

**PAGE:**

1. The City is considering expanding the urban growth boundary (UGB) near the Eugene airport by about 924 acres to provide land for over 3,000 jobs, a community park, and future Bethel schools. ([View Map](#)).

What is your opinion about the location, size, and land use arrangement of the proposed expansion area?

	Response Percent	Response Count
<b>I strongly support having these lands in the UGB as proposed</b>	<b>41.3%</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>I can support the proposal, all things considered</b>	29.4%	32
<b>I prefer a different approach (please comment below)</b>	29.4%	32
	Other (please specify) <a href="#">Hide replies</a>	46

- |  |                            |
|--|----------------------------|
| 1. No build. We need farmland, not more warehouses.  | Thu, Jan 22, 2015 11:31 AM |
| 2. I have strong reservations about the conversion of agricultural land for industrial uses. One of the core principles of Oregon's land use planning system is to preserve agricultural land for agricultural uses. Once it is gone, it is gone forever. I would prefer that you find another site for industrial growth that is NOT agricultural land.   | Wed, Jan 21, 2015 10:18 AM |
| 3. I would like to hear a neighborhood consensus from that area and be better educated about the process. If it took 5 years to reach this decision, we'd appreciate time to understand if, and why, it is necessary to spend more in resources, natural and monetary, in a time the City has wisely voted to reduce energy by ~50%.   | Tue, Jan 20, 2015 6:15 PM  |
| 4. Protect agricultural soils and water quality.   | Tue, Jan 20, 2015 11:02 AM |
| 5. I would like to see protections for farmland implemented. Parts of the expansion area include some of the best soils in the nation, and we will need good soil for food production, and productive ag land is irreplaceable. I would also like to see especially strong protections included for air quality and other environmental concerns - that part of Eugene already has environmental justice issues, with the people living out there and in Bethel bearing a disproportionate burden of environmental toxicity.       | Tue, Jan 20, 2015 6:37 AM  |
| 6. Immediately replace city manager John Ruiz.   | Tue, Jan 20, 2015 12:17 AM |
| 7. I am not familiar with that property and therefore, have no opinion.  | Mon, Jan 19, 2015 10:56 PM |
| 8. I have some concern about whether this area includes land best used as farmland.  | Mon, Jan 19, 2015 1:48 PM  |
| 9. I strongly believe that we should not allow medium industrial zoning on the lands around the Clear Lake road area. The City would create more jobs and more opportunity by focusing on expanding technology, farming, and food processing. Also, we must be mindful about wetlands preservation in this area. of frequent flooding. Preservation is good, off-site mitigation accomplishes nothing for this ecosystem. Wetlands mitigation is NOT the same as preserving existing wetlands for functionality and flood control. | Mon, Jan 19, 2015 1:15 PM  |
| 10. We have not had much luck attracting large industry. I think we would be better off strengthening our existing small businesses rather than expanding the UGB into farmland in order to have more theoretical industrial land.   | Mon, Jan 19, 2015 11:13 AM |
| 11. In this case, there is a need to allow land for future airport expansion, when needed.   | Mon, Jan 19, 2015 7:20 AM  |
| 12. That's high quality farmland. We're looking at some food security challenges as it is and if we're also looking at being refuge from those in limited water areas, we'll need all the farmland we can get. At the same time, we're increasing infill in our close-in neighborhoods, making it almost impossible for people to grow some of their own food.   | Sun, Jan 18, 2015 5:10 PM  |
| 13. I would prefer altering the current housing mix to 45% single family and 55 % multi-family.  | Sun, Jan 18, 2015 11:20 AM |
| 14. It would depend on the view of the residents of the area concerned.  | Sat, Jan 17, 2015 8:26 PM  |
| 15. I support containing growth within the existing UGB's. And let's acknowledge that continued urban growth is not always possible, healthy or wise. Our economy should not be based on continued growth.   | Sat, Jan 17, 2015 1:12 PM  |

16.	I understand that there was earlier consideration for expansion in the Crest Drive area. I would support that incorporation.	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 10:04 AM
17.	I don't think that expansion is necessary for homes and businesses at this time. There are opportunities for redevelopment of unused land and properties in other areas of the city's current UGB. The expansion for schools and parks is a good idea, however.	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 10:02 AM
18.	I don't think the multifamily/single family split is correct for today's retiring baby boomers and young people who prefer a urban residence.	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 9:16 AM
19.	Focus on development within the current UGB.	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 7:55 AM
20.	Make better use of the vacant areas already existing within the UGB	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 6:20 AM
21.	Not necessary . What industries, how will infrastructure be paid, what guarantees for business employment	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:26 PM
22.	As I become familiar with the six-page facts sheet about regulations within the proposed UGB expansion, I see that I cannot support it. Those of us being affected by the plan would lose too many of our present rights as landowners which would affect not only our lifestyles but our finances, for example restrictions regarding building rights, farm animals, pets, and wood stoves.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:05 PM
23.	I support the Clear Lake and Santa Clara proposals only. I prefer infill for the housing needs.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 4:57 PM
24.	I don't agree that any land that is best for agriculture (food) should be used to increase an urban growth boundary, nor do I think it's a sustainable approach to the future. I think building up or consolidation of the urban areas would be better, combined with utilizing green or open space for wildlife habitat within urban centers. I think creating living rooftops, rainwater catchment systems, off grid solar living and tiny home developments ( <a href="http://www.pbs.org/wnet/need-to-know/culture/living-large-a-look-inside-the-tiny-house-movement/2522/">http://www.pbs.org/wnet/need-to-know/culture/living-large-a-look-inside-the-tiny-house-movement/2522/</a> ) would be more sustainable (the science also supports this, even if capitalism is set up to only look at growth only ( ie. capitalizing off of losses to people and ecosystems that support clean air, water and food) models of expansion or future planning. I don't feel that the Sustainability Commission is doing a good job at being heard or maybe they are not following sustainable development concepts <a href="http://www.gdrc.org/sustdev/concepts.html">http://www.gdrc.org/sustdev/concepts.html</a> and <a href="http://www.ase.tufts.edu/gdae/publications/working_papers/Sustainable%20Development.PDF">http://www.ase.tufts.edu/gdae/publications/working_papers/Sustainable%20Development.PDF</a> and <a href="https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?menu=1516">https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?menu=1516</a> . I believe most people are unaware of how bad things are on the planet and because of this governmental and corporate systems set up to only concern themselves with wealth/economy under the rules of capitalism, fail significantly to see that it's is like cutting of our noses despite our face. In order for civilizations to ensure that their planet can continue to provide the basic ecosystem services like clean/healthy Air, Water, Food, Shelter for future generations, economic schemes an systems (this is what promotes growth/expansion right now) must be set up first to ensure the health of these systems and the people that live within them. Under capitalism, systems are sent up to divide, exploit, create extreme wealth/imbalance-(mentally, physically, socially) which can ultimately only lead to the death of the very systems that allow these poor choices to even be an option. Similar to Cancer in the human body, these systems follow no inherent rules of nature and balance and in the end, without the help of thoughtful, vigilant people (the anti-cancers), human made up systems will result in the death much of what allows humanity and other species to inhabit this incredible earth. What I ask of the readers is to get informed, read, bring reports to meetings and challenge your city councils, county commissioners and other governing bodies to get informed and begin making sustainable plans-thinking outside the box of previous social constructions that limit our imagination and ingenuity to create a sustainable and socially just city/county/state/country/world.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 4:40 PM
25.	More redevelopment of existing sites.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 3:57 PM
26.	Stick to the Envision Eugene Plan: infill and vertical growth, not more destruction of good land!	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 3:25 PM
27.	3000 jobs is not enough to justify the environmental impact. This would mean an increase in air water and noise pollution. This area is already identified as an environmental justice community and adding more environmental strain is criminal. The area is compromised of prime farmland and should not be industrialized.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 1:31 PM
28.	Is it possible to expand for one reason and not another?	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 1:05 PM
29.	This suits the area, but I feel there should be more parks and open space designations, and ideally more pathways; now seems the time to designate and acquire such "relief" areas to create better developments over the next decades.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 12:55 PM
30.	I believe the current housing mix--55% single family detached homes and 45% multi dwellings is not realistic based on past trends (4-5 years) which show the ration moving in the other direction. If the housing mix were changed there wouldn't need to be an expansion of the UGB.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 11:31 AM

- 31. Survey design problem #1: Fri, Jan 16, 2015 11:09 AM  
 The opening statement is "spin," in that it subconsciously nudges the reader to support Mom and apple pie (jobs, parks, schools). It is not neutral, so the results will be skewed.  
 Problem 2: Answers to questions are phrased as "strongly support," "moderately support," and "other." This is again biased. Imagine the answers to that set of options, then imagine if the options were: "strongly opposed," "moderately opposed," and "other."  
 There are good tools available (such as a Likert scale system) to better obtain fair opinions.

