



UGB / Commercial Industrial Buildable Lands (CIBL)
 Stakeholder Committee

**Summary of Committee Process &
 Recommendations**

Thursday, April 16th, 2009

The CIBL Stakeholder Committee is advisory to the Planning Commission and City Council. The Committee has met nine times at Springfield City Hall, 225 Fifth Street, Library Meeting Room, 6-8pm. All meetings were open to the public.

Committee Members:

<i>Member Name</i>	<i>Membership Category</i>
1. Mayor Leiken	City Council liaison
2. Lee Beyer, Planning Commissioner	Springfield Planning Commission liaison
3. Johnny Kirschenmann, Planning Commissioner	Springfield Planning Commission liaison
4. Dan Egan, Executive Director	Chamber of Commerce
5. Dave Marra (<i>DC Real Estate</i>); Jim Welsh, (<i>JD Welsh Co.</i>) as alternate	Springfield Board of Realtors
6. Lauri Segel – Planner (<i>Goal 1 Coalition</i>)	Land Use Advocacy Group
7. Eve Montanaro - Watershed Coordinator, Middle Fork Willamette Watershed Council	Watershed Council
8. Philip Farrington Director, Land Use Planning & Development (<i>PeaceHealth</i>)	Large Health Care Provider
9. Tim Stokes – Local Business Owner (<i>Metal Products</i>)	Manufacturing Employer
10. Don Oldenburg (<i>Symantec</i>)	High-tech Industry
11. Guy Weese, Board Member (<i>Emerald Empire Art Association</i>)	Arts-Based Employment Sector
12. Kari Westlund, Executive Director (<i>CVALCO</i>), Richard Boyles (<i>Alternate</i>)	Tourism Industry
13. George Grier, Board Member & Voting Delegate (<i>Lane County Farm Bureau</i>)	Regional agri-business
14 & 15. Brianna Huber, Thurston High	High School Student

School Student; Naomi Campollo, Springfield High School Student	
16. Mike Kelly, Springfield Citizen	Citizen at large
17. Donna Lentz, Springfield Citizen	Citizen at large
18. Steven Yett, <i>Paramount Center, LLC.</i>	Retail Industry
19. Doug McKay, <i>McKay Commercial Properties LLC</i>	Commercial Developer

This document is a compilation of key points from the meeting minutes and is intended to provide a concise, abbreviated summary of the committee's process and recommendations to date. Agreements and decision points are underlined.

Meeting 1: April 24, 2008.

- Dan Egan and Lee Beyer volunteered to co-chair the Committee.
- The group discussed committee meeting process and established guidelines. Committee members agreed to set monthly Stakeholder Committee meetings for the fourth Thursday of each month.
- Mayor Leiken reiterated the importance of the project and noted that the project timeline may lengthen if need be, as the Committee works through each issue.
- Committee members agreed that the Stakeholder Committee should try to reach consensus, but, if that is not possible, have a vote. Majority and minority opinions would then still be forwarded to the Planning Commission / City Council. Mr. Egan suggested that opinions would be encapsulated in the minutes.
- David Reesor led the group in a “snow card” process to identify key issues.
- Mr. Parker discussed the upcoming Public Workshop and future discussion of inventory work and the Economic Opportunities Analysis.

Meeting 2: May 22, 2008

- Mr. Parker described the context for economic development, and spoke in depth about economic trends affecting Springfield’s future.
- Mr. Parker led the group in a discussion related to the Economic Development Strategy in Springfield. He asked the group to comment about assumptions related to future growth in Springfield. These assumptions included:
 - Job and population growth will continue in Springfield
 - Springfield wants to be a “complete community”
 - Springfield will continue to function within the regional economy
 - The ratio of types of employment growth in Springfield will be similar to the regional forecast
 - 70% services
 - 10% government
 - 20% manufacturing
 - The City wants to:
 - Attract higher wage jobs
 - Diversify the economy
 - Provide a sufficient number of sites for long-term and short-term needs
 - Make strategic infrastructure investments to accommodate growth

