



Springfield 2030 UGB Study

College View/South Franklin Study Area Working Group

February 25, 2015 Meeting Notes

Attendance

Staff: Linda Pauly, Loralyn Spiro, Judy Castleman

Working Group: John and Normandy Helmer, Ross Pennhallegon, Gayle Landt, Jim Straub, Corbin McBride, Betsy Schultz (via phone), Tom LoCascio, Nicole Ankeney, Mark Rust, Tom Scates, Ed Moore

SWG Resource Group: Dan Terrell (Willamette Water Co., Max Hueftle (LRAPA)

Public: Cecile Haworth (study area property owner)

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

Linda began the meeting by reviewing objectives for the next two workshops. She said the Springfield City Council directed staff to work with this group to come up with high level vision statements for the College View study area. The statements will be provided to the Council when she reports on the results of this visioning process at the March 23rd Council work session. Vision and goal statements should address the environmental, social, economic, land use compatibility and transportation concerns that have been raised. The group will also be talking about commerce and industry types that would be viable and appropriate in this study area and land uses that would be consistent with the visions and goals discussed. Linda provided copies of additional materials to the group:

- Vision for Seavey Loop and Mt. Pisgah submitted by Normandy and John Helmer;
- TadZo Industry Report;
- 2030 Target Industries list
- Minutes from the February 11th meeting
- Examples of visions and goal statements from the Coast/Middle Fork Willamette River Confluence Assessment: 5 Goals Toward a Positive Future submitted by Chris Orsinger

She pointed out the TadZo “Industry Intelligence” report. The consultant was asked to look at eight of the target industries that Springfield had identified in the 2008-2009 Commercial, Industrial buildable land study to provide more detailed assessment about the site needs of those industries. that the city commissioned with a consultant. All lot of what this group discussed at last meeting is also about quality of life, and the types of employment attracted to our area and our region because of our quality of life. You can see how that relates to how industry looks at sites and thinks you will see a lot of overlap there.

Next Linda asked for introductions from new people.

Ross Pennhallegon: OSU Extension Service involved in Lane County for 24 years and Agriculture for 15 years.

Max Hueftle: Permit Engineer from LRAPA with Industrial/Commercial permitting sources.

Linda noted at the last meeting a couple of questions came up about urban reserves and rural reserves. She asked Ed Moore if he could give a brief overview of how that process works and why we don’t have that reserves here.

Ed Moore- DLCD. Ed replied that there is only one place in the state that can have rural reserves and that’s Portland Metro area. For the City to pursue a rural reserves with the county for the Seavey Loop area is something that could be considered but it would require legislative action and whether or not it would be successful is problematic in that it hasn’t gone that smoothly in Portland. He said it could be that the experience that Portland Metro area is having either could help solidify that concept statewide but it could put it off limits throughout the state so it’s a wait and see, experimental, but is certainly something that could be considered. In terms of urban reserves the purpose of urban reserves is to look out 50 years of urban land need (20 years inside the UGB and an additional 30 years for Urban Reserve) to identify where the city can meet its future land need (21-50 years out) and make the urban boundary expansion in the future easier. (lands designated Urban Reserve are first priority land for adding to a UGB). This could be done here and the way it would work would be Springfield right now is looking at a new 20-year UGB for employment land (a Springfield UGB for residential land was established in 2011). So you almost would have to do and what Eugene is actually doing, which is sort of a two-step. If you want to consider urban reserves you first want to identify your new UGB because otherwise your 50-year starts from your current UGB. For example, what Eugene is going to do is first establish a new UGB for their City and then pursue urban reserves. What would facilitate that would be they have collected a lot of information about the landscape around the City that they could then go through a similar process in a UGB alternatives analysis and identify what land would be included in the next set of lands they would bring in for employment land or residential land. At this point that’s an option but you are really looking at what other land would you wanted to take into a UGB in the future. It’s not exclusionary process (like rural reserves) but more like an inclusionary process which then sets up a more expedited system for being able to expand the UGB in the future because the first priority land for UGB

expansion is for an urban reserve area and you really can't go somewhere else if you have an urban reserve.

Gayle asked Ed what the source of the struggle is for the rural reserve and why it's important.

Ed replied missed expectations, the fact that some cities weren't happy when they got included in rural reserves. Washington County was probably the biggest problem because when they looked through the whole entire metro area for where these rural reserves should be and selected them, some land was put into a UGB that should not have been. Gets down to those local politics and it was being done at a Regional scale vs. on a local City scale. Probably if cities in Lane County were to look at rural reserves and what was left they would actually take a big look at the county and say should we be looking at River Road north toward Junction City, has good soils there. We want to say these areas are off limits for the next 50 years.

Tom LoCascio: that would be more problematic than just saying one at a time we had our proposal here this is an area that has some unique values and fits this guideline.

