MINUTES

Eugene City Council
McNutt Room—City Hall
777 Pearl Street—Eugene, Oregon

May 30, 2012
Noon

COUNCILORS PRESENT: George Brown, Pat Farr, Betty Taylor, Andrea Ortiz, George Poling, Mike Clark, Chris Pryor, Alan Zelenka.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the May 30, 2012, work session of the Eugene City Council to order.

A. WORK SESSION: Envision Eugene

Mayor Piercy noted that Mr. Clark had to leave the meeting early and asked that no votes be taken in his absence.

Metro/Community Planning Manager Carolyn Burke called the council's attention to a memorandum from staff distributed at councilors' places responding to earlier council questions.

Ms. Burke led the council through a PowerPoint presentation titled *Envision Eugene, Council Work Session May 30, 2012*, which included an overview of the process recommendations, recommended revisions to those recommendations, and an outline of next steps. The changes to the recommendations were summarized in the Agenda Item Summary (AIS) included in the meeting packet as follows:

- *Regarding strategy 2.a. under the Economic Opportunity pillar: Staff will give consideration to properties that are outside the Campus Industrial or west Eugene study areas and can help to accommodate our land deficit for commercial jobs and multi-family homes by adding flexibility for commercial or flexible employment uses.*
- *Staff will perform further analysis to evaluate the pros and cons of bringing the airport into the urban growth boundary (UGB).*
- *Staff will include Russell Creek Basin in the analysis of potential UGB expansion areas.*
- *Staff will perform further evaluation of compatibility and health concerns related to existing and planned industrial uses in the Clear Lake Road area.*
- *Regarding strategy 1.b. under the Economic Opportunity pillar that identifies four 10 to 20-acre industrial sites for development inside the UGB through site consolidation and brownfield clean-up: This number should be revised to three 10 to 20-acre industrial sites. This change is further explained in Attachment B of the AIS.*

Ms. Burke called the council's attention to the staff responses to council information requests included in the meeting packet. The information requests were pertinent to the topics of whether to include the airport inside the UGB, the amount of industrial land to be designated, the housing mix ratio, and potential expansion areas. She invited questions.

Mr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Farr, moved to direct the City Manager to prepare, for a formal adoption process, planning documents to establish a new urban growth boundary based on recommendations in the Technical Components Document (Attachment E), and that carry forward the pillars and strategies described in the Envision Eugene Draft Proposal, March 14, 2012.

Mr. Brown, seconded by Ms. Taylor, moved to amend the motion to strike all references to the Clear Lake Road area in Attachment E.

Mr. Brown opposed expansion of the UGB onto wetlands and high-value farm soils, which were dominant in the Clear Lake Road area. Such soils were unique and could not be replaced. He also opposed the development of new industrial uses near homes, parks, and schools.

Mr. Zelenka proposed to table the amendment because he had a recommendation for the order of discussion.

Mr. Zelenka, seconded by Mr. Brown, moved to table the amendment. The motion passed, 6:1; Mr. Farr voting no.

Mr. Zelenka, seconded by Ms. Taylor, moved that the council first discuss industrial lands, then the airport, then the single-family housing mix, and then multi-family expansion areas. The motion passed, 6:1; Mr. Farr voting no.

Industrial lands

Responding to a question from Ms. Taylor, Airport Director Tim Doll indicated that any airport-owned land must, under federal law, be zoned for exclusive airport use. In response to a follow-up question from Ms. Taylor, Senior Planner Alissa Hansen indicated that the airport was contiguous to the UGB in two places and there were approximately 150 acres in the vicinity being proposed for inclusion in the UGB as industrial.

Ms. Taylor questioned why Eugene would want to locate housing near polluting industries and if the City must set aside land for polluting industries. Ms. Gardner said that locating housing near polluting industries was not a strategy in the plan. The City must be mindful of such conflicts in regard to both new and existing uses. She said that the staff-proposed motion was intended to allow time for such issues to be addressed before the formal adoption process.

Returning to the subject of the Clear Lake Road area, Mr. Brown opposed the expansion of the UGB onto farmlands for industrial use even if the land was not now being actively farmed. He anticipated such land would be used for food production eventually.

Mr. Brown cited the staff memorandum included in the packet titled *Envision Eugene: Follow-up on Industrial Lands from Council Work Session* and determined from Ms. Burke that the Joint Elected Officials Regional Economic Prosperity Plan had been used to determine key industries for the region. Staff had used the list of clusters of key industries to identify land suited for those uses, which led to identification of the Clear Lake Road acreage under consideration.

Mayor Piercy reminded the council that Urban Services Manager Denny Braud had provided information about the City's industrial zones and their differing land requirements. Mr. Braud had indicated that staff

did not envision the Clear Lake Road would be used for heavy industrial uses but rather lighter industrial uses more compatible with housing.