- Springfield will not have funds to provide major subsidies to attract firms

Overall comments related to general acceptance of the assumptions. Some specific comments related to the following:

- Importance of strategically planning for future infrastructure, including changing needs of infrastructure (i.e. auto, truck, railway, etc.)
- Consider cost of infrastructure
- Assuring ability to access employment sites
- Estimating different site needs for office development versus industrial development
- Diversity in the economy is important
- Importance should be placed on higher wage jobs
- Expand from just referencing “regional economy” to include “national and world economy” and its effects on Springfield
- Some subsidies may be important for certain types of business if they’re choosing to locate between only a few different communities.
- Cost of raw materials is having an adverse effect in the manufacturing sector.
- Springfield is a self employment friendly community.
- Value should also be placed on preserving and sustaining natural resources while balancing the need for jobs.
- The manufacturing sector is changing, but not leaving. Biomanufacturing, intellectual management are examples of the changing manufacturing sector.
- Next round of jobs coming to Springfield will be here because “they want to be here, not because they have to be here.” Quality of life is important and a selling point for attracting industries.
- Private / public partnerships will continue to be important
- It shouldn’t be taken for granted that job growth will continue in Springfield; Corvallis was given as an example as a community which has lost jobs in recent years.
- Springfield will benefit from people’s general desire to “come out West...”
- There should not be too much separation between Eugene and Springfield, as it’s a regional economy. However, Springfield doesn’t want to be a bedroom community to Eugene.

Meeting 3: June 26, 2008

- Ms. Goodman presented the results of the online community development survey. 214 people responded to the survey –slightly less than a similar survey conducted in Ashland. The group discussed survey validity and the public involvement process. Terry Moore noted that the Committee can recommend as a group how much emphasis should be given to the survey results. Mr. Moore noted that most people’s concerns related to the survey findings would be addressed in the Economic Development Objectives / Strategies discussion.
- Mr. Beyer facilitated a group discussion of the survey findings:
 - Ms. Segel spoke to the group about rising energy costs and the effects on future industries. She stated that, in her opinion, there were impeded assumptions in the survey – assumptions should have included climate change, rising fuel costs, etc.

- Mr. Grier spoke about survey findings, and indicated that the results show that we need to protect our quality of life; people want to live and work within close proximity; etc. He noted that there is useful information in the survey findings.
 - Ms. Lentz stated that she had concerns over vacant development – she'd like to see the vacant stores filled up prior to building on the fringes.
 - Mr. Kirschenmann spoke to the group about Springfield's ground water protection program and how Springfield is ahead of other communities in that regard.
 - Mr. Beyer discussed with the group his opinion regarding industries reliance on transportation. Mr. Beyer spoke about emerging industries such as solar manufacturing. He gave an example of solar manufactures needing 100 + acre sites.
 - Mr. Farrington spoke to the group about community amenities that attract employers to this area. He noted that Springfield has these attractive amenities.
 - Mr. Marra discussed the importance of attracting new businesses to the area by having enough available land. He also explained that call centers are not necessarily long term businesses in his opinion, and that there should be more focus on manufacturing industries.
 - Mr. McKay spoke to the group about the importance of attracting smaller manufacturing industries locate in Springfield. He indicated that there may be a shift in the future to smaller manufacturers that provide items locally and may be more of a shift towards service industries.
 - Ms. Huber noted that new businesses need to be more environmentally friendly and focus less on fossil fuel consumption.
 - Mr. Grier asked Mr. Moore about factoring in energy costs into economic development planning.
 - Mr. Moore noted that the market is currently responding to the increase in energy costs. The difference between the 1970s and today is that is people believe it is more long term. People's reaction today to high energy costs will not happen overnight, but over the long-term. Policy choices today, though, will help effect people's responses to high energy costs.
 - The group discussed the relationship of energy costs and economic development.
 - Mr. Weese indicated that his opinion was that the high energy costs will work itself out – there will either be more oil or cleaner energy.
 - Ms. Segel noted that she disagreed with Mr. Weese and spoke to the group about peak oil and climate change.
- **Presentation & Discussion of Draft Economic Development Objectives and Strategies:** Terry Moore. Mr. Moore's presentation covered the following topics:
 - "Narrow/traditional view" and "broad/emerging view" of economic development.
 - Simple model of regional growth
 - Key objective of economic growth – "jobs"
 - Factors that mater to firms
 - Implications / policies related to economic development

Group discussion focused on the “land development” section of economic development objectives/strategies.