Linda asked if people had reflections from the last meeting because she thought we had really good discussions last time. What themes they felt came out of that.

Tom LoCascio said he's still having a hard time. He realizes that the City has a need to grow its UGB and that geographically and environmentally you are hemmed in on all sides. But at the same time when he starts talking with neighbors and sees work that has gone on at Pisgah, to define what are our rural values and look at what we as a group or as a government could do to try to safeguard those values if UGB does expand there. There doesn't seem like there is any mechanism in place that would allow that beyond the political desires of that particular piece – it seem like it's all or none. He is having a really hard time finding how to engage in a productive discussion when knowing that in order to say okay this could work if we had this kind of industry but yet if somebody comes along 5 or 10 years from now and makes another proposal that could totally change it.

Tom Scates thought last meeting was productive for him because it got a lot of different views out and he was able to come to the conclusion that everybody is going the same way on different paths. He agrees with the folks on Seavey Loop and Pisgah area that that needs to be preserved but at the same time Springfield has to grow somewhere. This looks like a reasonable area to come to, it would serve their purposes because it's the state government that says to have UGB enlarged; how it progresses he doesn't know. He agrees no one is going to know what's going to happen in 50 years down the road. People down the road – it will be left to them so how do you protect that. Doesn't think you can go out 50 or 20 years and say this is the way it's going to be – should be this is the way we think it's going to be because in your politics you could get a whole one side change the other.

Gayle said she's had some thoughts about that since the last meeting. She gave an example about Glacier National Park and visions to enlarge it. Some people think if you try to preserve something precious to just a few people isn't necessarily true. She thinks it would be fabulous if we around this table could think originally in some way. Thinks Linda is presenting and helping to bring to this table a wide range of views and that's valuable. Gayle said she thinks it would be cool if we could figure something out to meet the interest and needs. Linda's idea of getting people around the table and thoughtfully talk is what would make that possible.

John added that like Gayle he's been thinking a lot about what's wonderful about Oregon or this area was actually a vision by the people 40 or 50 years ago and even longer, and people did look out that far. He thinks it is incumbent on us to be the generation that steps up and looks at least in broad strokes at the reality of what happens in the next few years. Since last meeting he's still feels stuck. During that meeting he asked what our work product is. He's still a little unclear on how what we come up with relates to the laws governing the expansion of the UGB which seems to be a very strict process that does not allow a lot of room for interpretation. When he had a neighborhood meeting with the City of Springfield some time ago he came away feeling like he just doesn't see where this fits into that. This is a great process. Still doesn't know how what we're doing is going to make a difference. What he heard was Linda would be reporting to the council the results of these discussions so this is strictly to inform their voting? He asked Linda if she could tell him more about what this group is going to get out of this process.

Linda answered that reporting back to the council is going to be summarizing the meetings. In the overall context the City of Springfield's 2030 Comprehensive Plan has an Urbanization Element and that is a policy element that talks about the new land that's added to the UGB through this process, what polices will determine how land will be used before it's annexed into the City and after they are annexed into the City of Springfield and what kinds of uses would be permitted under interim zoning before land is annexed. It's a description of how the land would be regulated in terms of land uses over the next 20 years. The important policy discussion about environmental and social values, the group is working on — she is hoping we're going to capture in the vision statements. Vision is about what you want it to be, about thinking out 20 years and closing you're eyes and saying what would be a perfect scenario. Linda read some example vision statements from the Main Street Corridor Vision Plan that City of Springfield Council just adopted. We spent a year having conversations in our community about our Main St. Corridor which is 7 ½ mile strip of land. The Vision Plan is a picture of what people really want to see, how they want to live. Then the goal statements are about how you are going to get there. Visions are pictures of where you want to go and goals describe actions on how you're going to get there. Implementation is specific things to be done to achieve the goals.

Tom LoCascio noted that right now we are part of Lane County, a rural area so one potential goal could be we would like to stay that way because of the obvious reasons that it would mean we wouldn't have to deal with the fact that politically there really is no rule that could preserve cultural values? A goal statement to him is a very concrete thing – if you say to a group of people

this is what it's all about then if suddenly something changes you can go back and say wait a minute this was the objective, so he said he likes goals. Visions are: this is where we want to go but we're not exactly sure where it's going to take us, and then suddenly we're here instead of there. Tom asked how much actual legality does the vision statement that was put for Glenwood Corridor carry, or is it just more words that could be politically changed.

Linda replied that Visioning is where you start in the planning process because if you come in and ask people what policies do you want, what codes should you have, there is nothing to bring it all together if you don't have a picture of where you want to go and how can you create the right kind of regulations that will make that condition occur.

