer park (Hoya, Roble) and the neighborhood there. Concern is these people think they are living in the Seavey Loop area what will they think of living next to industrial? Buffering is important.

Linda asked what that area is called.

discussion: The Blossom Mobile Home Park or the Blossom Area.)

Tom said power lines above keep the space open.

Linda said she had telephone conversation from a resident that lives in one of the houses on the boarder of Straub's property and Linda sent her a map and some information. The resident said she wouldn't see development there because of all the trees along the slough. Vegetation is mostly deciduous.

Linda next explained the large yellow sections on the map are BPA ROW/easement. She said she's had a number of conversations with BPA and their representative did a training with City staff. One easement (the wider one) is a very restrictive easement and that's why the city is not counting on that area as buildable land. Tom Scates asked since nothing can be done with it because of overhead power lines, can a parking lot be constructed there?

Linda replied some uses (e.g. parking) could occur in the narrower easement only if there is sufficient line clearance.

Mark: Gateway entrance is when you turn off Franklin and on to Seavey Loop Rd. Thinking about it from the I-5 perspective driving down I-5 and looking off to that direction Pisgah can be seen. What really hits him is how developed and industrialized that corridor is. For the last 5-6 years having driven the southern part of Franklin Blvd. down to Goshen and back up through

there it feels like together with the freeway and power lines and railroad and development that is there it is very impacted. It's not until he turns on to Seavey Loop that he feels that transition into farm land and getting into the rural part of the land.

Linda acknowledged it is hard to get a perspective from freeway. She noted coming from the south where you can see into this area is right over the Walsh Trucking property area corner and then you do see into that open space beyond. Coming from the north it's harder to see anything because of the jersey barriers in the middle of the road and it doesn't have very good freeway exposure. Along College View you can see it as you're going north but where you really get the big picture is from the corner of Twin Buttes looking into the Seavey Loop area.

Cecile said that is her property (talking about people on the residential area on the other side of the slough). She thinks that one thing that could be done as issue of encroachment is addressed on property owners on the other side. Right now there is a wonderful lining of trees and blackberries - habitat for wildlife and if that was left intact that would do so much for the people on the other side of the slough. As property owners on the west side of the slough we don't even have a sense of who is there other than that little tiny glance into that mobile home park.

Betsy: Following up on conversation she had with Commissioner Stewart about his thoughts of having a greenspace or some sort of buffer she is curious what would that look like and how would it impact future growth in the area or keep future growth from happening.

Linda said the City requires riparian area setbacks and requirements for restoring native vegetation so those requirements would be in place on anything that would be in our jurisdiction in terms of development. Other things discussed have been different kinds of conservation easements which is a whole different category where private property owners make the decision that they are going to put an easement on their property. She said her understanding is the cost is about \$30,000 to establish one. Another concept that has been talked about is should this be a rural reserve and that is something that she'd like Ed Moore to talk about that next week because she is not an expert on that topic. Her understanding of rural reserves is we don't have that option in our county right now. This is done in the Portland Metro Area but to get that option down here would take a legislative action. The reserves process uses the same criteria essentially as UGB, priority lands, soil types, etc. designed to protect the best resource land. It's a 50 year, not a 20-year commitment.

John: There is a remarkable level of agreement about where that gateway is but even if we could draw that line and all say this is perfect, and Springfield could say that's where the UGB should be, what keeps it from spreading from there. John added that he attended a City of Eugene open house and what he heard was they are talking about both urban and rural reserves.

Linda: Springfield and Eugene used to have urban reserves in the metro area but when rule changes were made our urban reserves no longer met the criteria. When the UGB is expanded your first priority to look at are your urban reserves. It uses the same criteria so it's going to be

looking at where the exceptions areas are - the zoned industrial, zoned rural industrial, zone rural commercial, rural residential areas. She told the group many of you own rural residential property that was divided before the rule came into effect that protected large acres of farmland. These are the exception areas, high priority for UGB expansion under the rules.