- George Grier stated that many communities attempt to include as much land in the land need analysis as possible – this is a concern for the agriculture community as it ties up the land base. Mr. Grier noted that the planned infrastructure should guide development in a more orderly manner.
- Lee Beyer spoke to the group about a need for large sites.
- Ms. Lentz indicated that she desired that the city fully utilize the existing urbanized land prior to expanding the UGB.
- Mr. Farrington noted that there needs to be an adequate short term supply of land.
- Ms. Segel spoke to the group about staying focused on redevelopment of infill sites and that future patterns of development may not be similar to historic patterns of development.
- Mr. Grier reiterated his point related to the importance of the availability of infrastructure in relation to future growth. Availability of infrastructure should drive the process.
- Mr. Beyer discussed that new, larger companies may not necessarily need infrastructure in place, but rather they could help install the infrastructure themselves.
- Mr. Farrington reiterated his point of allowing flexibility for accommodating new industries.
- Ms. Segel reiterated her point of changing industries and the effect of high energy costs and decline in fossil fuel capacity. Ms. Segel indicated that new call centers should not be allowed to build in the floodplain.
- Group discussion continued regarding development on farm land; floodplains, etc.
- Mr. Moore briefly spoke about redevelopment effects on land need.
- Eve Montanaro reminded the group that when hearing different opinions during the meetings, that all members should respect others and listen to different opinions.
- Additional questions were asked by the group related to the effect of historic trends relation to future economic planning.

Meeting 4: July 24, 2008

- Staff presented a **Group Working Agreement** to the Committee. The Committee agreed to adhere to the Group Working Agreement.
- **Economic Development Objectives / Strategies.** Mr. Parker gave the Committee a brief overview of steps taken to provide the draft objectives and strategies. These steps included: work sessions with Planning Commission and City Council; Stakeholder Committee discussion during the June Stakeholder meeting; online survey taken by Stakeholder Committee; and discussions with staff. The Committee provided comments and suggestions on the draft Economic Development Objectives / Strategies:

- **Redevelopment Potential.** The committee agreed to Mr.Parker's proposal to produce the inventory / redevelopment estimates using the mid-range redevelopment potential scenario.

Meeting 5: September 25, 2008

- **Public Testimony.** At committee member George Grier's request, staff distributed a printed handout describing a seminar the University of Oregon is conducting regarding Multi-Lane Boulevards to the Committee.
- City Attorney Bill VanVactor spoke to the Committee regarding new State ethics law/requirements for public representatives.
- **Discussion of Draft Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA) & Inventory.** Committee members commented on the information presented by ECO Northwest, including corrections to inventory maps; inventory constraints re ODOT regulations on Main Street; building regulations on floodplain and floodway within the existing Urban Growth Boundary. After deliberation on the issue, it was agreed that floodplain would be included as potentially buildable land for existing inventory purposes, so long as it did not preclude potentially excluding floodplain land in any future expansion areas during the Alternatives Analysis.
- Committee members agreed with the Technical Advisory Committee's assessment of inventory constraints. Committee members identified edits to be made to the inventory maps.