Jim said he likes the idea of the vision statement because it starts a path. You may not have the manpower, funding, resources to implement that vision right now. In politics there is that rule you can't legislate future legislation. But vision statements get around that; says this is the collective view of what we would like to see this area become. He sees that if there is a vision statement for Seavey Loop/Buford Park area that tells people in the future of what we hoped would be here and of what the general population would like to see so if there was the opportunity 5 years from now to pass a bond measure to obtain more property to expand the park that fits the vision and that becomes an action item. He finds this very intriguing and we can't necessarily solve all the problems today as a single group but if we can provide input in a vision statement that creates a lasting impression and gives people in future generations to look back upon and perhaps get some direction from.

Linda said she just needed to be clear that we're talking about the City's proposed UGB area. We're not talking creating vision statements for Buford Park which has its own visions. And where they began 50 years ago was people sitting around a table like this saying we need to have a vision, here's my idea, let's talk about it.

Jim: If land was within the UGB then Willamalane passes a bond measure and they have money set aside for open space or park space. There's all sorts of different options have popped up in different scenarios that could come to fruition.

John: Linda said the area we're talking about is strictly within the bounds of the current proposed UGB. The location of that boundary—the potential expansion or reduction—is not within scope of what we are talking about. Correct?

Linda: Not really – we have people at the table that might have input into that and as we go through this process if we identify — or example if someone identifies —say a natural resource on this property that should that really be in the proposed UGB or should that be left out of the UGB and remain in the County — that's the kind of information that would be useful. So refinement of the boundary I would say yes, that is on the table for this group's discussion. Everything is really on the table, I can't tell you what to talk about or what not to talk about, but I can tell you what I've been charged with by my City Council and what I'm hoping to get out of

this process because I know that I need to produce a final product that's going to be a draft policy element for Springfield that can have some really good policies in it that talk about what the vision for this area is. And when you talk about cultural statements aren't part of the law, look at any comprehensive plan – it's full of cultural statements. Our existing Metro Plan is full of cultural statements – it's not just about numbers. Sometimes it seems that way with buildable land inventories, acres, etc.

Ross told the group he's been working with cities on UGB expansions for probably 20 years. From Lane County's perspective if we look west there is nothing west; look north nothing; look northeast then that opens up potential but then that runs out fairly quickly. Looking east there's some hills before you get to Cedar Flats that becomes questionable, look south not a whole bunch. From the City aspect they are up the creek because there's only small opportunities. From the agricultural perspective what he's heard is that once a UGB shows up then it takes forever. Example of River Road and Beacon Drive... How effective is Exclusive Farm Use? It used to be extremely strong and if that is the case, to him, here's the line (referring to the UGB map), here is the good ag land, here's Buford park – you don't touch it forever. That becomes the critical portion that's fairly agreeable. But where the line is drawn it becomes arguable that Buford Park, follow the road around Seavey Loop two miles on each side. That becomes fairly uniform discussion and agreement but again how do we make this "fence" that it cannot be crossed. And he doesn't know that process so as the UGB expands how do we get insurance because this is some of the best soil in the world. River Road example.

Ed responded that Ross that misspoke a little bit. Eugene is not expanding up north River Road but rather it is going to develop an existing filbert orchard inside the current UGB. He said for the UGB for residential purposes Eugene is taking a little bit of EFU. For industrial it's literally just immediately west of Hwy 99W up to the airport. Part of it's for a school and part is for a regional park and wetlands, to meet their industrial need like Springfield's trying to do. As far as the state statutes are concerned ag land is sacrosanct, it's the last land you can bring in. Then when you look at ag land you take the least productive ag land first class 4, 5 and 6 and then your prime ag land (the last ones you can consider). Ed said he thinks you still can rest assured about so many changes in statutes. Eugene like Springfield is having to jerry-meander their UGB so that it fits the state priority of lands to include.

Gayle asked Ed how far east do you have to go from what's currently developed along I-5, the shooting range and JCI and there's some stuff there already how far do you have to go east of that to get to Class 3-2- or 1 soil?

Ed replied mostly what Springfield is bringing in has already been identified as exception land. Basically if you don't have urban reserves it's the first set of lands in.

Tom LoCascio One thought about that is when they are so land locked that it seems to him it wouldn't go far for them to make an argument that because we have so little land we're already

looking at Class 2 or Class 3 soil since there is just not enough room for that to grow is his understanding. How far are they from being able to prevent that argument and have it begin to erode away?