---

- 32. Use the land you have inside the UGB more efficiently through redevelopment and infill. Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:40 AM

---

- 33. The cost to provide city services to the proposed residential UGB expansion is unacceptable and will lead to sprawl. The proposed areas fail to comply with Envision Eugene as evidenced by the TBL analysis Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:04 AM

---

- 34. Don't expand the UGB.....find a way to do so within the current boundary! Sprawl is one of our worst enemies! Thu, Jan 15, 2015 6:13 PM

---

- 35. "somewhat support" Wed, Jan 14, 2015 12:28 PM  
 Could we look at growth solutions from a different perspective- like rhetorical growth, reclaiming and cleaning up toxic or other closed sites. Surely we can look for creative ways to adjust for growth other than we need X number of acres for this X number (contiguous) acres for that.

---

- 36. I support the park land proposals, but have questions about the low density housing and employment proposals. I'd like to know more about the methodology used to determine the need to expand the UGB for these two uses. Wed, Jan 14, 2015 12:19 PM

---

- 37. I think commercial or industrial \_ be closer to I-5 Wed, Jan 14, 2015 12:15 PM  
 I think the Gimple hill area is hilly and difficult to build- the same with most of Bloomsburg

---

- 38. Still have a lot to learn, but seems to be going ways I like Wed, Jan 14, 2015 10:54 AM

---

- 39. Feel that too many acres that is farm will be affected Wed, Jan 14, 2015 10:53 AM

---

- 40. Infill, we have low population density & 100's of acres of undeveloped industrial land; getting rid of farm land with Class 1 & Class 2 soils is not sustainable; Sun, Jan 11, 2015 5:23 PM

---

- 41. A recent letter to the Editor (RegGrd) suggested a hotel at the airport. Yes! What a good idea. Sun, Jan 11, 2015 3:29 PM

---

- 42. The City could do a better job of pointing out that existing industrial lands are fragmented and generally too small for many industrial uses. It would also be helpful to make the point that food processing businesses, bike manufacture etc are industrial uses, not just "polluting out of town companies". I'm tired of reading the comments "Eugene has a surplus of unused industrial lands" and "We can develop the brownfields". Thu, Jan 8, 2015 1:25 PM

---

- 43. But in view of the huge amount on industry already located in West Eugene, I hope the City will take its environmental justice concerns very seriously, and seek to ameliorate the social and environment impact of the new industrial zone. Mon, Dec 22, 2014 8:54 PM

---

- 44. Eugene needs large industrial sites to attract new employers. Wed, Dec 17, 2014 8:51 AM

---

- 45. So will the tax payer have to pay for bike lanes all the way out there? Fri, Dec 12, 2014 10:03 PM

---

- 46. We have enough pollution on this side of town. Please don't give use even more. Can any plan also extend Terry south to West 11th? Or Roosevelt west out to Greenhill? Fri, Dec 12, 2014 11:12 AM

50 responses per page ▼

**answered question** **109**

**skipped question** **11**

2. The city is considering expanding the UGB by 35 acres near Madison Middle School (Wilkes Drive and River Loop 2) for a Santa Clara Community Park. ([View Map](#)).

What is your opinion about this proposal?

Response	Response
Percent	Count

<b>I strongly support having these lands in the UGB as proposed</b>	<b>54.5%</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>I can support the proposal, all things considered</b>	36.4%	40
<b>I prefer a different approach (please comment below)</b>	9.1%	10
	Other (please specify) <a href="#">Hide replies</a>	20

1. No build.	Thu, Jan 22, 2015 11:31 AM
2. #1	Tue, Jan 20, 2015 6:15 PM
3. The park proposal is a ruse to get more land into the UGB.	Tue, Jan 20, 2015 12:17 AM
4. Parks and open space is something I can support, no matter where it is.	Mon, Jan 19, 2015 10:56 PM
5. There are so many unincorporated parcels in the River Road area and the residents fiercely fight annexation in to the city. It is difficult to support city services being dedicated to a Santa Clara Community Park knowing there are SO MANY residents in that area that do not contribute to city services because they are outside the UGB. I recommend the city annex the entire River Road area and then use the tax revenue from the new taxes and fees that will be collected to fund a project for the Santa Clara Community Park.	Mon, Jan 19, 2015 11:01 AM
6. More parks in SCCO!	Sun, Jan 18, 2015 5:10 PM
7. It would depend on the view of the residents of the area concerned.	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 8:26 PM
8. Expanding park space in the Santa Clara neighborhood is a great idea.	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 10:02 AM
9. Focus on development within the current UGB.	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 7:55 AM
10. As above	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:26 PM
11. I can not say I support the proposal because I do not know enough about it.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:05 PM
12. I think we should have a city/county and corporate collaboration on this. The city is trying to take over the Santa Clara area to ensure more tax base for it's unsustainable development. Currently much of Santa Clara is within the county where taxes remain more affordable for those who are not in the middle or upper levels of the economic pyramid (class/economy structure for division under capitalist constructs). This is socially better to help lower income earners, who are imperative to the capitalist system and outside of this thinking are also equally important in their own right as human beings (a more matriarchal or matristic view of things- <a href="http://www.hagia.de/en/matriarchy/why-the-term-matriarchy.html">http://www.hagia.de/en/matriarchy/why-the-term-matriarchy.html</a> ). I of course support more parks and open space, but not simply to increase sporting events. I would like more spaces for people to interact with nature within the city, to connect with the natural world because it is important to our survival as a species. However, I don't think this needs to happen through acquisition of county lands so that high tax revenues can again be used in an unsustainable/greedy way.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 4:40 PM
13. Stick to the Envision Eugene Plan: infill and vertical growth, not more destruction of good land!	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 3:25 PM
14. Seems to be a natural extension of already developed areas and provides a nice sized park that will offset and	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 12:55 PM

preserve the housing area.

- 15. We need to maintain and police our present parks first.....before we add more that we cannot afford to operate properly with policing! Fri, Jan 16, 2015 11:21 AM
- 16. Don't expand the UGB.....use existing lands within the boundary to create the community park! Sprawl is one of our worst enemies! Thu, Jan 15, 2015 6:13 PM
- 17. Do we need so many acres dedicated to a school or schools? Could we think a bit more urbanely that schools have smaller lots and recreation occurs within smaller school grounds ascending families and kids to all the sports fields spread with area Wed, Jan 14, 2015 12:28 PM
- 18. I don't think the cut 4 can maintain the Parks they have now and river road has a big park already. Wed, Jan 14, 2015 12:15 PM
- 19. Not enough parks in NW Eugene. Wed, Dec 17, 2014 8:51 AM
- 20. Does that mean LTD will bulldoze their way to that area, and demand that we need more transit. Fri, Dec 12, 2014 10:03 PM

25 responses per page ▼

**answered question      110**

**skipped question      10**

3. Please use the space below to provide any additional comments you have on the UGB expansion proposal for Jobs, Parks, and Schools.

