

To whom it may concern,

My name is Richard Proulx and I am writing you concerning the proposal to possibly expand the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) in or around South M St, "my neighborhood". My wife and I are NOT in favor of this proposal for several reasons.

My family and I, including in-laws, have lived in this neighborhood for approximately 50 years. We chose this area for the peaceful relaxing atmosphere it provided. We enjoyed nice walks to the river where we could watch an abundance of wildlife including, deer, foxes, coyotes, beaver, otter, raccoons, geese, ducks, salmon, and more. We have used the area as an outdoor school to teach children and grandchildren about nature

We really like living on a dead end road that until recently had very little "outside" traffic. Children played freely and safely in their yards seldom seeing vehicles pass by when they had to retrieve balls that had been errantly kicked into the street.

We like that we're close to town but still in the country away from the hustle bustle and noise of the city.

Our first taste of freedom infringement came 20 years ago when the Springfield Utility Board (SUB) purchased the property behind our house along the river from our neighbor and friend Molly Reeves for \$1. It was more of a donation at the time and Molly stipulated the property could not be developed beyond being a park. The first thing SUB did was to put up fences, gates, and no trespassing signs to protect the well fields. At first, SUB was a good neighbor, allowing the local homeowners continued access to the land we had been using for years. Then SUB built several water filtration ponds and a building. At that point, the good neighbor policy went away. All access to the fields and river was denied. Traffic on our quiet little street has quadrupled as a multitude of SUB vehicles go by daily from dawn to dusk. Cars, trucks, and heavy equipment constantly go by, bringing noise, dust, and a reduced sense of safety.

A portion of the road (South 28<sup>th</sup>) leading to our neighborhood is gravel. Two or three times a year it has to be road graded to fix the pot holes that develop. Since the filtration project began, and the increased traffic from SUB vehicles, the road is in need of repairs five or six times a year. The city of Springfield has always been pretty responsive about making repairs when needed. But with budget issues, we have been told there is no money to "maintain" that specific road. As we speak, there are holes four to six inches deep. If you are not aware of the problem, you could damage your vehicle. About five years ago, the families and businesses of our neighborhood came up with a plan and the money to pave that portion of South 28<sup>th</sup> St.. We were told that to pave it, we would have to add gutters and curbs, sidewalks, sewer and drains, and lighting so it would be up to "code". It was a ludicrous requirement considering the businesses along the road are two auto recyclers (junkyards) and a lumber mill log yard. Those portions of South 28<sup>th</sup> to the north and south of the unpaved area are paved do not have curbs or sidewalks. The requirement by the city had no common sense supporting the decision but they stuck to the decision so nothing was ever done.

FEB 17 2010 4:12 KR

Now you want to bring the city out to us!!?

We see nothing but the same kind of treatment happening from any kind of new development as happened with the evolution of our relationship with SUB.

The city cannot afford to maintain a short piece of road, but to move forward with development, it will have to be paved, which brings up another concern for me—financial. If development was to happen, who will pay for the improvements required? Roads, sewer, water would all have to be installed and I have no interest in paying for them. I've paid for wells, septic tank installation and cleaning. A large economic improvement bill from the city is not in my budget.

I also just received a notice from the City of Springfield telling me that certain chemicals will no longer be legal to store on my premises to protect the city water in the case of a spill. Upon visiting city hall, I was told it only applied to commercial buildings. What do you think will happen to the water system when development begins? Turbidity, gas and oil leakage and more will occur. Now that SUB is so well established in the area in question, I cannot believe they are very happy about the idea of development either.

One last comment about the residents of the area. At 50 years of residence, my family is relatively new to the area. Mac, who just recently died in an auto accident at the age of 89, had lived here for 70 + years. Bob who lives just down the road has lived in that house since the day he was born, over 90 years ago. In fact, I have never seen anyone move from this area once they've moved in. Death is the only way openings are created.

It's a special neighborhood. We don't need or want anymore development.

With economy in a funk like it is why don't you enhance or rejuvenate some of the many vacant properties that exist throughout the city?

As for the "20 year model", the little patch of land you are looking at here is probably more band-aid than solution.

Thank you,

*Richard & Rita Proulx*

Richard and Rita Proulx  
2777 South M St.  
Springfield, Or.  
97477

*Larry & Virginia Schmidt - 2695 G. M. St*

FEB 17 2010

4:12 KR