Ed answered If you're looking for residential purposes it is incredibly difficult. Residential land is like sand so Springfield met its residential land need partly because SUB said they could serve anything. There is some land in the hills above Thurston that literally will be so expensive to serve the city probably will never bring it in. But it had to count it as SUB wouldn't say it cannot be served. But industrial land has a different set of factors. You've got to look at your target industries, what are their site needs, site requirements and then again go through a process where you first have to look at exception land then if there is nothing there that fits that need then you start looking at non-resource land then marginal land. Then look at ag land lastly then start again with the least productive soils and go forward. As part of the analysis Springfield did would take a look at the soil classes around there. And if they are all Class 1, there isn't a choice to pick another class so they have to land on Class 1. Again they basically have to do their due diligence then their studies have to prove that they are using the land inside the UGB in the most efficient way possible. We have certain guidelines that they have to follow for that.

Dan Terrell said he wanted to add a point that he thinks one of the concerns people have is – is there a hard line that gets drawn and basically what this process is doing is drawing a hard line for the next 20 years. This process comes back again in 20 years and the City will have to justify everything again. But once this line gets drawn, that is it for the next 20 years.

John: that's where he feels one of the things that would help a lot of people out would be (and may be outside the scope of what the City of Springfield can do) have them draw a line if the City can also put a rule and insuring there is some kind of buffer there – something that helps insure that line doesn't get moved in another 20 years. They can have a vision to look beyond the boundaries of the UGB and look a little farther out in the future. That's the issue for a lot of people, they look at that maybe a very narrow UGB makes sense – but is that just creep having been established and it grows and grows for many years. There needs to be a way to look farther out and say we can do this but we can also find a long term way to preserve what we value in this other area. And that's difficult I think from what you described Linda because that's in a sense getting beyond the scope of what you can do.

Linda responded that John is talking about private property and what people's rights are

John said three jurisdictions are looking.

Linda – when you are looking at preserving land for open space or whatever values of your group or your interest it all comes down to acquisition. Look at what Buford Park has done and all the work that's been done to acquire all that land and Nature Conservancy. That's really what makes those kinds of things happen. Gave example of Boulder, Colorado where she lived – they bought all the land to create that green belt.

John still wanted to know if there a rule for the City of Springfield to help make that happen or is it just Springfield is going to define the boundaries and this is what they care about end of story. He thinks it takes community and takes the two cities and county and thinking about things like reserves and trusts and if Springfield is solely interested in getting what it needs to fulfill this function it's not very satisfying at some level.

Tom LoCasio: has been reflecting on this idea that it started with a group of people that came together and said that we would like to manage the public land to be for people and then it grew into another organization that ran the Buford Park, then from there we said we had the Nature Conservancy, then we have a lot community people working together managing land owned by the people for the people and the betterment for the people and it has created a culture and an environment which really you can't compare it to anything else. It's very unique, it has created one of the most valued and loved resources anywhere in the state and we don't really have any rule that addresses – when you talk about the expansion, suddenly he realized we could end up becoming part of the Willamalane Park District. What would that mean? Everything keeps growing exponentially. The hardest thing that he's having is that the more government involved the more rules and the beauty of what's happening out there has been that it has been something that has been kind of growing exponentially itself and it really has created a very valued service. And it's created a culture that society realizes how special it is to have people working together and freely contributing together from all ages. That his greatest concern – it's very unique and he would like to see the county, City of Springfield, city of Eugene, state all come together and recognize this and begin to have that discussion because it's something our culture really needs right now and he can't get beyond that because that's been his whole adult life. If we destroy that we've taken a lot of our soul out of our city and you don't have to look far to see that we're doing a pretty job of that everywhere you look right now.

Gayle: If that were included in a vision statement along with things other people have said, the vision would be, we'll be talking about what that corridor might look like. If you're looking at a full range of options one is it's not part of Springfield but other option might make it part of Springfield. You'd have to be able to talk about protecting Seavey Loop so the vision would have to have in it activities happening in that strip which do not degrade the quality of the lands to the east including the ag lands and park.

Jim said he thinks that should be included in the vision but what he heard Linda say is she's charged with creating a report and presently Springfield is not looking at touching Seavey Loop in their UGB expansion at all so that could be incorporated in the vision but in her reporting to the City he doesn't think that's going to impact them very much because if you look at the map it doesn't touch anything that we've all mutually agreed is the gateway to Pisgah.

Gayle: thinks Jim is the perfect person to have her be more clear than she is on this. She is taking the time with what she would like as it might be helpful to some other people as well. She feels the land just east of I-5 already impacts her property to some degree. There's noise from JCI and

traffic noise to some degree. People talk about NIMBY. We already have on Seavey Loop included some things that people need. Her question is what is a reasonable amount.

Jim said what is included on the UGB map isn't Seavey Loop but we tried to address question.

Gayle: where do you think Seavey Loop begins? Asked Jim if he thinks the UGB doesn't go into the farm land at all at this point on S.L.

Jim: specific question does it go into the farmland then of course he can't argue with the soil maps yes it would go into the farmland.

Gayle: 3,2 and 1 soils close to town important for locavores.