Associate Planner Jason Dedrick expanded on the remarks of Ms. Burke, explaining that staff had used the targeted industry clusters to identify suitable lands. In regard to the issue of Goshen versus the Clear Lake Road area, Mr. Dedrick emphasized that providing lands in one area did not preclude the need for lands in another area. The land in Goshen was unique and the industries interested in locating in Goshen might not be interested in the Clear Lake Road area. Conversely, an industry with more interest in being close to the airport might not be attracted to Goshen.

Mayor Piercy called attention to staff's response to a councilor's question regarding potential restrictions on industry for the purpose of health or quality of life (page 84 of the packet) that emphasized the importance of not placing heavy industrial uses adjacent to residential uses, suggested such lands be zoned campus industrial or light/medium industrial, and specifically cited target industries such as solar panel manufacturing, food processing, and research.

Mr. Zelenka asked Ms. Gardner and City Attorney Emily Jerome a series of questions clarifying the process and how staff would interpret the council's direction while maintaining consistency with State law.

Mr. Clark believed the City's analysis regarding projected employment growth was lacking and he advocated for a more aspirational approach that accounted for job growth caused by nonresidents. He suggested that the City was not identifying sufficient land for employment growth. He also called for analysis of the impact of new land on the tax base over the next 20 years and the impact on the costs of operating a government that delivered the services citizens wanted.

Mr. Clark left the meeting.

Mr. Farr questioned the purpose of revisiting the work done by the Technical Resource Group at this point given the process that lay ahead. He supported moving forward with the original motion so the questions of concern to councilors could be answered and the outstanding issues resolved.

Mr. Pryor suggested that no progress would be made without acceptance that the process was both about data and values. He called on councilors to be thoughtful and deliberate when it came to those "article of faith, belief, principled aspects" that the council had yet to discuss as a body. He acknowledged the process was not straightforward and would require the councilors to come to some policy consensus before it moved onto the technical aspects of the issues.

Mr. Brown indicated that he would also ask the council to strike the provision in Attachment E calling for council initiation of a plan and code amendment to redesignate the former Naval Reserve site on 13th Avenue to medium-density residential. He believed the proposal was premature given the fact the Jefferson-Westside Neighbors Board of Directors unanimously endorsed the site as a temporary homeless site and camping spot. He supported that goal.

Responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka, City Attorney Jerome clarified that the City had a legal need for more industrial land because State law required the City to take a comprehensive approach to the question of need that went beyond numbers and that encompassed policy questions such as what type of industries the community wanted and what it was best suited to support. From that basis, the City did not have a workable inventory of industrial lands. The City was also considering redesignation of its less suitable industrial lands for other uses, which reduced the inventory further; however, that exercise had

not created the need. City Attorney Jerome suggested it was a case of the industrial lands inventory being "a bunch of ties when everyone needed socks."

Mr. Zelenka suggested the City's approach to industrial lands spoke to Mr. Clark's interest in a more aspirational process. Speaking to Mr. Brown's concerns about the soils in the Clear Lake Road area, Mr. Zelenka suggested that those challenges would be found in other areas considered for expansion as well.

Mr. Farr believed that the community needed more jobs and more industrial and residential land and it needed those things soon. He suggested the council base the decisions it had to make now based on the information it had been given and allow the manager to finalize his recommendations. He pointed out that State law compelled the City to add land and jobs. He acknowledged that some people preferred to slow the process but he believed it was time to move forward.

Mayor Piercy determined that with the exception of Ms. Taylor, the council was ready to move forward with the manager's recommendations regarding industrial lands and the Eugene Airport with the caveats previously expressed.

Responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka, Ms. Gardner said that Goshen's land inventory could not satisfy Eugene's industrial lands need because it was not in Eugene and was not considered urban. City Attorney Jerome added that Lane County was seeking an exception from the State to allow industrial uses in Goshen. If that land became available the City could evaluate its impact at some future time and determine if the industries locating in Goshen were satisfying Eugene's job growth need. However, it appeared that Goshen was seeking to attract a different type of industry than Eugene was attempting to attract.

Mr. Zelenka acknowledged Eugene had few good choices in regard to expansion for industrial lands and the manager's recommendation could represent the least objectionable choice. How such lands were developed was important, particularly with regards to social equity and environmental justice concerns. He hoped to revisit those issues to ensure that the Seven Pillars were adequately addressed as it regarded UGB expansion for industrial purposes.

Mr. Zelenka supported including the Eugene Airport inside the UGB and asked about potential downsides. Land Use Planning Manager Steve Nystrom said including the airport in the UGB could affect the facility in the long-term by restricting the land immediately available for expansion for operational purposes. He believed more discussion of the implication of the shift was needed.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 1:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Forrest

Beth Forrest
City Recorder

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)