Meeting 6: October 23, 2008

- **Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA).** Present site / land needs based upon revised EOA.
- **Finalized discussion and recommendation of Redevelopment Assumptions.** The following comments/recommendations were made by Stakeholder Committee members:
 - **Mike Kelly:**
 - Agreed with ECO's redevelopment assumptions for small retail development.
 - His experience is that it is easier to redevelop commercial sites smaller than 2 acres (especially those 1 acre and smaller) but that commercial sites larger than 2 acres are harder to redevelop.
 - Questions that Springfield will get 50% redevelopment of industrial development given the history of Springfield. Noted that developers want large industrial sites that are ready to build.
 - There is a need for more new parcels available for industrial parcels 5 acres and larger.
 - **Guy Weese:**
 - Employment site needs can / should be met through redevelopment and infill

- ECO's assumptions are statistically valid, but lack of large, unconstrained vacant land on the fringe of the UGB make it unrealistic to assume that Springfield will be able to find large sites for new development.
- Described many vacant buildings he knows of which could be redeveloped.

Naomi Campollo:

- Explained that there should be a priority list and timeline for redevelopment of properties.
- List of when and what will be developed on specific sites.

Richard Boyles:

- Agreed with Mike Kelly

Steven Yett:

- Agreed with Mike Kelly - pressure is on having large lots
- Also agreed with ECO on redevelopment of smaller sites.
- Thinks that the City needs to provide larger, good sites for development.

Johnny Kirschenmann:

- Agreed with ECO recommendations

Dan Egan:

- Explained that if redevelopment is to happen at ECO's assumed level, there needs to be strong city policies / tools to support redevelopment in order for it to occur.
- Stated opinion that redevelopment hasn't historically been as aggressive as ECO recommendation.
- Thinks that the assumptions underestimate the demand for large sites.

George Grier:

- ECO's recommendations are realistic, not aggressive.
- Is concerned with the cost of servicing new sites.

Philip Farrington:

- Overall agreed that ECO's recommendation was accurate.
- Thinks that the City will need sites to capture larger businesses but that the analysis does a good job with assumptions about redevelopment of smaller sites.
- Stated opinion that safe harbor population projection underestimates growth in Springfield.

Lee Beyer:

- Overall agreed with ECO's recommendation given the fact it's for a 20-year time period.

Eve Montenaro.:

- ECONorthwest Assumptions are reasonable

Donna Lentz:

- ECONorthwest Assumptions are reasonable

Meeting 7: November 20, 2008

- Staff prepared a memorandum summarizing the committee's comments on the Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA):

November 20th, 2008 **Stakeholder Committee Comments / Recommendations** **on the Draft EOA**

Lee Beyer:

- Felt that the assumptions / recommendations are a compromise but acceptable
- Technical analysis is sound

Kati Westlund:

- Asked that the cluster development narrative in the draft EOA include a conference center (page 48 – add box for conference center. Page 50 – additional conference center would add to tourism industry in Springfield). Also noted that a couple additional large sites would be desirable.

Don Oldenburg:

- Overall agrees with ECONorthwest recommendations – however, would like at least one additional large site.
- Commercial redevelopment assumptions seem reasonable
- Industrial redevelopment assumptions may be overly aggressive

Johnny Kirschenmann:

- Overall felt that ECO's assumptions / analysis are realistic – however, an additional large site would be helpful – but doesn't want to risk not getting State approval if additional large sites are added.

Naomi Campollo:

- Overall agreed with ECO's assumptions / analysis

Dave Marra:

- Overall agreed with ECO's assumptions / analysis but thought the parcels needed should be large
- Indicated that there may be a need to update the inventory again after study is complete.

Doug McKay

- Likes the idea of creating large parcels – but noted that there will be pressure to partition / subdivide large parcels into smaller ones.

Dan Egan:

- Infill and redevelopment assumptions are very aggressive. Understands that assumptions are a “political compromise”, and is comfortable with that.
- Noted that large sites are needed for cluster employment sites (noted example of RiverBend site)

Guy Weese:

- Agreed that there is a need for more large parcels.

Steven Yett:

- Noted that having one or two more large sites is critical.
- Agreed that there will be pressure to partition / subdivide large sites
- Explained that historic redevelopment / infill trends did not occur at a fast pace – but noted that there was more “green field” land available in the 1970s than today, and that it was easier to develop.