Jim: the point he was trying to make for Linda is that regardless of what we say we can talk about what we want to save and preserve that's not really going to go into her report and not going to necessarily impact the city's decision that much. What they are look at is taking in what's in this plan. His vision of whether or not the impacted land that may or may not be brought into the UGB affects the rest he thinks that's getting argumentative/speculative and his understanding of the UGB process is pretty black and white – cut and dried. There's not a lot of room for public input.

Gayle: in her vision it seems it might be reasonable to shrink those boundaries some and she sees that with some level of humility but since has some level of precious farmland in it.

Jim: we have an expert can tell us what's available out there. He might be a very bad farmer, but the soil map shows types. With a proper amount of chemicals and water you can make a lot of things (Gayle - horse manure) - thinks the soils maps are close but boundaries could be flexible – not as much farmable land south - closer to Seavey Loop his recent purchase of 25 acres is Type 2. It's planted right now in grass seed and growing well if they can keep the geese off of it. The stuff south of that. Carl Druse a farmer who lives on the loop has been farming all his life. He's been trying to farm this land for him for 30 years. He said, Jim it's a waste of diesel. I can't get anything to grow out there without pumping fertilizer and a lot of it. Speaking to Ross, Jim said he's sure Ross doesn't remember him but he's talked to Ross a number of times about his different parcels of Ag land and what he was doing wrong. He said over the years he has asked Ross advice about what he should do, fertilizers, etc.– he can't pay farmers to farm this for him. How does he use this land and Ross gave him some excellent resources in how to reach out to different farmers and different venues and how to make it appealing to them, but it's difficult to own land and not let it go fallow.

Tom LoCascio asked for a clarification – worried that the UGB would take in everything to the river. If that is part of this industrial zone process is defining the boundary as you have drawn as being the area that would become part of Springfield and everything else doesn't change.

Linda replied that's correct and it wouldn't become part of Springfield until it is annexed and developed. It would be part of the Springfield UGB — which means the property owner could request annexation and they could develop the property after a lot more planning work and infrastructure is available.

Tom LoCascio said that at some point he would like to have a discussion about that with anybody who could just educate him about that. It is interesting to hear this and he needs to learn more.

Jim: Gave an example: he has 30 acres out off of Thurston Rd. in that is within Springfield UGB for 35-40 years - it's not annexed, he still tries to grow stuff on it. It's a beet field and it sits there, but there isn't industrialization around it but it has been in the UGB for as long as he has owned it. His father owned it.

Mark: another good example right now Ed just talked about the filbert orchard on River Road that it's been in the Eugene City UGB for a long time. They are just now annexing it to the city limits so that they can develop it.

Tom LoCascio: So the property owner itself is the one that decides when it gets annexed?

Linda: Yes and we're counting property like this as buildable lands in our inventories even though owners may have no intention of doing anything with it in the next 20 years. We're counting it if it's not constrained (by slopes or wetlands or other constraints.)

Tom LoCascio: interesting thing was it had to be annexed before it would even be considered, he didn't catch that.

Jim: But also in order to take in Pisgah and the old Wildish into the UGB they would have to show a need - thinks would be difficult.

Nicole added it's in a flood plain – look at the flood maps that are going to restrain you a good deal when you look at the FEMA floodway and floodplain.

Tom LoCascio: at one point a discussion on how difficult. If we could go to the community and say most likely this is not ever going to be brought in because it would put minds at ease.

Jim: his property is in the floodplain not floodway he hasn't seen a current maps. Nothing in the proposed UGB but if you look at the rest of the Loop a large portion of it is in the floodway which is very restrictive and getting even more restrictive. Nothing they can do to change the floodway.

Mark said if you want a 100 year or 50 year hard fast line that this isn't going to be developed, to him the floodway is a pretty good line, you'll never to develop to urban density.

Jim: from a development standpoint even if you could obtain insurance in a floodway its going to be so astronomical that a business can't afford it.

Linda: noted the floodway and flood plain are shown on the map in the group's packet. She heard Gayle trying to come up with a vision statement when she referred to "activities in the strip." Gayle's starting about one way to start a vision statement for the study area we're talking about — shown in green on the map.

Gayle: guess she means yes what you're proposing for this UGB.

LP: Yes – we are zooming in - not for Buford Park, or your farm — you we're starting to talk about the "strip".

Gayle: but we are talking about the strip and how it relates to my farm.

Linda: Exactly.

Jim suggested referring to the strip as the "corridor."

Yes agreement about using the term "corridor".

Gayle: Do not degrade rural character to the east.

Tom LoCascio said maybe this is asking too much but say things like noise, light, run off, etc.

Linda: how can you make those into positive statements rather than negative statements. Zoning will get into those issues.

Gayle: Activities in the corridor retain the high quality of the rural landscape character.