Response

Count

[Hide replies](#)      31

- 1. We haven't had the facts or figures to knowledgeably comment but, as above, if this happens more organically, when neighborhoods have a say and a need, the City would be more like a treasured resort than a big box shopping area. The people who live in the area care the most and are deeply invested. Tue, Jan 20, 2015 6:15 PM
- 2. It's a good move for the city of Eugene and the outlying areas. Tue, Jan 20, 2015 11:59 AM
- 3. If this expansion occurs, it should include special buffer zones between industrial uses and homes and schools. I would also support restrictions on the types of permitted industrial uses, to protect people from additional exposures to toxicity. Tue, Jan 20, 2015 6:37 AM
- 4. "Jobs": Important yes, but generally can and should be within the existing UGB and certainly not on farmland. Mon, Jan 19, 2015 4:28 PM
- 5. I have heard some neighborhood resistance to having lighted athletic fields at the Madison Middle School site. The area certainly needs more park area and athletic fields but does the area need to be brightly lit at night. Mon, Jan 19, 2015 12:39 PM
- 6. This is not exactly an unbiased survey with the way the questions are written. I'm also not sure that it's even possible to have this expansion get through both 1000 Friends and DLCD. Mon, Jan 19, 2015 11:13 AM
- 7. I would only want the UGB to be expanded IF the Sun, Jan 18, 2015 3:48 PM

population grows as is projected and only AFTER lands within the UGB are developed.	
8. See #1 comments above.	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 1:12 PM
9. I don't think that expansion is necessary for homes and businesses at this time. There are opportunities for redevelopment of unused land and properties. The expansion for schools and parks is a good idea, however.	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 10:02 AM
10. Focus on development within the current UGB. Plenty of can be created to make to enrich life within our current UGB. Do not sprawl. Do not make people drive further to get to center of town.	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 7:55 AM
11. I don't trust the city to stick by its word....I am afraid they will do whatever brings the most money in, regardless of public forums and comments.	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 6:20 AM
12. I hope you will take the time to explore the links I have provide and open your minds to increase learning about these subjects, I am aware that many of you may already know and even be in support of much of what I have proposed or objected to in my comments, for you, I will hope that you will have the courage to bring these issues up and continue to speak out in favor or more sustainable ways of moving forward in our precarious future.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 4:40 PM
13. I do not support expansion of the UGB.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 3:25 PM
14. I would like to see the city incentivize commercial development inside the current UGB through discounts on SDC fees related to transportation and stormwater. I am all for expanding the UGB to meet future growth projections, but that is not the only solution to meet future needs.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 2:05 PM
15. Please expand the UGB and city limits to encompass the city-owned land in Lane County that comprises Wild Iris Ridge.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 12:18 PM
16. Why add more housing to North Eugene/Airport area when we need to address traffic on beltline rd. Delta Riverroad is really congested morning and night. More traffic from more housing is not the answer. if we don't have the funded, we should look elsewhere. Lets fix our existing problems first, then move ahead.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 11:21 AM
17. This has been a long, well studied and vetted process ... given all the state rules and local issues, this is the best location for much needed industrial ground. While adding it doesn't guarantee that we will improve our economy, not adding it guarantees that we lose the opportunity to do so.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:47 AM
18. From the amount of blighted commercial and industrial properties in the city already, you should work on creating more value with what you have through redevelopment than add more greenfield land that will reduce the market for redevelopment of existing property.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:40 AM
19. Parks is a nice use for UGB expansion because it serves as continuing green space and buffer for animals before reaching the built environment.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:02 AM
20. I was hoping to hear the novel approach of contracting the UGB.....inevitably my experience shows that expansion brings high costs to us all and derogates our environment. Developers and investors take \$ out of our community as we are left less!	Thu, Jan 15, 2015 6:13 PM
21. I am concerned that we'll keep growing horizontally, gobbling up more and more green space- whether farm lands, wetlands or natural areas. Eventually/ suppose the UGB will be at least to Creswell if not to Cottage Grove and Noi to Coburg. One more comment- I'm discouraged that opened space is often envisioned as a future sports	Wed, Jan 14, 2015 12:28 PM

park, area, indoor something or other dedicated to sports.

- 22. It is estimated that the population will expand by 35K in 20 years. I is short sped to bring such a small amount of land into the USB Wed, Jan 14, 2015 12:15 PM
- 23. Expansion doesn't always mean more jobs Wed, Jan 14, 2015 10:51 AM
- 24. Whether we agree or like it, our community will continue to attract new residents. This means growth, either without our city limits/UGB, or in bedroom communities. If we don't want to have sprawl, and if we want to support diverse development instead of gentrification, we need to have sufficient land within the UGB. I strongly support the proposed expansion plans. The plan was the result of an exhaustive review and represents a compromise of many MANY stakeholders, I think it's as fair as any plan that can be "envisioned" and should be implemented. Mon, Jan 12, 2015 2:14 PM
- 25. Interpreting the state law in such a way that we have no choice but to expand UGB is incorrect. We do not need to expand for single family housing, for instance. We can lessen our infrastructure costs, carbon footprint, and other hidden costs by managing growth with out encouraging growth Sun, Jan 11, 2015 5:23 PM
- 26. Given the location of the airport, the Clear Lake area is almost infill. Wed, Dec 17, 2014 8:51 AM
- 27. I give-up on the city remotely being concerned about jobs. Fri, Dec 12, 2014 10:03 PM
- 28. Open parks smoke and tobacco free please. No one wants to breathe that stuff. Fri, Dec 12, 2014 5:49 PM
- 29. We need good jobs for our growing families, friends, and others who come here! Let's make sure they're the kind of jobs we all want (tech, green jobs, quality food, etc.) Fri, Dec 12, 2014 4:03 PM
- 30. Clear Lake Overlay should be developed in collaboration with boards, commissions, and interested stakeholders. Fri, Dec 12, 2014 1:28 PM
- 31. Please stop the trying to cover up we will have more polluting industry on this side of town, with all the negative externalities including increased truck traffic, noise, dust, exhaust, etc, involved in that new industry by calling it "jobs" Fri, Dec 12, 2014 11:12 AM

50 responses per page ▼

**answered question** **31**

**skipped question** **89**

4. The City is considering expanding the urban growth boundary (UGB) by 230 acres near Bloomberg Road, north of 30th Avenue and Lane Community College, to provide land for about 400 homes. ([View Map](#)).

What is your opinion about the location, size, and land use arrangement of the proposed expansion area?

	Response Percent	Response Count
<b>I strongly support having these lands in the UGB as proposed</b>	31.5%	35
<b>I can support the proposal, all things considered</b>	31.5%	35
<b>I prefer a different approach (please comment below)</b>	<b>36.9%</b>	<b>41</b>