George Grier:

- Noted that Springfield is geographically constrained, and servicing new expansion sites will be extremely costly (i.e. new bridges, sewer, etc.).
- Consider System Development Charges (SDCs) – more aggressive growth will cost more money for SDCs. Cost of infrastructure should be considered in any UGB expansion.
- Fiscal and geographic realities make it appropriate to look at infill. ECO’s assumptions don’t appear overly aggressive. The assumptions don’t take into account parcel assembly.
- Concern expressed over how some of the assumptions were made. Projected need for medical and government services outside the UGB is overstated – believes this can be accommodated through parcel assembly.
- Concern expressed over general growth rate.
- Supports redevelopment for commercial

Mike Kelly:

- Would like to see more sites for 20 acre or larger sites, but understands that this could create a need to change some of the underlying assumptions.
- The draft EOA is acceptable

Brianna Huber

- Agrees that it would be useful to bring in more large sites.

Donna Lentz:

- Agrees with George Grier – the City should try to work with the sites we currently have inside the existing UGB.
- **Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA)** ECONorthwest presented revisions to the EOA, updates to the Buildable Lands Inventory, infill and redevelopment assumptions, site needs & land needs. Key points and clarifications from the Committee’s discussion:
 - Bob Parker explained that providing a range of site needs scenarios (low vs. high scenario) provides some flexibility when looking at sites outside the UGB.
 - All land within the existing UGB was part of the analysis.
 - The existing Metro Plan designation was used as the basis of the analysis and constraints such as wetlands were discounted.
 - Glenwood was included.
 - Mr. Kirschenmann asked about whether or not Jasper Natron was included in the short supply. John Tamulonis explained costs and timelines associated with future road and sewer construction to Jasper Natron.

- Mr. Parker noted that there are a lot of small sites available in the existing UGB, but not a lot of large sites.
- Mr. Grier noted that there were no redevelopment assumptions made about parcel assembly. Mr. Parker explained that the redevelopment assumptions regarding needed small sites will be addressed through changes in land use policies that effect land use efficiency within the existing UGB. Mr. Parker noted that the State allows parcel assembly to be considered a constraint because of the difficulties associated with it.
- Kari Westlund explained how the number of site needs and acreage need was calculated.
- Beth Goodman explained that the high scenario was put in place since the last meeting in response to what was previously heard from the Stakeholder Committee, TAC, Planning Commission and Council related to allow flexibility in including large employment sites.
- Doug McKay asked for clarification on the low vs. high scenario – asked if ECONorthwest wanted the group to come to consensus on the low vs. high scenario. Mr. Parker stated that the Committee is not asked to decide this evening between the low vs. high scenario. He indicated that the discussion should move forward into the alternatives analysis next month, allowing the Committee to look at what types of sites are available.
- Mr. McKay asked if there is a sense of how many acres of commercial and industrial were used in the last 20 years.
- Mr. Tamulonis indicated that he could perhaps find more information, but that it was not currently available.
- Mr. Kelly stated that he was surprised that commercial and industrial needs were treated the same. He felt that they are not the same. He stated that industrial uses are drawn towards green field sites rather than redevelopable sites. He also explained that small commercial site needs are more likely to be met through redevelopment than industrial.
- Lee Beyer explained that he shares some of the same concerns. He indicated that he was somewhat bothered that all of the industrial sites will be met through redevelopment.
- Mr. Parker explained that there is a need for an industrial park, which could then be divided into smaller pieces to meet the need for small industrial sites. He noted that there is a need to balance needed sites with UGB expansion. He further explained that some new industrial uses are different than traditional industrial uses.
- Mr. Egan noted that companies look for sites based upon specific need. He explained that in his experience, it's hardly ever a site that is smaller than 50 acres. He noted that Springfield does not have an industrial park with available sites. He explained that in a 20-year period, there will be hundreds of industries looking for new sites. He noted that Springfield needs to focus on large sites were there are the most inquiries.
- Mr. McKay asked clarification on typical parcel sizes for big-box stores. Mr. Parker noted that warehouse sites need to be located close (i.e. approximately one-half mile) from I-5
- Mr. Egan explained that the definition of "industrial" is different than what it used to be – it is more based on technology centers (i.e. solar manufacturing, software manufacturers, etc - not smoke stacks).

