

THE ZONING ORDINANCE MAP AMENDMENT CONFORMS TO THE JUNCTION CITY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND IS CONSISTENT WITH OTHER PROVISIONS OF THE JUNCTION CITY ZONING ORDINANCE.

This application seeks an amendment to the city's Zoning Ordinance Map to rezone the subject property from Agriculture (AG) to Light Industrial (M1). The city's Zoning Ordinance (Ordinance No. 950) describes the procedures for a zone change. Section 106 of the Zoning Ordinance provides that an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance Map may be initiated by a property owner or by the authorized agent of a property owner. This amendment application is initiated by Country Coach as agent for and with the consent of the property owner. Section 111(4)(g) of the Zoning Ordinance provides that a zone change is a Type IV application that is subject to Type IV review procedures.

ORS 227.175(4) requires that a zone change conform to the city's Comprehensive Plan. After the city amends its Comprehensive Plan to expand the Urban Growth Boundary to include the subject property within the boundary and amends its Comprehensive Plan Map to designate that property for industrial uses, rezoning the property from Agriculture (AG) to Light Industrial (M1) will make the zoning conform to the amended Comprehensive Plan Map.

The Zoning Ordinance requires that any development in the Light Industrial (M1) zone conform to the requirements of that zone. Therefore, future development of the subject property will necessarily be consistent with the Zoning Ordinance. The compatibility analysis contained in Section 4.2.4 of the Application demonstrates that the Light Industrial zoning of the subject property and uses thereon will be compatible with the zoning and uses of adjacent property. Therefore, the zone change is consistent with other provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.

FINDINGS ADOPTED IN RESPONSE TO 1000 FRIENDS OF OREGON / LANDWATCH LANE COUNTY'S COMMENT LETTER DATED AUGUST 23, 2005.

1000 Friends of Oregon (Friends) and LandWatch Lane County (LWLC) submitted written testimony regarding the proposed amendments.

Need-Based Expansion

In this letter, they assert that the proposed expansion site is desired by Country Coach because of its convenience and states that "convenience" is not an applicable criterion for expansion onto high value farmland and should not be considered as a basis upon which to adopt the proposed UGB expansion proposal. The council agrees that "convenience" is not an applicable criterion and the council's decision to approve the proposed UGB expansion and zone change is not based on convenience to Country Coach. Instead, the council's decision is based on a consideration of all of the criteria and policies addressed above and the council's findings regarding the applicant's satisfaction of all of those applicable criteria. As is explained above, among many other reasons, allowing the company to expand onto the adjacent site reduces impacts on the local transportation system, reduces air pollution, reduces vehicle miles traveled, conserves resources and is economically efficient. Appendix E to the application and the Statement of Jay Howard attached as Appendix R to the application set out some of the reasons why allowing the company to expand onto adjacent property is necessary. We find that the factual statements and projections contained in Appendix E and Appendix R are credible and adopt those statements and projections as part of our findings in support of approval.

Moreover, the applicant provided a through analysis of other potential lands within and adjacent to the city's Urban Growth Boundary and demonstrated that there is no suitable alternative site, which we find to be true. Even if all of the positive benefits of allowing the company to expand onto the adjacent site (as opposed to a remote site) are disregarded, for the reasons stated above, the Oaklea site is not suitable, the industrial corridor area between the rail lines and south of the city limits is unsuitable, and other potential areas abutting the current Urban Growth Boundary, even if suitable, would also impact high-value farmland.

Why Current Land Is Not Sufficient for Country Coach's Growth

Friends and LWLC assert that until full build-out of the 17.5 acres previously added to the Urban Growth Boundary in 1999 has been implemented, any further UGB expansion onto high value EFU land is unwarranted. We find that Country Coach has adequately explained the reasons it has not yet built new manufacturing facilities on the 17.5 acres. We also find that Country Coach has also adequately explained why expansion onto undeveloped property located south of its existing campus, which property is owned by a third party, is not reasonably possible.

We find based on the testimony of Jay Howard (the President of Country Coach) that the area within the Urban Growth Boundary which is owned by a third-party and located south of the campus is not available to Country Coach because the owner is not willing to lease the property to Country Coach on any reasonably acceptable terms. We find that such land is not available for expansion.

We also find based on the testimony of Mr. Howard that motor home manufacturing is subject to economic cycles that can affect short term product demand. In his statement attached as Exhibit R to the application, Mr. Howard states that in 1998, the company was producing 550 coaches per year, which is a 500% increase from the number of coaches produced just nine years earlier in 1989. That 500% increase in production is one reason justifying the company's request to expand the Urban Growth Boundary to add the 17.5-acre expansion site in 1999.

The evidence also shows, however, that by 2002, the company's production had fallen from the 1998 level of 550 units to only 416 units. (See Page 1 of Appendix E to the application.) The council finds that the short-term drop in the demand for the company's products from 1998 to 2002 adequately explains and justifies why the company has not yet expanded onto the 17.5-acre site.

However, the evidence also shows, and we find, that from 2002 to 2004, the company's production and employment levels nearly doubled. The evidence also shows, and we find, that despite some up and down cycles, the company has over the longer term shown significant growth. Exhibit D to the application describes the company's growth and we specifically incorporate that description as part of our findings.

Given the near doubling of the company's employment and production from 2002 to 2004, its objectively reasonable near term growth projections based on past growth results, and its long term history of growth, we find that the company has adequately established its need for the entire 74-acre expansion site. We further find that is objectively unreasonable to expect the company to make a sizeable investment into a new manufacturing facility unless it is assured that its reasonably anticipated future expansion needs will also be met on the expansion site.

UGB/city limits anomaly

Friends and LWLC note that the Lane Metro Partnership, in a letter dated May 13, 2005, states that approval of the application will "eliminate one of the rare anomalies in Oregon land use law where land within a city limits is outside that city's urban growth boundaries." The council finds that elimination of that anomaly is not an applicable approval criterion. The council's decision to approve the application is not based or motivated in any respect on attempting to cure that anomaly (assuming that such is even an anomaly at all).

Conversion of Agriculture Land

Friends and LWLC argue that approval is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan policies that state that it is the policy of the city to prohibit the premature conversion of lands designated for agricultural use, unless such proposals conform to statewide planning goals, especially Goals #2, #3, and #4. However, that policy is satisfied in this case because for the reasons stated above, the proposal is consistent with all applicable statewide planning goals, including in particular the specific goals cited in the policy. In addition, a condition of approval allows continued agricultural use in the industrial zone until such time as conversion to industrial use is accomplished.

Buffer Policy

Friends and LWLC cite a statement in Appendix II to the Comprehensive Plan that refers to the following policy in Section VI of the Environmental Element of the plan.

It is a policy of the city to preserve agricultural land uses on lands adjacent to the city's Urban Growth Boundary by requiring buffer zones be provided on lands within the urban growth boundary and between adjoining agricultural land uses within the county.

Conditions of approval ensure compliance with this policy. Agricultural lands abut the easterly and southerly boundaries of the expansion site. The approval conditions require an 80-foot building setback along the entire easterly boundary of the property, providing a substantial buffer between the industrial use and the agricultural lands to the east. Furthermore, the approval conditions require that the wetland swale at the southerly end of the property be preserved and enhanced to serve as a buffer to the agricultural land to the south. In addition, at the time of development on the subject property, the property owner shall be responsible for planting a line of fast growing trees along the southerly 200 feet of the easterly boundary of the expansion property.