John: The neighbor's vision statement includes positive statements that fit into this.

John: Preserve and enhance the beauty of and gateway to Mt. Pisgah.

John: Preserve and diversity sustainable agriculture...

Gayle: Activities in the corridor maintain the option...

Tom: Promote industrial activities that benefit and compliment sustainable agriculture...

John: Promote activities that protect and improve air, water, soil and wildlife habitat.

Ross: Doesn't like work sustainable – it's a nice word, but has no definition, overused. "Good agricultural practices" better

Tom L: Promote alternative, or good transportation...things less polluting, less traffic congestion, not interfere with farming, less noise.

Mark: multi modal

Corbin: efficient...

Normandy; bike pathways and LTD

Tom S. We can't stop noise

Tom L: How will trucking corridor works.

Tom L: Already loud at Pisgah.

John: We have to accept what is there – I-5 is not going anywhere. What are we adding to it. Clanging metal, lights etc add to it.

Tom S: businesses will have lights

Tom L: promote aesthetic design...don't want ugly industrial

Jim: No ugly buildings

Jim: Would any of this restrict agriculture use? Fish/tilapia farming, greenhouses. People complain about noise on their farmland. Farmers start early in the morning. If he started intensively growing row crops...

Gayle: Or some huge dairy...

Tom L: It's zoned for farms, so you have to live with it. Use must be compatible with farming.

Ross said there is the right to farm but if it becomes a corridor then that's another set of parameters. Until it becomes developed it remains farmland.

Ed responded that actually state statues govern and local ordnance doesn't matter.

Linda said she was glad this was brought up because a lot of people don't want to hear this because they are living in the rural area next to farms. But the research and the data show that it's more compatible for agriculture to be next to employment industrial kinds of uses than it is to have agriculture next to residential uses. Typically people complain about farming practices, tractors, dust, spraying, noise, etc.

Tom LoCascio: Sadly the industrial run-off usually goes through the ag drainages which I don't know that that's always good.

Linda: there are other threats to agriculture.

John: is this the appropriate place not sure if it's within the scope but one of the issues is the impact on the property value of properties that are not within the UGB but are adjacent. If you

have a residence and it makes a difference to the value of that residence. Like the back of a Walmart. Is it appropriate to say that the uses enhance or preserve the neighboring properties? The externalities. Is there a way to state that in a useful way?

Linda said she thinks this starts to get at it, aesthetic pleasing design and vegetative buffers or other means, if you're talking about how traffic is going to flow in and out of an area.

Tom LoCascio: You could add viewshed to that...buffers, trees, respecting viewshed...

LP: You would need to define where those viewsheds are. In our Gateway Refinement Plan there are policies about protecting viewsheds to the McKenzie etc.

Tom LoCascio: Preserving the rural character...

Tom Scates: Is there anything that would prevent a high rise building of some sort in this UGB.

Linda: When we get into the code and the policies - building heights could be addressed. Those policies wouldn't come into play until we do more refined level of planning and development code, but that's where you indicate how tall buildings could be.

Gayle: she's been thinking about that, say Springfield does include it into the UGB, if that happens. It would be possible to have buildings along there that would reflect back some of the noise from I-5. That would be good in her opinion. Salem has buildings and walls along highway.

Linda: if this land is included in the UGB it is assumed that it will eventually be urban in character. It could be a really distinctive area that has special design and development parameters that have to do with building heights, noise levels, etc. but just wanted to be really clear it will be urban.

Gayle said she gets that will it be urban with 15 stories or urban with 3-4. She realizes that industrial means development and hardscape and parking lots, cement and all.

Linda: To give an idea of what industries are looking at now, your packet includes a report called "Industry Intelligence." The report identifies typical building heights and sizes, parking needs, etc. for these different employment uses. You can start to get an idea of the kinds of uses that are looking for different kinds of sites. Doesn't mean these will be the ones in 20-years, but this is what these industries need now and that's why we're proposing to bring this area in to provide sites for those industries.

Jim said all you have to do is look across the river and see about the public input process and how effective that can be to alter a proposed development plans. He's said he has seen many things that have come out of the Springfield office that once they have a public hearing about it the neighbors will impact what the future design of it. There are all sorts of processes that can influence what the eventual design is and he thinks the hard thing is us looking at what current

industries need but looking out 20 or 30 years from now. Back then we could envision what's happening now. Who would have thought of a green roof on an industrial building back then?

Gayle: a point earlier in our meeting if you have a vision statement it may be useful 20 years from now as people try to figure out what the rules are going to be and why.

Jim: That would be more flexible.

Gayle: Some buildings have plants all over them, that would be interesting to see.

Linda: Visioning asks what if, what could it be?

Gayle: As we get less defensive we can better at what if.