- Mr. Parker focused the group again on the methodology – he noted that he heard many Stakeholders saying that they’re uncomfortable with the redevelopment assumptions related to industrial sites more so than commercial sites.
- Don Oldenburg asked for clarification regarding how numbers were generated to accommodate all needed sites less than 5 acre sites within the existing UGB, and 50% of the 5-20 acre sites through redevelopment.
- Mr. Parker explained that the assumptions were from input from the Stakeholders, Council, public, etc. – Springfield wants economic development but also efficient land use (i.e. not have small employment sites on the fringe of the UGB, but focus them on the center). The assumption with the 5-20 acre sites were discounted to 50% because they are more difficult to come-by.
- Mr. Parker explained that the Study needs to be legally defensible – he noted that the City could be a lot more aggressive with the Goal 9 analysis. He explained that it is ultimately a policy decision if the City chooses the proposed redevelopment assumptions, as it limits land supply on the fringe, which then encourages redevelopment in the existing UGB.
- Lee Beyer explained that redevelopment for small sites (less than 5 acres) makes sense because the cost of infrastructure for these small sites on the fringe would be more prohibitive.
- Kari Westlund asked for clarification on a table shown in the PowerPoint. She noted that it appeared to show a surplus of small industrial sites. She explained that small commercial sites are where it showed site deficits.
- Mr. Kelly noted the complexity of bringing in residential land into needed acreage.
- Ms. Westlund noted that Springfield may not have enough land for large parcels when considering more residential growth.
- Mr. Grier asked for clarification in the revised EOA draft, which showed a decrease campus industrial acreage. Mr. Parker explained that it was mostly due to incorporating Marcola Meadows master planned area. There also was a large portion of the Campus Industrial site in Gateway that is constrained by floodway.
- Dave Marra passed around a flyer advertising a big-box site near Wilsonville - he indicated it was an example of something Springfield needs.
- Mr. Beyer explained there is a difference between how companies seek commercial and industrial sites – commercial demand is driven by purchasing power and population – industrial is different.
- Mr. Egan gave an example of the Woodburn outlet mall - he indicated that Springfield would not have the ability to site a similar commercial development with our existing land supply.
- **Finalize discussion and recommendation of Revised EOA.** The following is a general summary of the combined comments from the Stakeholder Committee:

*“The majority of Committee members **felt strongly** that Springfield needs more large sites but are accepting of the fact that the City may need to settle for less to get the plan approved -- approval being the most important point at this time. A minority of the group felt **equally strongly** that we should not pursue a large expansion of the UGB.”*

Meeting 8: January 22, 2009

- Bill Van Vactor, City Attorney gave a presentation: *Safe Harbor Population Forecast*.
- Allen Johnson, Attorney gave a presentation: *Adopting Springfield's UGB and UGB Adoptions around the State*.
- **Potential Employment Opportunity Areas & Constraints:** Ten different opportunity areas were discussed. The notes below summarize the discussion regarding each site.

Site #1 North Gateway Area

Constraints Discussion:

- Floodplain and floodway issues in the area.
- How much of the area (in acres) is affected by flood hazards?
- Much of the Wicklund property is designated as a "Natural Resource Area" in addition to being subject to floodplain and floodway issues.
- The Committee should be careful to avoid choosing expansion sites that cannot realistically be developed because of topographical or environmental constraints that were not an issue when the original inventory of industrial lands was compiled.
- The cumulative effects of building in the floodplain must be considered. Such development is going to take a problem and move it somewhere else.
- The TAC indicates that Johnson Rd. provides some potential access. Why is this so?
- There are significant limitations on the traffic capacity in the Beltline-Gateway vicinity may affect the North Gateway site.
- ODOT says there is a potential limitation on the density of buildout in the area (Trip cap).