Adjoining Lands Policy

Friends and LWLC claim that the applicant mischaracterizes the intent of the Industrial Land Uses policy found in Chapter 3, Land Use Element, which provides that "It is a policy of this plan to encourage existing industry to expand onto adjoining lands." Friends and LWLC state that "the proposed expansion is onto adjoining land, but it is County resource land, not land within the city." The sentence preceding this policy, "Two light industrial firms have expanded to the point that they must either expand their existing plant sites or relocate outside the community." provides the context of this policy. It is clearly the city's intent to allow for expansion of existing industries rather than force them to relocate to another community by limiting their expansion options. There is nothing in this policy to restrict expansion of businesses onto adjacent lands outside the UGB if the required analysis of compliance with statewide planning goals and other plan policies is met. Furthermore, the entire expansion area is already entirely within the jurisdictional limits of the city.

Need for Expansion Area

With respect to the analysis required under OAR 660-004-0010(1)(c)(B)(ii), Friends and LWLC claims that the applicant has not accounted for the availability of underutilized portions of Tax Lots 202, 102, and 200 which Friends claims are inside the existing Urban Growth Boundary and could accommodate 300,000 square feet of new facility. For the reasons stated above, the applicant has accounted for and addressed those lands. With respect to Tax Lot 102, which includes the 17.5 acre expansion area added to the Urban Growth Boundary in 1999, we reiterate our findings set out in the third through eight paragraph of this section. Similarly, with respect to Tax Lots 200 and 202, as was explained by Mr. Howard, Country Coach does not own those lands and Country Coach has not been able to lease them for the needed expansion.

ESEE Analysis

With respect to the analysis required under OAR 660-004-0010(1)(c)(B)(iii), Friends and LWLC claim that while the applicant notes the existence of significant wetlands on the subject parcel, Country Coach Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Rezoning (CPA-05-1 and RZ-05-2)

substantive information about location, impacts, and mitigation have not been addressed. Friends and LWLC also claim that the applicant did not address the social and environmental impacts of converting high-value soils to industrial use.

The Friends' claims have no merit. The applicant provided a draft wetlands study that shows the location of the wetlands, which are principally farmed wetlands utilizing fertilizers and pesticides. The evidence and findings demonstrate that development on any of the wetlands on the site will require a Division of State Lands' and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' fill permit and mitigation. Furthermore, all significant wetlands and mitigation sites on the property will be protected by the city's overlay ordinance that protects wetlands.

With respect to the social and environmental impacts of converting high-value soils to industrial use, Friends and LWLC misstate the criteria found in OAR 660-004-0010(1)(c)(B)(iii). Specifically, that rule provides:

The long-term environmental, economic, social and energy consequences resulting from the use of the proposed site with measures designed to reduce adverse impacts are not significantly more adverse than would typically result from the same proposal being located in areas requiring a goal exception other than the proposed site.

In other words, the required ESE analysis must compare the subject site (with mitigation) to alternative sites. The evidence provided by the applicant and the above findings addressing the statewide goals explain why all of the possible alternative sites are unsuitable for the expansion. The findings also demonstrate that expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary at other locations will similarly impact high-value farmland. Our findings regarding the statutory land priorities established under ORS 197.298 also show that. We find that the applicant's evidence set out and referenced in Section 7.0 of its application that addresses the land priorities established under ORS 187.298 is credible and we incorporate that section and its analysis as our findings and analysis regarding the statutory criteria.

Goal 14 Compliance

Finally, Friends and LWLC claim that the applicant has not satisfied the Goal 14 urbanization criteria. With regards to Conversion Factor 1, the findings acknowledge that the UGB expansion does not come about because of a general need for more industrial land to meet population and employment projections. Rather, the need for expansion comes from the more specific analysis of the site suitability of any of the vacant industrially designated land inside the UGB for Country Coach's expansion needs. The conclusion is that none of the other sites meet the siting requirements and serviceability of Country Coach.

The findings for Conversion Factor 2 are not based on HB 2011 but rather on the need of Junction City to maintain its employment base and allow for local expansions creating needed jobs. HB 2011 does provide the broad economic environment in which the city and Country Coach are operating and in that way, contributes to the ESE analysis. Country Coach has shown a need for contiguous land for its expansion. The company is the city's largest employer and one of Lane County's largest employers with over 1600 active full time employees. The

company's payroll for 2004 exceeded \$43,000,000. The company's combined withholding taxes, unemployment taxes, Lane Transit District taxes, Oregon income tax and local property taxes totaled approximately \$4,547,000. Furthermore, the company's capital investment in the new proposed manufacturing facility will exceed \$15 million just for the first phase. Part of the multiplier effect is manifested in the company's purchases from local vendors, which expenditures during 2004 exceeded \$10 million from Junction City businesses and \$40 million from Eugene area businesses.

In terms of addressing the need for the 74 acres, Country Coach has shown that they need the assurance of expansion opportunities over time to warrant an investment in current improvements. Country Coach's large-scale drawing of proposed development indicates a general concept plan for the site. Given the buffers required, (80 feet on west, wetlands and wetland mitigation sites on the south, and manufacturing restrictive buffer on the northern 80 feet), there is already a reduction in buildable area. Add to that the land needed for adequate on-site parking, and large building sites to meet the manufacturing expansion plans envisaged by Country Coach, it is shown here and in findings listed above that 74 acres are needed to provide an efficient layout for the flow of manufacturing of the large-scale coaches.

In conclusion, the evidence and our findings set out above based on that evidence demonstrate that all of the applicable criteria have been addressed and satisfied.

JOINT LANE COUNTY AND JUNCTION CITY PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION & PUBLIC HEARING

A joint work session of the Junction City and Lane County Planning Commissions was held at 5:30 p.m. on **Tuesday, May 3, 2005** in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 680 Greenwood Street, Junction City, Oregon.

PRESENT WERE:

Junction City Planning Commission: Chairman Bob Nelson; Commissioners Tim Nord, Brad Lemhouse, Donna Bernardy, and Jack Sumner. Absent: Commissioners Lance Stoddard, Brandon Nicol, Sandra Dunn, and Jodi Jennings.

Lane County Planning Commission: Chairman Steve Dignam; Commissioners Jim Carmichael, Ed Becker, Lisa Arkin, Jozef Siekiel-Zdzienicki, and Juanita Kirkham. Absent: Commissioner Marion Esty.

Staff: Junction City Planner Sandra Belson and Lane County Planner Stephanie Schulz.

I. I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Bob Nelson called the joint work session to order at 5:40 p.m. and reviewed the agenda items.

II. II. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA

There were no comments.

III. III. WORK SESSION – LANE COUNTY PA 05-5132 AND JUNCTION CITY CPA-05-1 AND RZ-05-2 – IN THE MATTER OF AMENDING THE LANE COUNTY RURAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND THE JUNCTION CITY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO EXPAND THE CITY'S URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY TO INCLUDE 74.26 ACRES OF CITY LAND TO FACILITATE EXPANSION OF COUNTRY COACH, INC.

THE JUNCTION CITY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT WILL INCLUDE REDESIGNATING THE LAND TO INDUSTRIAL AND REZONING THE AFFECTED PROPERTY FROM AG (AGRICULTURE) TO M1 (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL)

Junction City Planner Sandra Belson presented a brief overview of the application and the intent of the work session and public hearing. She stated that there had been one request to have the record held open; therefore, no deliberations would be held at tonight's meeting.