- |  |                            |
|--|----------------------------|
| 1. No build. The citizens who already live there should have the decision making power over the decision.  | Thu, Jan 22, 2015 11:31 AM |
| 2. The Bloomberg/McVay area already has high traffic congestion and has environmental issues (flooding, wetlands) that make it a poorer choice than several alternatives available. The Crest/Chambers-2 area would be a better choice and would provide the same housing capacity.  | Wed, Jan 21, 2015 10:18 AM |
| 3. #1. We need to think above and beyond the rewritten codes & ordinances to common sense (Robert's Rules of Order) to be sure that the decisions are for the betterment of society and none based on economic greed; to protect our natural resources so we still want to live here. This is near the confluence of our main river, Goal 5 worthy with I5 degradation. Isn't connectivity in our environmental studies for the survival of natural habitat? very different than what happens to land once spandex bicycle men begin to ride through it, followed by buses and businesses on roads not safe and never built to serve heavy traffic.  | Tue, Jan 20, 2015 6:15 PM  |
| 4. Protect wetland habitat.  | Tue, Jan 20, 2015 11:02 AM |
| 5. How the heck was this small parcel identified? Why not south of 30th? 400 homes? Give me a break. I can only wonder what large landowner might stand to make a lot of money if this proposal were to be approved.   | Tue, Jan 20, 2015 8:04 AM  |
| 6. Infill. Infill. Infill. This residential expansion is prohibitively expensive. It makes no sense to use public money to build infrastructure to support more homes for wealthy people. SDCs will never cover the cost of expanding to serve residential development in that area.   | Tue, Jan 20, 2015 6:37 AM  |
| 7. Extending city services into this steep area would be extremely costly, and convert more open space for big-money developers.   | Tue, Jan 20, 2015 12:17 AM |
| 8. I live on Bloomberg Road and am very concerned about where these 400 homes would go. We already have a serious traffic issue. What are the plans to mitigate the traffic? We have no safe access out of Bloomberg Road by bike.   | Mon, Jan 19, 2015 10:56 PM |
| 9. The "need" to expand Eugene to accommodate more homes is a product of projections based on inaccurate assumptions and outdated data. Please reconsider the decision to base the projection on a 55/45 housing mix.  | Mon, Jan 19, 2015 2:21 PM  |
| 10. I would prefer using the proposed Chambers expansion area for all 530 homes needed, particularly because it would be a less expensive area to provide city services.   | Mon, Jan 19, 2015 1:48 PM  |
| 11. That is too many homes for this area and too many acres. Also this area is designated as wildlife refuge, isn't it? Shouldn't that be accounted for under Goal 5.  | Mon, Jan 19, 2015 1:15 PM  |
| 12. The City of Eugene has two iconic assets of inestimable value that give it definition and distinction – the south hills water shed including Spencers Butte and the Willamette River. Eugene citizens should take pride in these assets and do everything possible to preserve them and pass them on intact to future generations. Unfortunately much degradation has occurred in the form of development that is insensitive to the natural environment and outright pollution of the Willamette River which has been mitigated to a great degree over the past several decades. Insensitivity to the Laurel Hill Valley basin has led to the encasement of Laurel Hill Creek in underground culverts that have construction on top and the potential encroachment of development on the riparian areas at the south end near 30th Ave. We are more fortunate with the Amazon Headwaters in that the City has purchased some of it and is about to purchase the rest for park area.<br>The proposed expansion of the Eugene UGB into the Bloomberg/McVay area across from LCC is another affront to the | Mon, Jan 19, 2015 12:50 PM |



ecology of the South Hills and a probable degradation of the Russel Creek Basin. This sensitive area is the juncture of both the Russel Creek Basin and three branches of the Willamette River. The fact that the City would consider welcoming (and even encouraging) development in such an extremely sensitive area shows where its allegiance lies.

I strongly recommend the rejection the Bloomberg/McVay area UGB expansion proposal for the sake of future generations.

- |     |   |                            |
|-----|---|----------------------------|
| 13. | This is a bad place to encourage development so much housing, slopes, wet soils and increased traffic over 30th, up Amazon and Willamette, and into downtown. They'll face the full force of I-5 noise too.   | Sun, Jan 18, 2015 5:10 PM  |
| 14. | I am especially concerned about expansion in this area given the recent Springfield interest in expanding their UGB in the area of Seavy Loop. I am concerned about the impact of development on nearby farm land and park land. This area is a rural oasis and needs to be protected.  | Sun, Jan 18, 2015 3:48 PM  |
| 15. | See comments in #1 above. 400 homes is a huge number which would result in serious traffic congestion on an inadequate road infrastructure. Would the developer of this area be paying the total cost of all sewer, water and other utility expansion plus the entire cost of new roads? I resent taxpayer money subsidizing a developers business and bottom line.   | Sat, Jan 17, 2015 1:12 PM  |
| 16. | I don't think that expansion is necessary for homes at this time. There are opportunities for redevelopment of unused land and properties in other areas of the city's current UGB.   | Sat, Jan 17, 2015 10:02 AM |
| 17. | Focus on development within the current UGB. Plenty of can be created to make to enrich life within our current UGB. Do not sprawl. Do not make people drive further to get to center of town.  | Sat, Jan 17, 2015 7:55 AM  |
| 18. | Please consider infill rather than expansion as a logical choice.   | Sat, Jan 17, 2015 6:20 AM  |
| 19. | But if any UGB expansion is actually needed, which I doubt, this area is at least near job centers, the community college main campus and public transportation.  | Fri, Jan 16, 2015 11:48 PM |
| 20. | As above  | Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:26 PM |
| 21. | I do not support the expansion for many reasons, many of which are well documented in the land use arguments against placing a National Guard armory on the corner of McVay Hwy. and 30th avenue, including traffic, lack of suitable building sites, destruction to the natural habitat, amount of wetlands, cost for services. In addition, as I become familiar with the six-page facts sheet about regulations within the proposed UGB expansion, I realize that those of us being affected by the plan would immediately lose too many of our present rights as landowners which would affect not only our lifestyles but our finances, for example restrictions regarding building rights, farm animals, pets, and wood stoves. Proposing 400 single family homes in this area seems completely unrealistic, given the lack of viable land for building these homes, the cost for services to be brought in, the cost for a new fire department in the area, the cost to recreate a traffic system feeding in and out of I-5, etc. Please take the Bloomberg area off the list. The map that is available for viewing does not show the area with enough clarity and detail, but I attended the open house. | Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:05 PM |
| 22. | I prefer infill in areas already in the UGB   | Fri, Jan 16, 2015 4:57 PM  |
| 23. | I absolute am against anything being built in this area that will negatively impact the wetlands ("mitigation" has clearly been found to be unsustainable if you read the science on it- <a href="http://www.unep.org/maweb/documents/document.358.aspx.pdf">http://www.unep.org/maweb/documents/document.358.aspx.pdf</a> ). The only kind of housing that I would support is a tiny home complex that is developed in a way that promotes and builds on then natural ecosystems around and within it ( <a href="http://www.wbdg.org/resources/biomimicry.php">http://www.wbdg.org/resources/biomimicry.php</a> ).   | Fri, Jan 16, 2015 4:40 PM  |
| 24. | Ridiculous. Should expand towards Junction City where efficient transportation can be provided. The LCC area is fragment  | Fri, Jan 16, 2015 3:57 PM  |