Opportunities Discussion:

- The site is popular and visible from I-5 and is near other industrial development.
- Has the large parcels (25-50 acres) that are needed.
- Future improvements to I-5/Beltline and Gateway could expand transportation capacity in the area.
- EMx is extending service into the area.

Site #2 Hayden Bridge Area

Constraints Discussion:

- The area seems to be confined with the adjacent steep sloped lands, and the rivers. Is it affected by floodplain issues?
- There appear to be significant areas of hydric soils that are a sign of wetland issues.
- May not be developable for industrial uses.
- May be better for future residential development.

Opportunities Discussion:

- May be easy to service with nearby infrastructure (south side of Hayden Bridge).
- Good connection to I-5 via Hwy 126.

- TAC thinks the area is compatible with future office or retail development. What was the thinking of the TAC? There is no surrounding residential base to support retail development.

Site #3 North McKenzie Highway

- George Grier declared that he has a potential conflict of interest related to this site, given that he owns land in the vicinity. He indicated that he would keep his comments factual and objective.

Constraints Discussion:

- Significant floodplain and floodway problems. The 1996 flood inundated a number of areas on the map that are shown to be outside the floodplain. The floodplain maps are not accurate for this location.
- SUB groundwater protection regulations are an absolute constraint on this land. There are nearby wellheads that would limit commercial and industrial development.
- Cedar Creek is the receiving body for much of the stormwater runoff for North Springfield. City studies indicate that Cedar Creek is at capacity and will be challenged to accommodate future runoff from urban development within the existing UGB.

Opportunities Discussion:

- None discussed.

Site #4 Far East Springfield Area

Constraints Discussion:

- Stormwater constraints. This area drains to Cedar Creek. Development proposed on the Gray property which is inside the existing UGB was constrained by the stormwater capacity limitations of Cedar creek.
- Steep slopes are also an issue in this area which would constrain development.
- The area would probably be best considered for residential development.

Opportunities Discussion:

- None discussed.

Site #5 Wallace Creek Area and Site #6 West Jasper/Jasper Bridge Area

Constraints Discussion:

- Site #5 has some steep slope issues. The ridge separating the Wallace Creek basin includes areas of thin soils covering basalt outcroppings that prevented the extension of the Bob Straub Parkway to Wallace Creek as originally planned.
- Site 6# has floodplain issues and is affected by the Willamette Greenway which requires riparian setbacks from the river.

Opportunities Discussion:

- The Bob Straub Parkway provides an improved access route to Hwy 126 and I-5 from this area. Is this a logical extension of the Jasper-Natron area?
- Development within the Jasper Natron area along the Bob Straub Parkway may spur future development in this area.

- The Weyerhaeuser Haul Rd. provides a connection to the Wallace Creek from Jasper Natron.
- There is an existing industrial site just south of Jasper that should be considered.

Site #7 Clearwater Area

Constraints Discussion:

- Floodplain should be respected. If you don't build around the flood channels running through the area there will be problems.
- The area is part of a SUB ground water protection area (Willamette Wellfield).
- New rules for lending in floodplain areas are not favorable to homeowners.
- This area should be considered for residential development. Some neighborhood scale commercial would be appropriate.

Opportunities Discussion:

- The school district owns some land along Clearwater Lane.

Site #8 South Millrace Area

Constraints Discussion:

- Is within the 0-5 year time of travel zone. The Willamette Wellfield (wellheads) is a prominent part of the area. Development can occur within time of travel zones, but mitigation is necessary and would restrict the used of certain chemicals by commercial and industrial users.
- The rail crossing at 28th St. is a choke point for emergency access when trains are moving through the area.

Opportunities Discussion:

- There is a substantial amount of publically owned land in Site #8. The City, Willamalane and Sub all control parcels in the area which may help guide future development in a positive way.
- There is nearby industrial development. Integration of this area with existing urban development to the north makes sense.
- Some residential development may be acceptable.