Lane County Planner Stephanie Schulz stated that the Junction City Planning Commission would take the deliberation and approval process through to the City Council, prior to bringing back to the Lane County Planning Commission for deliberation. Planner Belson added that the deliberation and approval process for the City would probably take three to four months.

In response to a question on procedures, Planner Schulz stated that normally the Lane County Planning Commission does not participate in the public hearings, until after a city has made the decision at the elected officials level. She continued that then a complete decision would be presented to the Lane County Board and Lane County Planning Commission for co-adoption. She added that the Planning Commission would not be required to hold another public hearing at the County level.

Chairman Nelson commented that transportation issues were some of the pivotal points in the application.

Planner Belson presented the staff report on the application. An Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) expansion of 17 acres was approved for Country Coach adjacent to this site in 1999. In making decisions, both commissions will be looking at statewide planning goals and making sure the application meets their Comprehensive Plan policies. In addition to amending the Comprehensive Plan to redesignate to light industrial, Junction City will be reviewing rezoning from agriculture to light industrial. She reviewed the repetition between statewide planning goals 2 and 14. She added that because this expansion is more than 50 acres, once it is approved by the separate elected officials, any appeal would go through a periodic review process, and LCDC (Land Conversation and Development Commission) would have the final authority on this, instead of going before LUBA (Land Use Board of Appeals) for any appeals.

Planner Schulz concurred with Planner Belson's review of the applicable standards. She added that the Lane County Planning Commission's role was to review the Urban Growth Boundary issue, and they would not be addressing the rezoning.

In response to a question from Commissioner Kirkham on why the City did not bring the UGB expansion before the Commission a few years ago in conjunction with another expansion, Planner Belson stated that the applicant had initiated the UGB request.

Mr. Paul Vaughn, attorney for the applicant, stated that a key issue in expanding the UGB is demonstrating a need for that land and to examine whether there are lower quality soils that could be expanded on to preserve the higher quality soils. He reviewed this issue and pointed out that the Junction City Comprehensive Plan outlines that Junction City and the surrounding area has predominantly been built on high value farmland. He cited Comprehensive Plan language that

reads, "Land of lower priority (higher value farm land) may be included in an UGB, if land of higher priority is found to be inadequate to accommodate the amount of land that is estimated to be needed for one or more of the following reasons". Mr. Vaughn stated that the key to the whole application is having the land that would allow this company to expand to an adjacent site, and that it was not good planning to have large components of motor homes transported to another location in or outside of the UGB. He added that because of the overarching need to have adjacent land, the basic argument and finding is that even if you could point to another 75 acre site abutting the UGB that had lower value land, it still would be inadequate because it doesn't meet the adjacency requirement for this particular application.

Mr. Vaughn stated that the rules also state that before expanding outside the UGB, it must be determined if there are any properties within the UGB that could be used. He gave an overview of the existing industrial site locations within the City and why those sites would not be appropriate. He stated that the 70-acre Oaklea Professional Technical property cannot be used because the zoning does not allow motor home manufacturing, there would be traffic and other issues with transporting large component parts from the current site to that location, and the adjacent land area is residential. He added that the industrial triangle south of town would have access issues, as related to railroad crossings and is still a tentative site for the prison in 2010.

Mr. Jay Howard, President of Country Coach, pointed out where the owned, leased, and proposed expansion properties of Country Coach are located and reviewed the history and operations of the company. In response to various questions, Mr. Howard stated that acquisition of the expansion property, which is owned by Reerslev Farms, is under contract and subject to approval. The 17 acres that was annexed in 1999 is currently being used by Reerslev Farms, but plans are underway for a \$9 million development, which includes a 556 space parking lot. The long-term projection for the 74 acres is to build another 140,000 square feet building, which would house a new product that they are currently developing. As the market demand requires, these buildings would be converted from motor home finished goods manufacturing to supplier areas (cabinet shops, lamination, etc.) Country Coach is an integrated manufacturer (making components), and they would like to expand to make furniture and other components in the future.

Mr. Howard added that negotiations were conducted to purchase 10 acres of the property that Lee Joint Ventures still owns, but an agreement could not be reached. He continued that Country Coach is finishing up the last of the existing 10-year lease on that property, and they have an option, which they intend to renew for 5 more years. He added that at that point in time, they would have the option to purchase it.

Mr. Vaughn stated that one of the issues that was raised is that the plan does require some buffering between the adjacent agricultural uses. He continued that Mr. John Reerslev had submitted a letter that noted it is easier to farm next to a motor home manufacturing operation than next to another farm or residential area. Mr. Vaughn added that the wetlands report that is in the application was preliminary, with no concurrence on the wetlands delineation. There will be drainage swales and storm water detention ponds and that will help buffer some of the farm ground.

Mr. Vaughn added a final point that the policy in the Junction City Comprehensive Plan encourages existing industry to expand onto adjoining lands, and their proposal implements that policy directly. He stated that as economic development is a high priority in the state and Country Coach is a good citizen and good employer, it is important to keep the company within the community.

In response to a question on the City rezoning land that had been industrial to commercial and residential, Chairman Nelson stated that Junction City was developed because of the theoretical joining of two railroads, and industrial land was designated in specific areas. He outlined the various factors that resulted in eliminating industrial ground that was in between residential and commercial zones.

Mr. Vaughn added that he had addressed the Oaklea ordinance in detail on page 23 of the application, which included the history and what was deemed to be the needed residential and other land supply needs.

Commissioner Jim Carmichael mentioned that the City of Coburg had experienced emissions complaints from a local RV manufacturer and asked if Junction City residents had expressed similar concerns, as related to the planned expansion.

Mr. Howard responded that they had not received any complaints and added that part of the emissions complaints in Coburg were generated as residential areas were allowed to be within 20 feet of the manufacturer's paint booth. He continued that one of the reasons for the request of 74 acres was that they wanted enough land and buffer areas to make sure that the quality of life for residents is not negatively impacted

Planner Schulz noted for the record that she had received a phone call from someone that had inquired about the public hearing and stated that she had an issue with paint fumes from Country Coach.

In response to a question on gas price impacts, Mr. Howard stated that Country Coach makes luxury motor coaches, which range from \$250,000 to \$1.5 million. He continued that 98% of owners do not have to finance their coaches and travel

less than 5000 miles per year; consequently, fuel costs are not a particularly relevant factor. He added that their business would be severely impacted, however, in the event that diesel fuel was in short supply, as experienced in the 1970's.

Mr. Vaughn added that he appreciated the question about the paint fumes, because that is another very good reason why the Oaklea site is not a good location. He added that the proposed expansion site is already in the industrial area, and LRAPA (Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority) has specific rules, procedures, and monitoring equipment for the emissions standards.

Chairman Nelson stated that in the early 1980's Hewlett-Packard had planned on occupying the 70-acre Professional Technical (PT) area on the Oaklea Property. He added that one of the reasons that the ground was changed to R1 and R2 was because of the strict requirements on what could be built in the PT, and the possible problems of noise, fumes, etc. of having that type of use next to residential areas.

In response to questions from Chairman Digman, Mr. Vaughn stated that Reerslev Farms owns 2200 acres adjacent to the proposed property, and that he wasn't aware of any other farmers that have concerns about a manufacturing area being adjacent to their property.

Chairman Nelson responded that the only other farmer in that area was Mr. Don Fischer.