Mark: Floodplains and floodways are also big drivers from his perspective of what could potentially be developed. He thinks the original study area included additional lands that are in the floodplain. Right now there is a federal lawsuit and it's only going to get more complicated and difficult to develop in the floodplain. Another question is if someone did put conservation easement on their property would that preclude the City from looking at that or bringing it into the UGB if it met the priority to bring it in anyway.

Linda: If someone decided to put 100 acres of their land in an easement the next time the City was looking at potential expansion they would not consider that land is off the table.

Gayle said she has class 1.

Linda: She said we have class 1 and 2 soils in the surrounding area. Another criteria for UGB planning is when looking at different parcels the City is directed to go to the poorest quality soils first. And if those lands are not being considered the City would have to justify it. All of the other land Springfield has looked at in its studies since 2008 everything around Springfield, staff has to write a finding as to why those sites are not suited to the uses that we need. It's a very rigorous process and then the "ESEE factors" are applied at the very end of the process to compare the environmental, social, economic, and energy consequences of expanding in this area vs. another one. She said that's where there is some flexibility under the law, in her opinion, about one study area over another or one parcel or another. She said if there was very strong evidence that development would ruin the farming in this area, they have not received evidence in the record at this point. Those are the kinds of factors that could be considered.

Tom LoCascio: The experience of leaving the park and heading west on Seavey Loop and what it would be like to look out over Franklin, you'd be looking into that whole industrial zone. Right now very open and pastoral and all of that ground drains right into all the channels and places where people irrigate from now. Realizes that water quality is something that is monitored but you can't say that putting in more pavement and industry and every level of truck pollution and everything that goes with it is all going that way, it is going to have an impact visually and environmentally. Lastly what he finds so difficult about this is the talk about the Metro Plan and Springfield/County/ Eugene split. Springfield needs industrial ground so you say this rule can fit this piece of land but if we could step back a minute and say is that really the best place for the industrial land to be - it's a thin strip with already active commercial businesses, there isn't much industry along it. He said he could see commercial activity there and looking at the history of Goshen it is an industrial zone the middle spoke of the wheel and suits that purpose very well. Don't know how to get beyond that - we do have a unique resource and we have rules that drive

process and we do need to grow, but is this a smart way to grow? This is where he feels really challenged in finding compromise here. Just doesn't seem like the laws fit a model that really can take it all in.

Rob: Says he has recurrent area of concern on what the impacts of industrial areas have been, and how effective is any monitoring and enforcement of environmental restrictions. Since that maybe LRAPA or DEQ licensing industries to do discharges that would have an impact on the rest of the area but they are really not strictly monitoring or enforcing some of the limits. Asked LRAPA to respond. What kind of assurances could we have about impacts of this industrial zone from an air quality standpoint?

Merlyn: The requirements for a new facility are stricter than what is required to retro-fit existing facilities. Any new facility would be required to put on best available control technology so emissions would be lower for a new industry compared to a comparable existing one. He explained ss JCI increased its production over time the amount of painting they were doing and solvent evaporates as part of that process crept above the threshold that a permit was required and JCI did not apply for a permit when that first happened. They were reporting their emissions and that's where it was identified that they crept above the threshold where they should have applied for a permit. Actually USEPA and LRAPA were involved and the settlement dealt with all of that. Since that time he believes that JCI has reduced their emissions by going to other paints and solvents so that they would be below that threshold. The way the permit works is once you are required to have a permit you are always required to have it. JCI is still required to have a permit. There were fines involved.

Jeff said yes that's an accurate portrayal. They strictly monitor and have a person dedicated to that now. We fall well below the permissible limits now. It was an unfortunate situation.

Merlyn: The compliance people in their office consider JCI to be a model permittee, they are on top of it and communicating frequently and we consider that an unfortunate historical event.