	ownership, which will likely be inefficiently developed for higher-priced homes.	
25.	Stick to the Envision Eugene Plan: infill and vertical growth, not more destruction of good land!	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 3:25 PM
26.	I think that if services can be provided at a reasonable cost that this is the best expansion area of the ones proposed	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 2:44 PM
27.	Increase density in existing neighborhoods first. This area has always been more bucolic to me than the Bailey Hill and Gimpl Hill areas.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 2:05 PM
28.	Are you sure this is the best area to expand into? It seems to have a number of obstacles.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 1:05 PM
29.	I think it's a good choice as long as the wetland areas near 30th are preserved.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 12:55 PM
30.	I believe the current housing mix--55% single family detached homes and 45% multi dwellings is not realistic based on past trends (4-5 years) which show the ration moving in the other direction. If the housing mix were changed there wouldn't need to be an expansion of the UGB.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 11:31 AM
31.	What about traffic?? When LCC opens, traffic backs up on I5 for a couple of hours in the morning. What is your plan to deal with this? How many cars are going to be added to the traffic count in the 7:30 to 9:30 AM time frame? More Gridlock is not what Eugene needs!	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 11:21 AM
32.	From everything I have read published by the Urban Land Institute, Lincoln Institute, National Association of Realtors, given the demographic changes that are occurring, we have enough existing single-family homes to meet our need for the next 20+ years. Eugene should change its mix of housing and only project the need for multi-family housing and accommodate it within the existing UGB in 20-minute neighborhoods and along transit routes.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:40 AM
33.	seems an odd shape - thin, narrow, mostly I know to include the residential areas along Bloomberg road - also, the wet area right along 30th (excluded in your expansion) is designated Ag according to your map - not natural resource?	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:24 AM
34.	I oppose adding this area. At most, it should be designated as a reserve area.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:04 AM
35.	It is isolated from the rest of the ugb and doesn't make much sense to me why it would be included. I think there are areas that are adjacent to the existing ugb that make more sense	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 9:57 AM
36.	I watch the squandering of our resources on student housing downtown and in the university neighborhoods.....why not use that land for quality single family homes. Again, I do NOT support expansion of the UGB!	Thu, Jan 15, 2015 6:13 PM
37.	High development costs and possible loss of trail connectivity plus is good access to public transit. Reduces density!	Wed, Jan 14, 2015 12:19 PM
38.	As long as it doesn't affect Seavey Loop	Wed, Jan 14, 2015 10:58 AM
39.	As long as it does not affect Seavey Loop	Wed, Jan 14, 2015 10:55 AM
40.	again, infill, and maintain sustainable growth; the proposed approach for single family will have a huge negative and costly impact on an area already at capacity	Sun, Jan 11, 2015 5:23 PM
41.	I wonder why we have to try to cram as many houses as possible in this area. How is there going to be room for the park?	Thu, Jan 8, 2015 7:32 PM
42.	While there are advantages to this site, it is sloped and may not be as easy to develop as hoped. The high cost of providing infrastructure is a problem for me. The cost of providing these services will drive up the cost of these homes, and we don't need more high end homes. I'd prefer to change the housing mix to reduce the percentage of single family homes overall and increase row housing, flag lot housing, multifamily etc to allow for	Thu, Jan 8, 2015 1:25 PM

denser urban areas. The City Council and staff should stand tall against nimby neighborhoods that stand in the way of sustainability for our community.

- 43.
The City should expand its UGB into west Eugene in the Willow Creek Study area near Hynix and not in the LCC Basin.
Thu, Jan 8, 2015 11:49 AM
- 44.
Part of what makes the area nice is the rural feel. I do not support additional homes in this area. I also feel that there are many undeveloped housing lots in the area that need to be sold first. In addition, by limiting the number of new lots, we will help to increase the opportunity for homes in the older areas of Eugene to be refurbished and upgraded as population increases. Ashland, Oregon is a good example of this.
Mon, Dec 29, 2014 4:11 PM
- 45.
Part of what makes the area nice is the rural feel. I do not support additional homes in this area. I also feel that there are many undeveloped housing lots in the area that need to be sold first. In addition, by limiting the number of new lots, we will help to increase the opportunity for homes in the older areas of Eugene to be refurbished and upgraded as population increases. Ashland, Oregon is a good example of this.
Mon, Dec 29, 2014 4:11 PM
- 46.
This area is located far from the rest of Eugene, will result in more people driving a long way to reach town, and will be very expensive to develop. That will make home prices there very expensive--and who will want to live right next to I-5 if they have that much money to spend on a home? This location is in no way consistent with the Seven Pillars of Envision Eugene
Mon, Dec 22, 2014 8:54 PM
- 47.
The LCC basin is an excellent area to grow. If Eugene doesn't expand into this area, I suspect Springfield will.
Wed, Dec 17, 2014 8:51 AM
- 48.
Again, does this mean bike lanes and more transit development? How can anyone believe the city is really listening?!
Fri, Dec 12, 2014 10:03 PM
- 49.
If we have to grow for single family homes, these areas seem to be the best choices for Eugene. LCC is an obvious choice. At the same time, I really hope we can invest in rest of the city to make other housing options realistic and attractive, too.
Fri, Dec 12, 2014 4:03 PM

50 responses per page ▾

**answered question**      **111**

**skipped question**      **9**

5. The City is considering expanding the UGB by 60 acres near Bailey Hill and Gimpl Hill Roads to provide land for 135 homes. ([View Map](#)).

What is your opinion about the location, size, and land use arrangement of the proposed expansion area?

	Response Percent	Response Count
<b>I strongly support having these lands in the UGB as proposed</b>	26.1%	29
<b>I can support the proposal, all things considered</b>	<b>41.4%</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>I prefer a different approach (please comment below)</b>	32.4%	36
Other (please specify) <a href="#">Hide replies</a>		48

1. I prefer protecting it as parkland.	Thu, Jan 22, 2015 11:31 AM
2. The Bailey Hill/Gimpl Hill area is the wrong choice for expanding the UGB. Together with the Bloomberg/McVay area, the total cost of providing services to these areas is over \$29 million. For \$5 million less, the Crest/Chambers-2 area would provide the same housing capacity (532 homes). Bailey/Hill Gimpl Hill areas are far from employment centers, are not served by any public transportation, and have many natural features that make home building undesirable or expensive (steep slopes, wetlands. The headwaters of the East Branch of Willow Creek run through this area. A better approach would be to expand the UGB in the Crest/Chambers-2 area, adjacent to an area of existing developments.	Wed, Jan 21, 2015 10:18 AM
3. #1	Tue, Jan 20, 2015 6:15 PM
4. Infill. Infill. Infill. This residential expansion is prohibitively expensive. It makes no sense to use public money to build infrastructure to support more homes for wealthy people. SDCs will never cover the cost of expanding to serve residential development in that area.	Tue, Jan 20, 2015 6:37 AM
5. This is nothing but sprawl.	Tue, Jan 20, 2015 12:17 AM
6. This seems to me to be an area where we really ought to maintain the rural character, not suburbia and the next layer of commuting and many miles driven into and out of town, or the edge of the UGB in this proposal.	Mon, Jan 19, 2015 4:28 PM
7. The "need" to expand Eugene to accommodate more homes is a product of projections based on inaccurate assumptions and outdated data. Reconsider the decision to base the projection on a 55/45 housing mix.	Mon, Jan 19, 2015 2:21 PM
8. I would prefer including only the portion of this area identified as BG-1 (Bailey Hill) because it is contiguous to the current UGB and slated to be provided with sewers in the next 20 years. I would prefer EXCLUDING (BG-2) the McMorott Lane area because it realistically has room for very few houses and this neighborhood has asked to be excluded.	Mon, Jan 19, 2015 1:48 PM
9. This land is our gateway to vineyards and forest lands. We need to keep this area as rural transition area. I think expansion towards I-5 is a better use of resource lands	Mon, Jan 19, 2015 1:15 PM
10. Would be better with EmX going out that way.	Mon, Jan 19, 2015 11:13 AM
11. This piece of the proposal seems wacky to me: 1. The adjacent land closer to town and already in the UGB (for decades) has not been developed; 2. the land is FAR from bus lines and the heart of Eugene; 3. the trend of the last decade is NOT toward single family dwellings. It just isn't needed. 2.	Sun, Jan 18, 2015 11:20 AM
12. It would depend on the view of the residents of the area concerned.	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 8:26 PM
13. Beautiful area, but are there willing sellers? Betting on increased values to make acreage available, and with currently secluded nature gone, a few more ready to sell?	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 1:57 PM
14. See comments in #1 and #4 above.	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 1:12 PM
15. This area could be added at a later date.	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 10:04 AM
16. I don't think that expansion is necessary for homes at this time. There are opportunities for redevelopment of unused land and properties in other areas of the city's current UGB.	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 10:02 AM
17. I don't think McMorot Lane which is includedi in this area is needed and should be excluded.	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 9:16 AM