Mr. Jerry Szerlip stated that he owns a piece of property on the corner of Strome Lane and River Road and that he did have concerns. It was noted that Mr. Szerlip would have a chance to comment at the public hearing.

Commissioner Arkin commented on Mr. Howard's positive proposal that part of the 74 acres would be used as a buffer between the manufacturing process and the residential areas. She asked about the future plans for expansion and production.

Mr. Howard responded that he did not believe that the infrastructure exists on this entire piece of ground to have more than 5000 employees. He continued that the realistic expectation at this point, assuming that everything is approved and developed, including purchasing from Lee Joint Ventures, would be approximately 4000 employees. He added that as far as product, Country Coach produced 560 coaches in 2003 and has made 1000 coaches this year. He stated that he could see that number tripling, which would still be a smaller production amount than Monaco.

Commissioner Arkin stated that she had asked about expansion and product, as Country Coach is one of the top twenty air emission emitters in the County and

currently produces half of what Monaco puts out. She asked if Country Coach had considered putting in emissions standards that are more stringent than what the federal and state laws require to address the possible emissions issues and concerns to the residential neighborhoods.

Mr. Howard responded that this is an ongoing effort for every manufacturing company, because of the nature of trying to be a good neighbor and the limits on permit sizes and mitigating existing scenarios. He stated that they are currently investigating polymers that replace fiberglass, as their largest emission is styrene.

Commissioner Arkin responded that the neighbors would benefit from receiving assurances and knowing about emissions issues up front.

Mr. Jim Hanks, transportation engineer for the applicant, stated that in developing the traffic impact report, he had met with ODOT, Lane County, and Junction City. Nine signalized intersections were examined from 18th and Highway 99 to the Belt Line interchange at Highway 99. They also examined River Road down to Beacon Drive and the driveways of Thistledown and Lone Pine Farms. The objective was to meet the standards of the Transportation Planning goal, which states that through the planning horizon, which in this case is 2020, that additional traffic can not be added to any intersection that was failing or was projected to fail. Mobility standards apply here, and for the county and city that is level of service and for the state that is volume to capacity ratio. Based on full development of the site and other factors in 20 years, it is projected that four locations would fail – 6th and Highway 99, 1st and Highway 99, Clear Lake Road and Highway 99, and Beacon Road and River Road. To deal with this issue, the applicant has proposed transportation demand management, which would involve not releasing shifts between 4:30 p.m. and 6:30 p.m.

Chairman Nelson asked for comments on extending a public right of way through the south end of the property and developing another road that could access Highway 99 across the railroad tracks further south.

Mr. Hanks responded that ODOT rail would not allow a new railroad crossing on mainline crossings, unless there is an equivalent reduction of the number of crossings.

Mr. Tom Boyatt, Regional Planner for ODOT, stated that it really isn't ODOT rail that is implementing the concessions made to the rail industry, but it is the railroad that has to approve the new crossing, and they are against any new crossing, unless they are grade separated or they trade one crossing for another.

In response to questions on trip generation and growth, Mr. Hanks stated that the Junction City's planned growth factors of a general rate of 2% a year was factored into the analysis.

Commissioner Arkin asked about considerations and commitment to use shuttle services to decrease the car traffic, amount of parking needed, and air emissions from each vehicle.

Mr. Hanks responded that some employees were currently using LTD services, and strong incentives exist for this arena, in light of keeping the transportation demand management optimal.

Chairman Nelson noted that Country Coach made a commitment of about \$250,000 within the last year and a half to significantly improve the intersection at 1st and Highway 99.

In response to questions from Commissioner Becker, Mr. Hanks stated that 16% of the 1500 employees resided in Junction City and most of the other employees commuted from Eugene.

Mr. Jason Lien, Lane County Transportation, stated that they looked at the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) of the UGB expansion and zone change on a broad scale. They would like to see more site specific information at the time of development with an addendum to the TIA that would address additional items, such as drive way locations, circulation in and out of the site, bike and pedestrian access, and improvements (bike lanes, sidewalks, curb and gutter) to River Road or 1st Avenue. The expectation is that the applicant would be responsible for providing those improvements on their frontage on River Road. Mr. Lien continued that as Mr. Hanks had stated, mitigation included moving development trips to the off peak hours to ensure that the study intersections continue to meet the mobility standards of Lane County and ODOT.

In response to a question about an 80-foot setback from Commissioner Siekiel-Zdzienicki, Mr. Lien stated that the right of way would be 40 feet from the platted centerline.

In response to traffic mitigation and complaints on River Road, Mr. Lien stated that the traffic study went down River Road to Beacon Drive and looked at overall impacts to River Road and trip distribution. Congestion and capacity issues focus more on intersections and the mitigation focus is primarily at 1st Avenue and Highway 99.

Mr. Bill Morgan, Lane County Transportation, added that they examined the traffic complaints, which could be characterized as social driving issues. He stated that the applicant has indicated that they will analyze these issues and such things as pedestrian crossings at the site review process. He added that 70% of the employees from Country Coach that live in Eugene use Highway 99 and 30% use River Road.

Mr. Tom Boyatt, Regional Planner for ODOT, stated that the Junction City Transportation System Plan does not address Highway 99 or analyze this specific parcel as being developed for urban use, because it is outside of the UGB; thus, facilitating the need to look at the conversion of 75 rural acres to urban use. He reviewed mitigation strategies, the applicant's proposal for demand management, and zoning and trip generation issues.

He stated that there are a few questions that still need to be answered, which include the number of shifts in a 24 hours period, are those shifts going to overlap, and what will the percent of office use be on site. He added that these things influence trip generation, which is counted when determining the impact at intersections.

Mr. Boyatt continued that the proposed condition would apply to the 75 acres and carried in the County and City's legislative record. He added that ODOT and the City would more than likely enter into an IGA (Intergovernmental Agreement) that would memorialize the demand management strategy, primarily so there is a record in ODOT's institutional memory.

Mr. Boyatt suggested traffic circulation planning that would include a future right of way along one side of the property to be used as a driveway or a future road that connects to the south (Prairie Road or Highway 99) to address future growth needs. He added that now is the time to look at shadow platting or setting back buildings and other structures, including wetland for future road placement. Mr. Boyatt suggested that the City update the Transportation System Plan to include Highway 99, prioritize improvement projects, identify funding sources to leverage the projects, and update the Transportation System Development Charge methodology. He added that leveraging costs for public projects funded by the County or State with local dollars is going to be how the most successful projects get built in the next 20 years.

III. III. ADJOURNMENT

The work session was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kitty Vodrup, City Recorder

Robert Nelson, Chairman

A joint public hearing of the Junction City and Lane County Planning Commissions was held at 7:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 3, 2005 in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 680 Greenwood Street, Junction City, Oregon.

PRESENT WERE:

Junction City Planning Commission: Chairman Bob Nelson; Commissioners Tim Nord, Brad Lemhouse, Donna Bernardy, and Jack Sumner. Absent: Commissioners Lance Stoddard, Brandon Nicol, Sandra Dunn, and Jodi Jennings.

Lane County Planning Commission: Chairman Steve Dignam; Commissioners Jim Carmichael, Ed Becker, Lisa Arkin, Jozef Siekiel-Zdzienicki, and Juanita Kirkham. Absent: Commissioner Marion Esty.

Staff: Junction City Planner Sandra Belson and Lane County Planner Stephanie Schulz.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Bob Nelson called the meeting to order and opened the public hearing at 7:33 p.m. He reviewed the process for the public hearing. Chairman Steve Dignam called the meeting to order for the Lane County Planning Commission, as well.