Tom Scates said one thing he noticed on the soils diagram is that his property has hard rock on the surface. How does he get to that #3 soil?

Jim said he thinks that was their best guess given topographic maps and floodplains. Doubts they went out and did soil sampling.

Ross responded that actually they did in 1952. He said the soil survey is 99.5% accurate – he hasn't seen one inaccuracy in 30 years. Ours is amazingly accurate.

Tom L. Goshen/Twin Buttes has unique geology.

Tom S: that's part of the reason why he is for this is because we know that he doesn't have very good soil, so in a way he is sacrificing his area to protect better quality soils in your area.

Tom L: the other thing that he's thinking about but don't know how to phrase it this idea that we have is idea community group activity i.e. he excited to have JCI on board to dialogue about conflicts - like lighting. How can we create community based opportunities to help communicate values and enhance the needs of all involved? Gathering of the minds.

Jim: This process brings people closer together, including JCI.

Tom: Walsh put 10 high intensity lights on their building. He talked to Tom Walsh at Workshop 1 and he turned them off. Particularly in Springfield and thinks Eugene there are codes for light pollution.

Jim said having a long vision statement that incorporates the values of this entire area and that allows the public to rally behind some funding source to preserve that area would be useful. This is less risk than if Evonuk plunks down a few houses.

Normandy: Has a fear that we can have discussion that could be incorporated into what Springfield does in the UGB but Springfield is still a completely separate entity and those who live in the Seavey Loop area we don't have a hand in electing the commissioners or we don't

have any direct influence over what the City of Springfield is going to do except we are sitting here as participants. Can't control what Eugene is going to do has no voice in Eugene and no voice Springfield except what she is being offered here and doesn't have a whole lot of voice in Lane County because they've got the one commissioner who represents their area. She feels really powerless to make a case to take to someone that's going to actually do something about it. Her neighbors are private land owners – good. Doesn't really want all of SL to become part of a park – likes having the farms there. We have a very strange character to our neighborhood this amazing parkland resource but still bothers her to not have a way for all those invested to come together to address the UGB but really integrate the UGB goals and vision with the SL neighborhood goals and vision then the parkland goals and vision and county goals and vision. It shouldn't be on the backs of a few landowners to be running around at meetings to make decisions.

Ed noted there is a tool available called City and County Joint Management Agreement and they are required to have one under state law. His agency reviews those.

Cecile: what is the tool available to her as a property owner to speak out here. Frustrated she has come to 2 sessions and has not been allowed to speak out at all. To listen to all your concerns about what's going to happen. Every one of these pieces of property is owned by someone and she feels like this group is making the decision about them without their input. Has ideas about coming together. She sees the possibility that the UGB has changed – she's living there. Somebody comes next to her and puts up some industry. She would ask that everyone consider taking the next step and including all neighbors at least having a session where we can talk. Her vision is no industry on her property. Has no doubt that someday the UGB will change and people will come in and buy it. The working group was full and she couldn't get a place on it but she has a vision. In her vision, last summer she was at Peaceheath at Riverbend. And was standing on the 3rd floor and could look across the river she saw people bucking hay and it was so comforting to her and put her at ease. That's her vision of her property is that we can get somebody in there – medical facility, research institute etc., where they keep the property intact, none of us have to worry about it being sub-divided into individual parcels where we are living next door to a tire factory or something, where the character of our community is intact and she worries about the issue that John already brought up of the right of individuals to buy up the property because they are going to be individual parcels. Anything could happen unless in the vision everybody that owns that property needs to come together and we need to put forth a vision that she thinks by and large would be the same vision as the vision here because we are all living there because of the environment and landscape. Thinks that it would be possible to come together, maybe work with a real estate person, work with Linda or another city planner, other resource people and say this is what we see as a property. We want to maintain the character of it – do not want it to affect our neighbors because what it's like to have an industry right down the street. Doesn't want to see that happen to you. That's her vision.

Linda let everyone know all the property owners have been invited to attend all these meetings that we've been doing so from the very beginning of this study. Some of them don't have a mail receptacle so the mail comes back.

Tom Lo: she brings a really good point that was touched on the last meeting the idea that what he has heard is Seavey Loop area is UGB most of it's floodway – really not going to put too many houses on it. What he's heard is industrial land we're talking about a little spit which really is not that many acres that College View Rd and a portion of Hwy 99 up to Goshen. City of Springfield says they need industrial land but how crucial is it for the city to have this industrial land in order to be a city. When he looks at places such as Creswell and other areas that could grow industrial plan, begs the question for him do we really need to make sure every city has subscribes to this or could you as a city just say – we're not going to grow this way. Or, we're going to create a commercial zone through here that's not going to be an industrial zone. Which will help preserve the values that he thinks are worth considering. Talk about industry and big buildings and noise nobody wants industry next to them then when you take a community as unique as the one we just described it seems doubly offensive to us.