- |  |                            |
|--|----------------------------|
| 18. Focus on development within the current UGB. Plenty of can be created to make to enrich life within our current UGB. Do not sprawl. Do not make people drive further to get to center of town.   | Sat, Jan 17, 2015 7:55 AM  |
| 19. This neighborhood is particularly unsuited for UGB expansion. Far from job centers, lack of public transportation, a narrow, curvy and steep access road (Gimpl Hill) which is extremely dangerous for pedestrians and near impossible for all but the most athletic cyclists. The 6 existing homes may have a little buildable land on their properties for some additional housing density, but highly unlikely to situate anything near 135 additional homes. Not cost effective for all the infrastructure needed to bring out water and sewer, etc.   | Fri, Jan 16, 2015 11:48 PM |
| 20. As above   | Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:26 PM |
| 21. I have not studied this proposal with regard to viable land for building, but the restrictions for expanding the UGB, affecting lifestyles and finances as mentioned above, would be unfair.   | Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:05 PM |
| 22. As a resident in this area, I'm not in favor of the UGB being expanded on the proposed 60 acres here. This is a rural area and as such, the residents enjoy a particular way of life - one that we have chosen by living here - and inclusion in the UGB would hinder this way of life and the enjoyment of our land. One of the primary reasons has to do with the restrictions that would be imposed on us with regards to the use of our land. Some having to do with the number of animals allowed, brush burning, etc., but also with regards to structures on the land. Plans to build a new home on our property, for instance, could be negatively affected. This is unacceptable. Also, although there are speculative benefits in being included within the UGB, it is HIGHLY unlikely any of the residents would see any such benefits in the foreseeable future. Inclusion in the UGB would result in the loss of the use and enjoyment, as well as the improvement of our property, with a potential loss in property value. There would also be loss of some tax benefits as a result of inclusion in the UGB. Specifically, losing participation in the Forest Deferral Program. As it is now, should we, by the harvesting of our timber, be removed from participation in the Forest Deferral Program and obliged to pay back taxes, at least we would have means to offset such taxes owed by the sale of said timber. By being included in the UGB, as it stands now, we would be obligated for the same back taxes without having gained any financial benefits to offset such payments. If this 60 acres is to be included in the UGB, I would propose that the restrictions set forth in the UGB be set aside for these 60 acres until such time, if ever, when the implementations of such restrictions is deemed necessary due to development or some other activity. I feel that imposing the current restrictions of the UGB to this 60 acres is totally unnecessary and highly oppressive to the current residents. | Fri, Jan 16, 2015 5:44 PM  |
| 23. I prefer infill in areas already in the UGB  | Fri, Jan 16, 2015 4:57 PM  |
| 24. I've said plenty to help you understand why I chose this answer.   | Fri, Jan 16, 2015 4:40 PM  |
| 25. Again, a poor location in terms of topography and property ownership.  | Fri, Jan 16, 2015 3:57 PM  |
| 26. Stick to the Envision Eugene Plan: infill and vertical growth, not more destruction of good land!  | Fri, Jan 16, 2015 3:25 PM  |
| 27. The section on Bailey Hill Rd. Is amenable for half acre home sites but the Gimpl Hill section is too steep. Also the property owners in the area are almost totally against the plan since it will change the rural nature of their area.   | Fri, Jan 16, 2015 2:13 PM  |

With this amount of opposition to this plan it will not be economically feasible to put in the water and sewer lines for development. It is a real affront to this rural community to have the UGB expanded into an area against the residents wishes.

28.	Increase density in existing neighborhoods first.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 2:05 PM
29.	Is infrastructure strong enough in this region?	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 1:05 PM
30.	This area has the needed services in place and is a natural extension of the existing development areas. But I feel there should be more parks and open space areas designated!	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 12:55 PM
31.	Please expand the UGB and city limits to encompass the city-owned land in Lane County that comprises Wild Iris Ridge. That will make it easier for the police department to know who to send (EPD or the sheriff?) when there are illegal campers, people taking pot shots with their guns, etc.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 12:18 PM
32.	I believe the current housing mix--55% single family detached homes and 45% multi dwellings is not realistic based on past trends (4-5 years) which show the ration moving in the other direction. If the housing mix were changed there wouldn't need to be an expansion of the UGB.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 11:31 AM
33.	This really makes no sense. See my comment under question #4	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:40 AM
34.	The cost to provide city services to these areas is high and will not be offer by development fees or future property taxes. If the city changed the percent mix of single/multi family housing, the need for expansion of the UGB for residential purposes would not exist.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:04 AM
35.	I don't know enough about the area, but I do worry about fire if the surrounding area is forested. I do support UGB expansion for homes to keep costs of housing reasonable throughout the UGB.	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:02 AM
36.	I watch the squandering of our resources on student housing downtown and in the university neighborhoods.....why not use that land for quality single family homes. Again, I do NOT support expansion of the UGB!	Thu, Jan 15, 2015 6:13 PM
37.	somewhat although wonder about the "low density" proposal. If we're expanding, should all new areas be higher density?	Wed, Jan 14, 2015 12:28 PM
38.	Not served by public transit high development costs reduces density!	Wed, Jan 14, 2015 12:19 PM
39.	It is hilly and will take too long to bring in infrastructure	Wed, Jan 14, 2015 12:15 PM
40.	tough topography not a high density towards efficiency	Wed, Jan 14, 2015 12:11 PM
41.	Feel this rural area should be kept as rural and farm lands	Wed, Jan 14, 2015 10:53 AM
42.	Single family homes is not sustainable	Sun, Jan 11, 2015 5:23 PM
43.	Again, this seems like a lot of homes to put in this beautiful country area. Really seems a shame.	Thu, Jan 8, 2015 7:32 PM
44.	See comment above, though because the infrastructure costs are lower, I'm less opposed.	Thu, Jan 8, 2015 1:25 PM
45.	The City should expand its UGB into west Eugene in the Willow Creek Study area near Hynix and not near the Bailey Hill and Gimpl Hill roads.	Thu, Jan 8, 2015 11:49 AM
46.	Adding single-family homes out at the fringe of the community is expensive, unnecessary, and undermines the effort toward compact urban growth and efficient land	Mon, Dec 22, 2014 8:54 PM

use that is at the heart of Envision Eugene.

- 47. What about the 600 acres buildable that LTD says exists out on West 11th? Fri, Dec 12, 2014 10:03 PM
- 48. This seems like a reasonable option given the location and need to serve other land in the area. If we have to expand, let's be reasonable. Fri, Dec 12, 2014 4:03 PM

50 responses per page ▼

**answered question**      **111**

**skipped question**      **9**

6. Please use the space below to provide any additional comments you have on the UGB expansion proposal for Homes.

Response  
Count

[Hide replies](#)      41

- 1. I believe these proposals will ultimately fall short of the demand for residential property. Thu, Jan 22, 2015 3:18 PM
- 2. I don't believe that we needed to expand as much as we did. With all of the student apartment housing being built I think we have more empty rental houses than we have ever had. Wed, Jan 21, 2015 4:20 PM
- 3. The Gonyea property, or the Willow Creek study area, or the area south of 30th Ave. near LCC would all be better choices for homes. The property owners WANT to be included in the UGB, and are nearer to existing public transportation, employment centers, and traffic corridors. The owners will work with the city to make the adjustments necessary for inclusion, rather than fight the city for the next few years to prevent the expansion. Wed, Jan 21, 2015 10:18 AM
- 4. #1. When necessary, the hope would be to put them where the City already has services in areas that don't destroy the environment. It would have been helpful if our Neighborhood Leaders and Councilman would have discussed this topic, or brought up the December meetings at the Neighborhood Meetings. Tue, Jan 20, 2015 6:15 PM
- 5. Infill, please. Multifamily, please. Going forward, we should not be encouraging residential sprawl. The carbon emissions from single-person vehicle trips to serve ever-expanded Eugene residential footprint would be unacceptable. Tue, Jan 20, 2015 6:37 AM
- 6. Immediately replace city manager Jon Ruiz. Tue, Jan 20, 2015 12:17 AM
- 7. I ask the City Council to reconsider the mix of 55-45. Given current trends, this mix prepares for more single family homes than the population will demand. Multifamily housing is the wave of the future, is more economical for families, and should be at least 50 percent of the mix. Mon, Jan 19, 2015 1:48 PM
- 8. I would only want the UGB to be expanded IF the population grows as is projected and only AFTER lands within the UGB are developed. Sun, Jan 18, 2015 3:48 PM