II. PUBLIC HEARING – LANE COUNTY PA 05-5132 AND JUNCTION CITY CPA-05-1 AND RZ-05-2 – IN THE MATTER OF AMENDING THE LANE COUNTY RURAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND THE JUNCTION CITY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO EXPAND THE CITY'S URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY TO INCLUDE 74.26 ACRES OF CITY LAND TO FACILITATE EXPANSION OF COUNTRY COACH, INC.

THE JUNCTION CITY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT WILL INCLUDE REDESIGNATING THE LAND TO INDUSTRIAL AND REZONING THE AFFECTED PROPERTY FROM AG (AGRICULTURE) TO M1 (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL)

Chairman Nelson asked if there were any exparte contacts or conflicts of interest for the Junction City Planning Commissioners. Commissioner Tim Nord declared an exparte contact, as he and Mr. Jay Howard had briefly mentioned the hearing at a soccer match, but had not discussed any issues.

Chairman Dignam asked if there were any exparte contacts or conflicts of interest for the Lane County Planning Commissioners. There were none.

Chairman Nelson asked if any of the Commissioners felt that they could not render a decision or should abstain from discussion for any reason. There were none.

Staff Reports

Junction City Planner Sandra Belson presented the staff report, which included that the proposal was to amend the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan and the Junction City Comprehensive Plan to expand the City's Urban Growth Boundary to include 74.26 acres of City land to facilitate expansion of Country Coach, Inc. The request also included an amendment to the Junction City Comprehensive Plan to redesignate the land to Industrial and to rezone the affected property from AG (Agriculture) to M1 (Light Industrial). The property is located east of the Southern Pacific railway and south of West 1st Avenue and was annexed into the City in 1969. Planner Belson commented that this is an unusual situation, as the property is in the City limits, but was not included inside the City's Urban Growth Boundary.

Planner Belson reviewed the applicable criteria for the application, which included the Oregon Statewide Land Use Planning Goals and the Junction City Comprehensive Plan. She stated that Junction City has an economic development priority goal that the City provide an important share of Lane County's industry and to keep a strong industrial base. She continued that Junction City policies include providing a buffer around industrial areas and that the expansion be adjacent to existing industries. She added that in order to meet the buildable land supply as related to industrial land, there is also a policy in the plan to provide twice as much land to ensure that there is a sufficient supply.

Lane County Planner Stephanie Schulz reviewed that the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan Amendment process includes the Oregon Statewide Land Use Planning goals and Oregon Administrative Rules. She added that it must also be found that the amendment is based on a change in public need, based on the evaluation of the factors affecting the plan.

Ms. Marguerite Nabeta, of the Oregon Department of Land Conservation (DLCD) and Development, 99 E Broadway, Eugene, stated that she would not only be speaking on behalf of DLCD, but would also be adding comments as the Vice-Chair of the Willamette/Central Coastal Economic Revitalization Team. She stated that the planning staff and the applicant should be commended for their good work in collapsing redundancies within the statutes and administrative rules that guide Urban Growth Boundary expansions for the State of Oregon. She added that for this particular applicant, the most important part and key to the success of working through this process is the fact that it is very unique and this industry has demands that other manufacturing may not have. Those include having the large chassis and moving things from one point to another and why it wouldn't be expected that an industry such as this would move to another place, when it outgrows its existing property.

Ms. Nabeta continued that regarding the concerns with the larger site that the City has that makes up the bulk of inventory for industrial lands, they are closer to revealing why the Oaklea site would not be suitable. She stated that the zoning would not work there, and Mr. Vaughn had addressed the conflict with the planned land use around that area. She added that she would be reading a report over the next few days on the expense of moving the facilities to that site, in comparison to moving to the adjacent site where they are currently located. Ms. Nabeta stated that the cost of siting, locating, maintaining, and sustaining the current manufacturing in the community was a key point to examine, especially in light of Goal Number Nine – Economic Development.

On behalf of the Economic Revitalization Team, Ms. Nabeta extended the opportunity for City representatives to meet with State agencies in the next biennium to discuss and analyze appropriate development for the industrial area south of the City and to research grants and other funding mechanisms for such a purpose.

Applicant Testimony

Mr. Paul Vaughn, 180 East 11th Avenue, Eugene, Attorney for Country Coach, Inc., stated that he would like his written response to Planner Belson's staff report to be included in the record, as well as the written response to the comment letter that had been submitted by Ms. Marguerite Nabeta from DLCD and all of the maps that they had offered. He referred to the soils map and stated that all the soils that surround the UGB are high value soils, which simplifies the need to show that there are not other areas that would be more appropriate. He stated that the adjacency requirement is paramount, and that the Junction City Comprehensive Plan encourages existing businesses to expand.

Mr. Jay Howard, 135 East 1st Avenue, President of Country Coach, Inc., expressed his appreciation to the time that both Planning Commissions were giving to this issue. He stated that Country Coach, Inc. manufactures class A motor homes, with retail prices of between \$250,000 to \$1.4 million, and there are 1600 employees with an overflow facility off of Airport Road, where buses are manufactured. He continued that Mr. Bob Lee brought the company to Junction City 30 years ago. National R.V. Holdings purchased the company from Lee Joint Ventures and over the last two years the company has doubled in size, in sales, employment, and number of units produced; thus, pressing the current facilities beyond what they would like to do. Mr. Howard stated that Country Coach is an integrated manufacturer that makes many of their own components, starting with chassis, which are 40 to 45 feet long and fiberglass components, which are 42 feet long and 9 feet high. He stated that a thousand motor homes are made per year, and if they had to move off site, there would be a traffic flow of 10,000 of these large components being moved through a transit scenario. He

added that this would be a burden on the operation and would put them at a great economic disadvantage to their competitors.

Mr. Howard continued that they were proposing a phased development, which involves construction on the 17 acres that is currently owned by National R.V. Holdings and is zoned for Light Industrial. He stated that as market demands require they would expand the facility onto the proposed expansion property. He continued that they would like to stay on their current site, which includes a \$10 million development that they currently own, in addition to the multi million-dollar investment in the capital equipment at the leased Joint Venture property. He added that if they were forced to relocate and could not expand the business as needed, they would start a national search. Mr. Howard stated that as president of the company, he has a fiduciary duty to make sure that the company is in a site that would allow them to be competitive in a highly competitive market. He continued that Mr. Bob Lee ran his company as a good neighbor for many years, and they planned on continuing that practice. He stated that three decades is a long time, and they have a big investment, many employees with over 20 years seniority in the company, and they are proud of their accomplishments. He added that they look forward to a promising future in Junction City, with City and County cooperation and approval.

Mr. Jim Hanks, 4765 Village Plaza, Eugene, JRH Transportation Engineering, submitted his written response to Ms. Marguerite Nabeta's comments from the DLCDD and noted comment responses on Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and the road system. He stated that in response to the road system, they were proposing to have an 80 foot no building setback along the easterly property line, so at such time as the City of Junction City comes up with a road plan, there would be no buildings in the way of doing that. He continued that the conclusion after reviewing the traffic impact report is that there must be TDM processes, which had been reviewed closely by the City, ODOT, and Lane County. He stated that in response to Mr. Jason Lien's comments about a supplemental impact report, they believed that should be done at the time of development, as the City under section 11, Appendix H of the Junction City zoning ordinance requires specific and detailed analysis for site plan review. He added that improvements to River Road should be done at the time of site review, and language was proposed to combine all of the proposed site requirements for TDM on the proposed site and attach it to the existing site. He stated that there were a number of technical and practical reasons why they don't think that is a good idea, as a major portion of the property of the existing site, doesn't have the same ownership.