Mark: Related to vision – identifying acceptable types of uses that could be allowed in the corridor, he prefers the term “employment land” rather than “industrial land.” Employment land can mean different types of employment, different types of uses. It might be different employment types of opportunities in this corridor that don't qualify in other people's minds as industrial that can create jobs or utilize land in a way that doesn't impact the area as negatively as a smoke stack kind of development that people might really fear for polluting. How would Linda write a zoning code for this area, the types of development that could be allowed in whatever the ultimate zone for this area could be limited by size, setbacks, heights or appearances, whether they are allowed to discharge they might get to a place that would be more appealing to people that don't want anything to go there. How much authority would that have if it was done?

Linda: The economic element of the 2030 Plan included in the packets, on the very first page is a definition from Statewide Planning Goal 9, Economic Development. The rule identifies "industrial and other employment" opportunities." Other employment as defined in the Oregon Administrative Rule (660-009-0005) is "all non-industrial employment activities including the widest range of retail, wholesale, service, non-profit, business headquarters, administrative and governmental employment activities that are accommodated in retail, office and flexible building types. Other employment uses also include employment activities of an entity or organization that serves the medical, educational, social service, recreation and security needs of the community typically in large buildings or multi-building campuses." That's the definition of industrial land that we are fitting this land need under. Thank for bringing that up, it's really important that everyone understands that.

Jim: People visualize industrial as being a smokestack basically but what he was hearing Linda saying and asked whether an example that has been in the news lately, like a call center, would that fit into this niche perhaps. Linda said yes.

Gayle asked if there is a precedent to be met for zoning it with an addendum or something that is binding so that over time the area is able to maintain the kinds of restrictions that you assume.

Linda: Zoning does change over time. Right now we can't think of all the uses that might be needed in 20 or 40 years so sometimes our zonings – like Heavy Industrial, etc. don't really fit what people want to do anymore. Industries that we need and we want to have. We are in a process now everywhere of updating what those zoning categories are. We just recently updated the plan and zoning for the entire Glenwood Riverfront area all the way down McVay Highway - essentially creating custom districts for Springfield that are mixed use districts. Gayle: That could be cool but is that temporary?

Linda: It's not temporary, it is the law and when an ordinance is adopted it is the law.

Gayle: There are precedents for people such as conservation easements that are something that seems to hold up over time even though all kinds of things can change around it. If later we were able to think of ways that some of the land in the UGB could be developed and used and there could be restrictions on pollution, emissions, etc., how durable could an agreement be if we really looked at that?

Mark: From his perspective there is definitely a precedent as Linda mentioned about the Glenwood area – they created a very custom zone for fitting within what their vision was for Glenwood. In terms of their ability there is always a process to propose to change a zone or allowable uses in a zone. That wouldn't be as rigorous as UGB expansion process but it would go out for public notice, there would be public hearings, opportunity for appeals etc. Not only can you specify what you would allow but also what would not be allowed.

Linda: Existing zoning codes will be brought to the group during the meeting scheduled after the next one and Mark will help explain land uses that are permitted under the current County zoning.

Tom LoCascio said it seems like the only kernel he's been able to grab on to is the idea that if we could define value and goals he thinks he has been talking to Linda about a vision from the city and wonders when City says industrial zone what does that mean? Is that smokestacks or is it a whole food processing plant? How much parking capacity needed? You talked about allowable emission, why would I want any emissions in the neighborhood I live or grow food in. If we could start to take a scalpel and really look at that, maybe there is hope. But without that it would be silly to say industrial zone is great.

John said he appreciates Mark mentioning this area as an employment zone, but he also would include that whole area we're talking about that is farm and rural and park as an employment zone, not the people that work on the farms. When you think about employers trying to bring people to this region in a competitive market place this is the kind of place that makes a nice place to live. Like a high tech firm looking for livability. Distinction and character of the place is an attractor.

Linda said yes that's a really important point. The industrial analysis addresses all those factors as well as the capacity of the workforce. We had our consultant look at eight of our target industries and to do an assessment of which ones might fit in different area.

Rob: when having visitors from out of town and he wants to show them a special place – Pisgah is a tremendous asset in that way in terms of our showcasing our special qualities and letting people experience what is special about this place.

Mark joked that Cabela's is an economic driver and many visitors want to go there.