- |   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| 9. Thanks for the thoughtful work that has gone into these proposals. I'm a longtime resident, and the growth that has taken place in the River Rd. Area in the past 10 years saddens me most, because of the excellent soil along the river corridor. That long string of roadside commerce instead of fields-- a heartbreaking eyesore.   | Sat, Jan 17, 2015 8:57 PM  |
| 10. Given all the previous studies done during the Armory fiasco, of the area north of 30th Avenue, commonly called the Russell Creek Basin, I think the proposal is flawed for the reasons stated in the letter submitted by Mr. Craig Shelby and intentionally disregards the nature of the area for the proposed use for a reason that isn't sound at best and deceptive at the worst.   | Sat, Jan 17, 2015 8:26 PM  |
| 11. I am among a few individuals who have lived in Eugene over 65 years. Some things you can get gut hunches on being in an environment for a long time. If estimates of additional 35,000 residents in 20 years are realized, infill and a few acres at bloomberg/gimple hill will only be realistic with a lot of high rises. Do you have places these will be approved or wanted by landowners or neighbors when the need arises?  | Sat, Jan 17, 2015 1:57 PM  |
| 12. Developers and construction contractors should be required to pay the full cost of all utility and other city service upgrades and expansions as well as the entire cost of new road infrastructure to handle the increased traffic their developments will cause.  | Sat, Jan 17, 2015 1:12 PM  |
| 13. I don't think that expansion is necessary for homes at this time. There are opportunities for redevelopment of unused land and properties in other areas of the city's current UGB.   | Sat, Jan 17, 2015 10:02 AM |
| 14. I don't think restrictions that would be placed on our property make any sense since nothing would probably happen for the next 20 to 30 years or more.   | Sat, Jan 17, 2015 9:16 AM  |
| 15. There is no need. The single family / multi family housing ratio recommended (55%-45%) is obsolete and trending heavily in the opposite direction. There are large undeveloped swaths within the current UGB which remain unannexed after 30 years. Change the ratio to a more realistic one and make use of what we already have.  | Fri, Jan 16, 2015 11:48 PM |
| 16. until the city can demonstrate that there are enough resources to pay for infrastructure, enough police, enough money for present schools, enough services for the community it seems questionable why the city believes bigger is better when it can't even manage the present boundaries.   | Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:26 PM |
| 17. I realize the reasons for not including the property in the South Hills off Crest Drive. But in future expansions I strongly believe that expanding in this area is needed to protect the valuable farm lands on the north side of our community. Even though it is more expensive to build in the hills I believe this is where we need to add housing as our community grows. Farm land is not replaceable when it is covered with housing.   | Fri, Jan 16, 2015 5:49 PM  |
| 18. I also believe that the current percentages used by Envision Eugene to determine the UGB may be somewhat outdated and could be readjusted to more accurately show that the current UGB contains sufficient lands to meet state standards. I ask the council not be swayed by the opinions of some whose livelihoods may depend on the acquisition of vacant land on which to build large, single family houses. I feel the need for such houses may be greatly exaggerated. The residents of McMorrot Lane, specifically, have put greater value on the land around them as opposed to the square footage of our homes and our lifestyles reflect this. Although we | Fri, Jan 16, 2015 5:44 PM  |



are not blind to the fact that the land around us may be developed some day, it is our desire to maintain our neighborhood the way it is now - rural, with plenty of space around and between us. Inclusion in the UGB represents a threat to our current way of life.

- 
19. In addition to the obvious advantages of growing towards Junction City, the large area near the old Hyndai plant should have been considered because of the practicality and owner interest in a planned development that would serve a variety of household income levels and could be much more resource efficient. It would lower the demand for the much more problematic location of Veneta for single-family homes. Fri, Jan 16, 2015 3:57 PM
- 
20. Again, use infill, vertical growth, and multiple unit housing to meet these goals. And... any new housing plan MUST include affordable housing, no matter where it is. Another thing to consider: does the plan include infrastructure development? Housing needs roads, public transportation, etc. Fri, Jan 16, 2015 3:25 PM
- 
21. I feel that there are many opportunities to increase density for smaller homes as opposed to the large site needs of commercial and industrial properties. Fri, Jan 16, 2015 2:05 PM
- 
22. I appreciate the efforts of the city staff to make balanced evaluations of all the different areas that are under consideration. Thank you. Fri, Jan 16, 2015 12:55 PM
- 
23. The downward trend in single family detached dwellings is most likely related to the numbers of retiring baby boomers who are downsizing and the many members of the younger generation who prefer urban living (and not able to afford the costs of purchasing a single family home). Fri, Jan 16, 2015 11:31 AM
- 
24. TRAFFIC! We need plans to address and built infrastructure before we issue building permits. Fri, Jan 16, 2015 11:21 AM
- 
25. Again, given the state laws and local constraints, these two areas have been determined to be the least hazardous and "lowest" cost alternatives to accommodating future single family home needs. Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:47 AM
- 
26. See my comment on #4 Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:40 AM
- 
27. I actually think that we should have more land for homes, and not smashing them so closely together. People need some room to breathe, and do not want to live on top of each other! Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:06 AM
- 
28. It is important to have enough land for homes to keep prices reasonable throughout the UGB. If land is too scarce it causes housing prices to rise, and our community's wages are too depressed to handle high housing costs. Having homes in these far flung areas are going to encourage lots of driving, but the homes must go somewhere, so these are fine places. Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:02 AM
- 
29. NO, NO, NO.....how many US cities over the years have pushed out boundaries and let the inner city die from decay. Continue to focus on vital downtown interests and provide incentives to build single family homes within the current UGB. Thu, Jan 15, 2015 6:13 PM
- 
30. Thank you for working out these tough questions. Wed, Jan 14, 2015 12:28 PM
- 
31. The key for a sustainable future is to increase density. Adding low density housing outside the existing UGB is moving in exactly the wrong direction Wed, Jan 14, 2015 12:19 PM
- 
32. Our farmland is important to future generations Wed, Jan 14, 2015 10:51 AM
- 
33. We are underestimating the need and sending people to surrounding communities. Wed, Jan 14, 2015 10:48 AM
- 
34. Whether we agree or like it, our community will continue Mon, Jan 12, 2015 2:14 PM

to attract new residents. This means growth, either without our city limits/UGB, or in bedroom communities. If we don't want to have sprawl, and if we want to support diverse development instead of gentrification, we need to have sufficient land within the UGB. I strongly support the proposed expansion plans. The plan was the result of an exhaustive review and represents a compromise of many MANY stakeholders, I think it's as fair as any plan that can be "envisioned" and should be implemented.