Site #9 Seavey Loop Area and Site #10 Goshen Area

Constraints Discussion:

- Floodplain and wetland issues are apparent in this area.
- ODOT indicates that 30th and I-5 interchange has capacity constraints.
- Much of the area has Class I and Class II soils which are "low priority" for inclusion in urban areas under state planning rules.
- Mt. Pisgah is a sensitive recreational/environmental area.

Opportunities Discussion:

- Glenwood provides Springfield with a nexus to Site #9. Sewer connections to the area through Glenwood may be possible.
- There is a significant industrial and commercial development in the area already, especially along I-5 in both Site #9 and Site #10.
- The proximity to I-5 and 30th Ave. are beneficial for transportation access.
- ODOT has plans to improve the I-5/ 30th interchange.

- Would expanding Site #10 to include that portion of Goshen west of I-5 be feasible and or allowed under the Metro Plan? The Metro Plan governs the boundary between Eugene and Springfield within the Metro Plan boundary. Goshen is outside of the Metro Plan area. None the less, there may be push back if Springfield seeks to incorporate land west of I-5.
- Wildish owns land near Mt. Pisgah that it has proposed for residential development.

Meeting 9: February 26, 2009 (Draft – to be approved on April 16).

- The Committee reviewed and provided comment on the Draft Estimate of Public and Semi-Public Land Needs Memorandum and Preliminary Results of the Residential Land Needs Analysis. Final calculations of how much land is available within the existing UGB will be finalized in the next few weeks and incorporated into the final residential lands analysis.
- George Grier presented a conceptual plan for east Main Street supported by the Farm Bureau that showed how redevelopment along east Main Street could account for much of the needed residential units projected in the study and would reduce average VMT, reduce carbon emissions, reduced energy costs, etc. The study was prepared by a University of Oregon Architecture studio class.
- Round-Robin sharing of the committee's thoughts about the process to:

Brianna Huber: It has been an interesting learning experience. I have enjoyed working with all of you.

Dave Marra: Great bunch of people. Good experience.

Johnny Kirschenmann: It has been a great experience. This is a more complicated process than the Planning Commission issues usually considers. ECONorthwest did a good job of laying things out.

Dan Egan. I have enjoyed the process. I look back 20 years and the town didn't look this way when I first moved here. I disagree with George in that I have to tell people that they have to take their great businesses somewhere else because we didn't have the land. It will be important to have a final document that integrates the land needs for commercial, industrial, and residential lands combined.

Mike Kelly: I think we feel short of where we expected to, especially with the alternative analysis. I understand there were reasons for us to stop where we have. We need to have a policy that says here are our land use policy and our economic development policies.

Guy Weese: I have enjoyed the experience. I first thought that redevelopment would take care of our needs. We need some bigger pieces of land. The reality is that it will take people who are willing sell their land and someone willing to invest in development.

Kari Westlund: I was challenged by the material. I was interesting and like others felt like I didn't really have much influence and that we stopped short of where I thought we were going.

Philip Farrington: Springfield is attempting to fulfill its responsibility to maintain an inventory of buildable lands and I applaud the City Council for doing so.

Don Oldenburg: We are doing the responsible thing that will help shape where our community will go.

Doug McKay: I have been involved in redevelopment. Assembly of land can become expensive as soon as your neighbors hear you are trying to assemble land. I think that small redevelopment projects can be a catalyst for improving surrounding properties.

- **Future Opportunities for the Committee Members to Stay Involved.**

Staff presented a flow chart with opportunities for future Stakeholder involvement that provide a meaningful opportunity for influencing a final recommendation. The consultant will continue to work on refining the opportunity areas to come up with a specific recommendation to present for public review.

Staff was requested to provide the Committee with the recommendations in advance of the joint meeting with the Planning Commission. Committee members also expressed that a Committee meeting be scheduled before the Planning Commission/Council meeting to allow time to review the recommendations.