Mr. Hanks continued that there were social driving issues, but those were beyond the scope of the current application. He stated that River Road is a county arterial and former state highway and the driveways of Thistledown and Lone Pine Farms were analyzed for their level of service. He continued that the number of trips in a 24-hour period, shift overlaps, and traffic volumes were

analyzed, with the determination that shifts couldn't start or end during the peak hour. He added that it would be a good idea for the City to update the Transportation System Plan, as it is reaching the end of its life.

Public Testimony

Chairman Nelson asked for testimony of those in favor. There were none.

Chairman Nelson asked for testimony of those against.

Mr. Jerry Szerlip, 93951 Strome Lane, Junction City, stated that in 1999 Country Coach applied for an expansion and purchased 17 acres (765,000 square feet) of property. He continued that the expansion was never completed, and he wasn't sure if it had ever been started. He said that they still have 1,400,000 square feet of unused land that is already industrial that is not being utilized. He stated that Country Coach employees park all over the area with no regard to the homeowners or anyone else. He cited dangerous employee driving practices on River Road, and the high traffic volumes generated by Country Coach, which is anticipated to go from 1600 employees to possibly 5000. He stated that the City Council thinks that its good for Junction City to expand, but pointed out that only 220 out of 1600 employees live in Junction City, and the City is babysitting people from other communities. He expressed concerns on how the proposed development would affect the Flat Creek channel and the floodplain drainage, as this flows north right through Junction City.

Commissioner Arkin asked how often Junction City had experienced flood events.

Mr. Szerlip responded that there were events in November 1997 and February of 1998, where the whole area around his property was underwater.

Chairman Nelson added that Junction City was in the 100-year floodplain.

Mr. Svend Toftemark, 2060 Broadway, Eugene, owner of Farmview Park which abuts the proposed property on the north side, stated that he wasn't really in opposition, but wanted to express a few concerns. He stated that he wasn't clear if there would be public comment on the site plan review later on.

Chairman Nelson responded that there would be public input on that in the future.

Mr. Toftemark continued that he was glad to hear that some transportation plans had been addressed, as there were definite concerns about the number of cars and speeding. He stated that in addition to traffic, he would like to have some requirements imposed in the future for noise control, especially during the evening and work hours, as the area abuts residential property to the north. He continued that there were also some concerns about paint and other emissions,

and they would like to avoid problems like the City of Coburg has had with the plant there.

Commissioner Arkin expressed her concerns that both testimonies have included comments on driving practices and inappropriate behavior. She asked if there had been conversations with the neighbors and Country Coach regarding this.

Mr. Toftemark responded that he had not been involved in conversations, but that the issue has been presented to the City and Country Coach and that both sides were working on a resolution to address parking issues.

Chairman Nelson added that the expansion proposes new parking areas that would help to eliminate the parking issues.

Mr. Duane Edmondson, 230 Birch Street, stated that the speed limit is 25 mph on Birch Street, and excessive speeding and high traffic volumes at 5:30 p.m. were a danger to the community. He stated that every industry that he has worked for has required parking on the property site and leaving the site was done in an orderly manner. He continued that he met with a Country Coach representative to tour the parking facility and found out that they have adequate parking on site, but employees don't want to use it with only one egress and the amount of time it would take to enter or leave the plant. He mentioned property owner liability, with employees walking across private property. He added that he was in favor of the expansion, as it would be a possible solution to the parking issue, but stated that the other traffic issues needed to be addressed, before there are more injuries or fatalities.

Chairman Nelson asked Public Works Director David Renshaw to comment on the status of the parking issue. Director Renshaw stated that his understanding was that they had backed away from neighborhood signs and were moving towards more of an enforcement model, with the Police Department developing a residential parking ordinance. He added that placards would be issued to residents in the neighborhood, with the SCOPS (Senior Citizens on Patrol) assisting in providing a much higher level of enforcement.

Planner Belson read a memo from Junction City Administrator Mike Leighton, "The City is awaiting the preparation and delivery of an ordinance from legal counsel that would create a parking sanction against those who work for manufacturing and industrial firms parking in residential neighborhoods while at work. In essence, it will require that firms provide parking for employees. This ordinance is slated for adoption on May 10, 2005 at the regular Council meeting. Residents in the areas affected by Country Coach employee parking will be called to come to a town meeting explaining how this process of ticketing and towing of vehicles will occur. Yellow, durable placards will be recorded and issued to residents so that they will have enough placards for their vehicles and one extra for visitors. These placards will be displayed on the sun visor or

dashboards of residents' vehicles. The residents will be responsible for their placards proper use and protection. It is anticipated that this will be ready by June 1, 2005."

Mr. Edmondson stated that he was unaware that all of that had transpired. He added that he needed to express his concerns, as there were significant safety issues.

Mr. Lenden Bodtke, 94213 River Road, Junction City, stated that he was testifying on behalf of the Bodtke family. He continued that he has lived in the area for 41 years and has observed all of the floods and the fields totally covered with water. He stated that there would need to be a tremendous amount of tiling and plumbing done to address that issue. He stated that as an adjacent resident, he has to deal with the traffic at 5:30 p.m. and proposed the building of a new roadway south and across the railroad tracks to alleviate the high volume of traffic on River Road.

Chairman Nelson responded that that option had been explored, but it could not be done as the railroad would not give approval.

Mr. Bodtke added that there are companies that have packed up and moved and they have been very successful, with Monaco being a prime example. He stated that the proposed expansion property was prime farmland and that if the expansion is granted, it should be expected there would be additional requests to expand onto other prime farmland areas, as well.

Chairman Nelson responded that other applicants would have to prove that there is a need for that land. Mr. Bodtke stated that the need would be money.

Mrs. Barbara Bennett, 93951 Strome Lane, stated that her property is adjacent to the proposed expansion. She expressed her concerns about the emissions that would be coming out of the factory, and stated that currently she could smell vapors when outside. She continued that recreational vehicle factories have become some of the biggest toxic air polluters in Lane County and produce 250 tons a year of invisible, toxic fumes from painting, fiberglass manufacturing, and lacquering. She stated that the emissions included toluene, styrene, and xylene, which were declared health hazardous air pollutants by Congress in 1990. Mrs. Bennett stated that in Coburg, twenty-five neighbors are now seeking \$33 million alleging that the 130 tons of chemical fumes vented by Monaco are a nuisance. She said that she could imagine the same thing happening here, as it was happening in so many other areas. She stated that toxic fumes could be detected in the air now, and it is a big concern. She asked why this was not being currently addressed.

Mr. Szerlip stated that Country Coach was fined in 2001 for \$12,600. He added that there was another case, where they were also fined for illegal emissions.

Commissioner Arkin asked Mrs. Bennett if she would like to see the City connect air emissions with future land use permits.

Mrs. Bennett responded that she would be in favor of that, and this is something that the City should address, enforce, and require before any expansion takes place. She added that it seems as though Country Coach would rather pay a fine than pay the millions of dollars that it would cost to address the problem.