35. Realistic consideration of our airshed, watershed, and traffic, with a focus on sustainability does not seem to have been considered in this expansion plan. Sun, Jan 11, 2015 5:23 PM

36. I would like a more detailed map of the Bloomberg-McVay expansion area that shows the streets that it crosses or runs along. I tried to email at the email address on the project page but the link is not working and my email won't recognize it as a valid email address. Thu, Jan 8, 2015 7:32 PM

37. Demographics and desires for housing are changing. Eugene has lots of baby boomers that will need and want smaller, less costly to buy and maintain, more convenient homes that are near transit lines and services. Many younger people are a lot more interested in smaller homes with common space for food production and urban farming. While there is pressure from the HBA to build single family homes, this is not the housing of the future. Lets think about how we can provide for the type of development more likely to be affordable and desirable. I prefer to change the ratio of single family to multi family. Thu, Jan 8, 2015 1:25 PM

38. The need for single-family home UGB expansion should be re-visited. The numbers are based on old data, from 2008, and don't include a number of housing developments that have occurred since that time. A slight modification of the ratio of single-family to multi-family housing, along the lines of what has actually been sold in recent years, would eliminate the need to expand the UGB for single-family housing. Mon, Dec 22, 2014 8:54 PM

39. There should be some zoning for apartments for students at LCC near the school. Wed, Dec 17, 2014 8:51 AM

40. The whole Envision Eugene and the so called process is a joke. Fri, Dec 12, 2014 10:03 PM

41. I don't think there's any magic choice here that everyone will agree on. That's not a reasonable expectation. What we need are realistic choices based firmly on our values that support our long-term interests. This is a wonderful place to live and everything we do should make it more so. Fri, Dec 12, 2014 4:03 PM

50 responses per page ▼

**answered question 41**

**skipped question 79**

7. OPTIONAL: Is there an expansion area that you are most interested in or concerned about?

Response	Response
Percent	Count

Yes, the Clear Lake area	15.3%	17
Yes, the Santa Clara area	4.5%	5
Yes, the Bailey Hill/Gimpl Hill area	17.1%	19
Yes, the Bloomberg Road area	<b>23.4%</b>	<b>26</b>
I have concerns about all the areas	18.9%	21
No	20.7%	23
<b>answered question</b>		<b>111</b>
<b>skipped question</b>		<b>9</b>

8. OPTIONAL: Do you live or own property in any of the expansion areas? (check all that apply)

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes, the Clear Lake area	10.5%	11
Yes, the Santa Clara area	3.8%	4
Yes, the Bailey Hill/Gimpl Hill area	12.4%	13
Yes, the Bloomberg Road area	12.4%	13
No	<b>63.8%</b>	<b>67</b>
Other (please specify) <a href="#">Show replies</a>		12
<b>answered question</b>		<b>105</b>
<b>skipped question</b>		<b>15</b>

9. OPTIONAL: In what ZIP code is your home located? (enter 5-digit ZIP code; for example, 00544 or 94305)

	Response Count
<a href="#">Hide replies</a>	103
1. 97405	Thu, Jan 22, 2015 3:18 PM
2. 97405	Thu, Jan 22, 2015 11:31 AM
3. 97401	Wed, Jan 21, 2015 4:20 PM

4.	97402	Wed, Jan 21, 2015 10:18 AM
5.	97426	Tue, Jan 20, 2015 8:45 PM
6.	97403	Tue, Jan 20, 2015 6:15 PM
7.	97477	Tue, Jan 20, 2015 4:43 PM
8.	97402	Tue, Jan 20, 2015 11:59 AM
9.	97405	Tue, Jan 20, 2015 11:02 AM
10.	97404	Tue, Jan 20, 2015 6:37 AM
11.	97405	Mon, Jan 19, 2015 10:56 PM
12.	97402	Mon, Jan 19, 2015 4:28 PM
13.	97405	Mon, Jan 19, 2015 2:24 PM
14.	97405	Mon, Jan 19, 2015 2:21 PM
15.	97402	Mon, Jan 19, 2015 1:48 PM
16.	97401	Mon, Jan 19, 2015 1:15 PM
17.	97403	Mon, Jan 19, 2015 12:50 PM
18.	97405	Mon, Jan 19, 2015 12:39 PM
19.	97402	Mon, Jan 19, 2015 12:10 PM
20.	97401	Mon, Jan 19, 2015 11:13 AM
21.	97405	Mon, Jan 19, 2015 11:01 AM
22.	97477	Mon, Jan 19, 2015 9:51 AM
23.	97402	Mon, Jan 19, 2015 7:20 AM
24.	97405	Sun, Jan 18, 2015 5:44 PM
25.	97402	Sun, Jan 18, 2015 4:23 PM
26.	97402	Sun, Jan 18, 2015 4:22 PM
27.	97401	Sun, Jan 18, 2015 3:48 PM
28.	97402	Sun, Jan 18, 2015 1:47 PM
29.	95070	Sun, Jan 18, 2015 12:45 PM
30.	97402	Sun, Jan 18, 2015 11:20 AM
31.	97405	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 8:57 PM
32.	97405	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 8:26 PM
33.	97408	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 1:57 PM
34.	97405	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 1:23 PM
35.	97405	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 1:12 PM
36.	97401	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 10:11 AM
37.	97405	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 10:04 AM
38.	97402	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 9:16 AM
39.	97404	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 7:55 AM
40.	97401	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 6:55 AM
41.	97405	Sat, Jan 17, 2015 6:20 AM
42.	97402	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 11:48 PM
43.	97405	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:26 PM
44.	97405	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:05 PM
45.	97405	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 7:56 PM
46.	97405	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 5:49 PM
47.	97402	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 5:44 PM

48.	97405	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 4:57 PM
49.	97405	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 4:42 PM
50.	97404	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 4:40 PM
51.	97402	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 3:57 PM
52.	97401	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 3:25 PM
53.	97438	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 2:44 PM
54.	97402	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 2:13 PM
55.	97402	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 2:10 PM
56.	97401	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 2:05 PM
57.	97405	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 12:55 PM
58.	97405	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 12:18 PM
59.	97477	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 12:09 PM
60.	97402	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 11:31 AM
61.	97404	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 11:21 AM
62.	97404	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 11:00 AM
63.	97408	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:54 AM
64.	97408	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:47 AM
65.	97401	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:40 AM
66.	97402	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:33 AM
67.	97405	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:24 AM
68.	97405	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:17 AM
69.	97405	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:06 AM
70.	97405	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:04 AM
71.	97405	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:02 AM
72.	97404	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 10:02 AM
73.	97405	Fri, Jan 16, 2015 9:57 AM
74.	95070	Thu, Jan 15, 2015 6:50 PM
75.	97405	Thu, Jan 15, 2015 6:13 PM
76.	97402	Wed, Jan 14, 2015 12:28 PM
77.	97405	Wed, Jan 14, 2015 12:19 PM
78.	97408	Wed, Jan 14, 2015 12:11 PM
79.	97405	Wed, Jan 14, 2015 10:58 AM
80.	97405	Wed, Jan 14, 2015 10:55 AM
81.	97402	Wed, Jan 14, 2015 10:54 AM
82.	97403	Wed, Jan 14, 2015 10:51 AM
83.	97404	Wed, Jan 14, 2015 10:48 AM
84.	97401	Wed, Jan 14, 2015 10:47 AM
85.	97401	Wed, Jan 14, 2015 10:46 AM
86.	97405	Wed, Jan 14, 2015 10:45 AM
87.	97401	Mon, Jan 12, 2015 2:14 PM
88.	97404	Mon, Jan 12, 2015 1:12 PM
89.	97405	Mon, Jan 12, 2015 10:21 AM
90.	97405	Sun, Jan 11, 2015 5:23 PM
91.	97402	Sun, Jan 11, 2015 3:29 PM

91. 97402	Sun, Jan 11, 2015 9:29 AM
92. 97405	Thu, Jan 8, 2015 7:32 PM
93. 97405	Thu, Jan 8, 2015 1:25 PM
94. 97408	Thu, Jan 8, 2015 11:49 AM
95. 97403	Mon, Dec 29, 2014 4:11 PM
96. 97403	Mon, Dec 29, 2014 4:11 PM
97. 97401	Mon, Dec 22, 2014 8:54 PM
98. 97401	Wed, Dec 17, 2014 8:51 AM
99. 97402	Fri, Dec 12, 2014 10:03 PM
100. 97405	Fri, Dec 12, 2014 8:00 PM
101. 97402	Fri, Dec 12, 2014 5:49 PM
102. 97405	Fri, Dec 12, 2014 1:28 PM
103. 97402	Fri, Dec 12, 2014 11:12 AM

250 responses per page ▼

**answered question 103**  
**skipped question 17**

10. If you would like to be added to the Envision Eugene interested parties email list, please provide an email address below.

Response  
Count

[Show replies](#) 30

**answered question 30**  
**skipped question 90**