Tom LoCascio: Thinks John was the one who coined this in the conversation we were having that he looked at this area as kind of the "Central Park" of our region and he thinks that if you look at the amount of growth that we are seeing happening in Springfield, Eugene, Goshen, Pleasant Hill and Creswell there's one thing about it is all these cities surround Pisgah. So if we really could have the vision to recognize that if we could cultivate that and put together a smart plan about how our communities interact with that space people will look back at this planning process and say "Wow, those guys had the right vision, they really made it happen." If you want to start talking about economic drivers that kind of plan will really bolster all of these communities and the people who live in it and that's the kind of vision he wants to see. If we don't see that vision it's going to be a fight because we've got it. He said he is so encouraged to hear the discussion today and to hear the people behind it; he is really hopeful that we can figure this out. He said he has hope right now.

Jim said he's hearing a couple of different things; he is hearing that the local area neighbors want to preserve the gateway access, scenic corridor, and Seavy Loop. He is also hearing that City growth happens and as much as we try we can't stop growth. Two issues: how to preserve the rural character forever – we can't legislate future legislation so we can all say we don't want any to happen unless we explore other options like conservation easements – something that forever binds also if the city does expand their UGB area. Also he sees that conservation easement as being a buffer because there are neighbors that are worried about creep; if they allow the UGB to come to this area now what's to say 15 years from now they don't slowly start creeping into the area that we see as the scenic corridor. But within that area that UGB if it were agreed upon could expand too is looking at what the allowable uses would be that fits the character of the neighborhood. Smokestacks is something nobody wants to necessarily see but if there was some type of commercial enterprise that people could agree upon that would be compatible maybe that's workable.

LoCascio: The other elephant in the room for him has always been once the sewer line goes in where will it go. And what will that mean. It's frightening to him that we focus on a need right now but Springfield is going to come back in a year or so and say we need more residential land and then farmland might look desirable so it's a complicated thing.

Linda: She appreciates everyone's perspectives and they will see the next meeting is really going to get more into viable land use types and more visioning. Asked Nicole to speak for Willamalane and open space.

Nicole: can bring maps next week. Right now Willamalane District does not enter that area; the only thing they have in their comprehensive plan now is the potential study of a future bike/pedestrian bridge which would only be the joining of agencies to figure out if, how, and where.

Linda added that the other vision she hopes the group will talk about next week is the skinny strip of land coming south on Franklin and what are ideas for bike paths and connectivity - some of it's shown in the confluence maps. Invited group to bring maps and info.

Rob wanted to know if in terms of transit and infrastructure is there going to be any discussion of 30th Avenue extension across the tracks and is that part of the contemplated plan? David said he is prepared to talk about that.

Linda: Have we identified the right theses - are we hitting on the right topics – we want to have the right people in the room, resource people lined up. She spoke with Lane county sanitarian yesterday so got some info about septic tanks and permits. We could get people from DEQ if necessary to talk about water quality issues.

Linda: Our work product is due in March 23rd. She is scheduled to go to the City Council and report back on the results of the visioning process. She's hopeful the product of that will be

minutes from the group meetings, what was talked about, what vision statements we've decided are important as a group and just compile all that information for them.

Jim want to know if we are trying to collectively come up with a vision that is then presented as this group that we either sign on to or choose not to support as individuals?

Linda replied that we'll see how it goes; she thinks we need to just play it by ear. But the idea was that we were going to come up with some fairly high level vision statements for the area out of this process and those vision statements can inform the Springfield 2030 Plan. Just as we have this Economic Element, adopted policies of the City and Lane County, we will have the Urbanization Element that is going to describe each area that the City is proposing. Remember this is a proposal and hasn't been approved by anyone yet and that each area is going to have policies that will be related to it. So some of the policies may be overarching for everything but some may be specifically in tuned with this particular area.

John asked if neighborhood's vision statement would be include in what goes to Council.

Linda replied yes it would.

Normandy concerned about public safety.

The group agreed that there is a lot discuss about transportation, truck traffic on Franklin. County transportation staff are invited. County staff have traffic counts.

Meeting adjourned.