Mr. Carl Bothman, 93760 Strome Lane, Junction City, stated that after reading the report there were a lot of issues and concerns that needed to be addressed. He continued that he has witnessed the high volume of cars leaving Country Coach on River Road, and tries to avoid being on River Road between 5:15 p.m. and 5:40 p.m. He stated that the purpose for more discussion was not to stop the growth of Country Coach, but to make sure that the issues that staff has written about were answered. He mentioned the traffic concerns and the responsibility to deal with lawless behavior.

Chairman Nelson stated that the public hearing would not be closed and no decisions would be reached at the meeting tonight. He asked if Mr. Bothman could write down more specific goals and issues that he has concerns about.

Mr. Bothman said that he would be happy to do that.

Chairman Digman added that any member of the public could be encouraged and allowed to submit any additional information into the record.

Chairman Nelson stated that the traffic issues and the social behavior of the employees needed to be addressed by Country Coach. He continued that he had spoken to the management at Country Coach, and they are aware of the problem and would take some steps to mitigate that.

Mr. Tom Boyatt, 644 A Street, Springfield, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), stated that ODOT is in agreement with the applicant's concept to put the overlay zone on top of the M1 to make sure that the information as related to RV manufacturing and trip estimates travels with the land. He stated that the trip generation methodology in the applicant's TIA is acceptable to ODOT, which is a method based on a number of trips per acre and was arrived at through conversations with Lane County, ODOT, and the applicant's representative. He added that the mitigation strategy of controlling the time of day of the trips; therefore, avoiding too much congestion at the peak hour is also acceptable to ODOT. He mentioned that planning for a future right of way for a southerly connection through the property is an option that could be examined in the future. He added that if more of a local street network weren't developed, then the traffic would have to go to the highway. He asked that the record be held open for one

or two weeks, as more work will be done with the applicant, and he would like to submit further, fine tuned comments.

Chairman Nelson added that the City is cooperating with the 2050 plan and looking at long range planning.

Mrs. Ann Bothman, 93760 Strome Lane, Junction City, stated that she had moved to the country to enjoy the aesthetics, and now there was a proposal for industry to encroach upon this. She asked about buffering requirements and stated that she would hope there would be a buffer of many trees and other buffers from noise and fumes, to keep the visual beauty of the area.

Chairman Nelson asked Planner Belson about buffering requirements for M1.

Planner Belson responded that in the M1 zone, the only time that you need any kind of buffering is if the property is up against a residential zone, which requires that buildings have to be 50 feet from the property line. She continued that if a living solid screen is provided adjacent to the residential zone, then the minimum setback might be reduced to 25 feet. She stated that Junction City ordinances do not require buffering next to agriculture, although it is a policy of the Comprehensive Plan to have buffering around the UGB.

Chairman Nelson added that this discussion could also happen at the time of the site review.

Planner Belson stated that the City has site review provisions in terms of access management, but does not have a site review process for industrial that goes into those other site specific issues, beyond access management.

Applicant Rebuttal

Chairman Nelson asked for applicant rebuttal.

Mr. Howard responded that in reference to "babysitting" the high volume of employees that live outside of the area, Country Coach infuses \$10 million a year to local businesses for parts and services. He added that when there are more homes available, there would be an improvement in the number of employees who live within the City. He talked about Country Coach's willingness to mitigate the valid safety concerns in the community, and cited the example of the company enforcing the restriction of parking on River Road through employee termination. He stated that the company is making all efforts to deal with issues in light of fast paced growth, and that they want to be good citizens and neighbors. He continued that the parking lot they created was being used to 70% capacity. He added that the City's parking ordinance would dramatically help in addressing the parking concerns.

Mr. Ken Schaudt, 2350 Oakmont Way, Suite 105, Eugene, representing the engineering firm for the applicant, stated that the City of Junction City was fairly well advanced in policy and development regarding stormwater issues, and that future development is required to have stormwater runoff match or be less than the historical rate. He continued that the historical surface drainage in Junction City runs from the southeast to the northwest and flows both around and through the property. He continued that the City engineer has asked that Country Coach be required to retain all of the water that lands on this site, based on a 25 year flood event, no matter the amount of roof surface or paving. He added that they are looking at having bio-filtration swales and detention basins on site, which would allow some of the water to flow through Flat Creek or continue to allow it to run through the City in the other drainages that historically have handled the flow. He added that mitigation of the 8.4 acres of wetlands was a 1.5 or 2 to 1 ratio, so there would be more than enough area to mitigate land where historically the water had flooded.

Junction City Public Works Director David Renshaw reviewed the City requirements of containing stormwater on site and stated that overriding concerns are to ensure that pre-development runoff is not exceeded and that there are no upstream impacts (blockages) or down stream impacts (floods). He added that all developments are required to go through a very exhaustive and expensive drainage study, and the City monitors this area very closely to make sure all standards are being followed.

In response to a question on the timing of wetlands delineation, Mr. Schaudt stated that he has encouraged Country Coach to mitigate that portion of the property as soon as possible. He continued that the laws are such that if they mitigate this immediately, do the planting and other aspects and let it be developed to that stage for three years, an assessment could then be done on how effective the mitigation was. He added that depending on the outcome, the ratio could be lowered.

Mr. Vaughn submitted a draft of the wetlands delineation, for the record.

Commissioner Nord expressed concerns on Mr. Vaughn's reasoning and response to some of the criteria that staff had raised, which pointed to the uniqueness of Country Coach and that those criteria would more than likely not justify UGB expansion for another business. He stated that past Planning Commission decisions were based on what they anticipated for certain business development, but then that development did not occur, and he didn't see that being addressed here. He added that he understood how market forces and other factors impact growth, citing that Country Coach was now beginning to develop the 17 acres that had been added in 1999, but was concerned about approving the UGB expansion in light of uncertain expansion in the future.

Mr. Vaughn reviewed the reasoning behind the responses and stated that it would be impossible to guarantee that future growth and expansion would definitely occur, but that Country Coach had made a good faith effort, tremendous financial investment, and sincere planning attempts that demonstrate a commitment to see this happen. He pointed to Goal Number Nine on Economic Development and the City's Comprehensive Plan, which encourages existing businesses to expand onto adjacent lands. He stated agreement that a brand new business probably would not locate in this area, but Country Coach has a 30-year history and has experienced unbelievable growth and finds itself constrained and needing to grow.

Mr. Howard added that Country Coach was over 100% of their capacity on their current facilities, and that would partially be addressed with the new development on the 17 acres. He stated that he wished he could guarantee when expansion would occur on the proposed 75 acres, but it would be impossible to predict with market pressures, etc.

Commissioner Nord responded that he is sensitive to that and was not asking for a commitment or guarantee, but Mr. Vaughn had used a potential growth and "what if" scenario to address quite a few of the criteria. He stated that if the UGB is expanded and then the land is not developed, there would be 75 acres that had been devoted to industrial land that impacts those neighbors. He added that there are important criteria that are addressed through the specificity of Country Coach, and 75 acres could be added and then sold in the future to another industry.

Mr. Howard responded that the land is pretty much tied to manufacturing, according to the overlays that were discussed earlier. He stated that the worst-case scenario would be that the company could not expand in the future and asked if the process of rezoning back to agricultural land would then be in the best interest of the City.

Commissioner Nord stated that it could be done, but it wouldn't be in Country Coach's best interest, as they would be better off selling to someone that could use the property.