Gayle: she's planning to study the list of industries.

Tom Scates said Springfield needs to enlarge their UGB because of state laws is that correct? He can see that – go ahead and get this UGB we've done our part – we're done.

Jim: All of us have seen the studies that show that in order for this area to be developed it would require incredible amounts of money. The city can bring this UGB and put their mandate but then the reality of this being developed, who's going to walk in with \$70 million and say I need something so bad here that I'm going to spend \$70M before I even put a shovel in the dirt to build my building. That doesn't preserve it forever but that creates a buffer of time before anything can happen.

Tom LoCascio: From his perspective when he looks at that area it is inevitable that we're going to have growth out there – we cannot stop it. The question here is what the appropriate development is. The city needs industrial ground but putting industry on that stretch of road is about as offensive as you can get. Commercial ground in a manner that has some evaluation criteria or something it's hard.

Gayle: can addition restrict which industrial things or you zone it industrial and if businesses is an industrial and fits they can just come in and build.

Linda: The zoning would tell which uses could be in and which ones couldn't. The target industries list is in your packet. Again that doesn't mean those are the only industries that we're going to get it just means these are some targeted one that we'd like to be able have in our community. It doesn't mean that all those uses would be in new land that was added to the UGB. A lot of those uses could locate within the existing boundary. But some uses do need larger sites,

some need sites with good access to I-5 and so those are the kinds of uses that would we think would be interested in that area.

John: If the vision that we come up with is incompatible with the full use of all of that space for industry that leaves you short, what would the City do with that. John: asked if the line for the UGB was on the table and you said yes his vision would include probably a smaller footprint than that. Thinks what's on the page now is too expansive so a vision would be a more narrowly defined corridor.

Linda responded that everyone has a map in their green folder so feel free to mark it up where you think the line should be if you don't think it's in the right place and hopefully you will have a rationale for why you think it should be changed.

John: Can this be on the flip chart? You've responded that part of the vision can involve different boundaries and having proposed a concept of different boundaries is part of the vision evidently doesn't qualify to be written on the charts. You really only want to talk about what's in the current written boundaries.

John: My vision is for a more narrowly defined corridor.

Tom LoCascio: my vision would be commercial zone instead of industrial zone.

Ed responded, you think that commercial has less affect than industrial – not true. Look anywhere in the country. He worked in Irvine they have very attractive industrial areas, it doesn't pollute. Uses occur inside a building. It is possible to develop attractive industrial buildings; most of the industry today is not smokestacks. Stuff is going to occur inside a building. The more critical case is what the view is from a road, how is it landscaped, what it looks like as you drive through the area. What types of materials? Do we want to have some type of architectural control, some kind of material requirements? You already have design requirements inside the city code. City could develop a specific industrial district that has those so it doesn't affect the rest of the city. Create a sense place that fits the Mt. Pisgah/Seavey Loop environment.

Gayle: They feel vulnerable. We say ok industrial and we want it to be like Carmel but later get something that makes us weep. How can we agree to something that meets the needs of a vigorous economy and get a win-win?

Ed: That's where you start with the vision statement. It will guide goals and policies embedded in the Comprehensive Plan. Encourage group to stay involved and work with staff to give input on policies. Vision informs goals when adopted with UGB.

Max: Air quality has typically more stringent requirements for industry and residential use – backyard burning and home heating. Industrial would have additional controls and more monitoring if located in UGB.

Tom L. asked about Seneca negative impacts.

Tom S. Can we put in vision that we don't want air polluting industries.

Tom L. Wants commercial and light industry – no giant footprint buildings.

Linda: Next week we're going to talk about the zoning code.

The following vision Statements were drafted at the February 25th meeting:

- Activities in the corridor: do not degrade rural landscapes character immediately to the east. Retain the high quality of the landscape character.
- Preserve and enhance the entrance to Seavy Loop neighborhood and gateway to Mt. Pisgah activities in the corridor.
- Promote aesthetically pleasing design (does this restrict ag-related uses) that enhances the viewshed / rural character.
- There are community-based activities / gathering of minds to address/mediate land use disputes.
- Activities in the corridor promote good transportation.
 - Less polluting
 - Less congestion
 - Efficient and effective
 - Bike paths
 - LTD
- Promote industry activities that benefit and complement sustainable agriculture/good ag practices.
- Promote activities that protect and improve water, air, soil, wildlife habitat.
- My vision is not industry. Wants medical facility, research facility. Property owners in study area need to put forth their vision.
- My vision is for a more narrowly defined boundary (reduced)
- My vision is for commercial use/smaller buildings / light industrial use that minimizes footprint and pollution, emission, traffic.