Mr. Howard stated that they could sell, only if there was a viable buyer. He made reference to the Oaklea site and the assumption that Hewlett Packard would occupy that land, which did not happen, and the land maintains the same zoning and is still for sale. He added that at some point, if the City determined that the proposed UGB site would not be a viable property other than agricultural, then the process could be exercised to rezone it back to agriculture.

Chairman Digman expressed his agreement that there were a lot of things in the application that are tied to Country Coach, but that is to be expected, as they are the applicant. He added that it is up to the Planning Commissioners and the

eventual deliberation to determine if the application meets with the applicable goals.

Note: At the September 6, 2005 LCPC meeting these minutes were amended by the commission to include Commissioner Zdzenicki's concerns over drainage, farmland preservation, and effluents that had not been included beforehand.

MOTION: Commissioner Sumner made a motion to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Nord and passed by unanimous vote of the Commission.

MOTION: Commissioner Bernardy made a motion to keep the written record open for two weeks until 5:00 p.m. on May 17th. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lemhouse and passed by unanimous vote of the Junction City Planning Commission.

MOTION: Commissioner Kirkham made a motion to close the public hearing and keep the written record open for two weeks. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Siekiel-Zdzienicki and passed by unanimous vote of the Lane County Planning Commission.

IV. III. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:26 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kitty Vodrup, City Recorder

Robert Nelson, Chairman

MINUTES**Lane County Planning Commission
BCC Conference Room - Lane County Courthouse**

September 20, 2005
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Steve Dignam, Chair; James Carmichael, Vice Chair; Lisa Arkin, Ed Becker, Juanita Kirkham, Nancy Nichols, John Sullivan, Jozef Siekiel-Zdzienicki, members; Stephanie Schultz, Staff

ABSENT: Marion Esty

I. Deliberations: PA 05-5132 \ In the Matter of Amending the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan to expand the City's Urban Growth Boundary to include 74.26 acres of the City Lane to Facilitate expansion of Country Coach, Inc.

Commission Chair Steve Dignam convened the meeting and called for public comment. Seeing no one wishing to speak he moved the meeting into deliberations on PA 05-5132.

Commission Staff person Stephanie Schulz noted that she had sent out the supplementary written material that had been submitted while the record was open and noted that the final ordinance from the City of Junction City was also included in the meeting packet.

Mr. Dignam established that every commission member had been present at the public hearing or had been brought current on the matter.

In response to a question from Commission member John Sullivan regarding the exact location of the urban growth boundary of Junction City, Ms. Schulz showed on a map where the city boundary was located.

In response to a question from Commission member Jozef Siekiel-Zdzienicki regarding a map of soil types on the property, Ms. Schulz showed him the map displayed on the wall.

Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki commented that the map was not part of the May 3 record.

In response to a question from Commission Member Nancy Nichols regarding Exhibit B(4). in the record and limitations to operations within 80 feet of the expansion site, Ms. Schulz said the setback was a transportation setback or a right-of-way sight line. She said there were more extensive conditions for approval for transportation setbacks.

Commission Member Juanita Kirkham clarified that the 80 foot setbacks were Junction City's conditions of approval which could also be adopted by the County Planning Commission.

Commission Vice-Chair James Carmichael added that there had been testimony at the public hearing to the effect that the voluntary setbacks would be used as buffer zones.

Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki said the east side buffer was there because a future road might be put in for egress from the property. He added that on the northern side the measurement was from the middle of First Avenue.

In response to a question from Commission member Lisa Arkin regarding her questions about air emissions and whether she could ask more questions of Junction City staff, Mr. Dignam said air emissions could be discussed among the commissioners but noted that the record was closed and would have to be re-opened if new information were discussed.

Mr. Carmichael noted that page 15 of the Junction City conditions for approval contained emissions information. He suggested that Ms. Arkin list her concerns over lack of emissions data in the application for the record to be forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners.

In response to a question from Ms. Arkin regarding whether the applicant had submitted wetlands and noise mitigation plans, Ms. Schulz noted that they had not.

Mr. Sullivan said those plans were required only at site plan approval before development. He added that the applicant had started those plans early but reiterated that they were only needed for approval at the site plan stage of development.

In response to a question from Mr. Dignam regarding sites that were inside the city limits but outside the urban growth boundaries and whether there were any other communities in Lane County that had a similar situation, Ms. Schulz said she did not know of any community in the State of Oregon that had a similar situation. She said she had no explanation as to why the situation had occurred.

In response to a question from Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki regarding whether the storm water issue for the site was supposed to be part of the criteria for approval of the site plan, Ms. Schulz said new construction or substantial remodel would require that criterion to be met during site plan review. She noted that the applicant had not made final plans for any new construction.

Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki expressed concern over lack of mention of storm water management in the application.

Ms. Schulz commented that Country Coach could not formulate a storm water management plan until it had an idea of what its facility would finally be. She said a storm water management plan would not be formulated until there was a final development plan.

Mr. Sullivan added that there had been testimony from the Public Works director of Junction City who addressed storm water management concerns. He said however, that Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki's concern was not part of the decision of the commission that evening.

Commission member Ed Becker cited an article in the September 13 issue of the *Register Guard*. He noted that the newspaper had reported that there would be a 38 percent increase in smog related chemicals released from the manufacturing plant. He observed that this figure did not include future expansion. He noted that the company currently produced 158 tons of volatile organic compounds and when it expanded it would amount to 218 tons. He opined that the facility did not want to take steps to reduce the pollutants because of the cost of installing burners or scrubbers would amount to \$29,900 per ton. He said he noted that Monaco had been sued when it had expanded which had resulted in a settlement to install \$2 million worth of scrubbers. He said Junction City that Country Coach stated during the public hearing that moving its paint booths from the edge of the property to the middle of the property would mitigate the situation. He said Eugene would experience a 38 percent increase in pollution from the facility and expressed his astonishment that no one was concerned over the issue. He raised concern that Junction City was not requiring the facility to meet the industry standard established by Monaco. He questioned why none of that information was mentioned in the application or the public hearing. He said the main mitigation factor he had heard was that paint booths would be moved from the edge of the property to the middle of the property and questioned whether this was mitigation at all.

Ms. Arkin called attention to page 14-15 of the meeting packet which contained goal statements regarding air, water, and land resource quality. She noted that the statewide planning Goal 6 was to maintain and improve the quality of air, water and land resources. She noted that when Country Coach expanded to its proposed site it would be required to obtain a modification of its existing permit or obtain a new permit to insure that its operations continued to comply with applicable state and federal air standards. She said if a company requested a modification of an existing permit the latitude to pollute was much "looser." She said by modifying the current permit a company would not have to comply with modern standards because previous standards would be grandfathered in. She said this had caused her some concern.

Mr. Becker commented that Monaco now owned Country Coach. He added that the 38 percent increase was only for the first expansion and did not take into account any further expansion. He remarked that the owners of Monaco would be considering the previous lawsuit as a potential liability and would want to include the same scrubbers and burners they had installed before.

Ms. Arkin commented on the difficulty of filing complaints over air pollution and noted that it was even more difficult to have any legal standing. She said the only way communities could successfully challenge polluters was under the grounds of trespassing such as if the odor became so all pervading that people could not use their own lawns, or porches or open windows.

In response to a question from Mr. Dignam regarding parking and traffic congestion and what work had been done to address the issues and concerns raised by neighbors, Transportation Staff Person Jason Lein said the City of Junction City was developing a program to insure that employees were not parking in adjacent neighborhoods. He added that traffic impacts had been mitigated through staggering shift changes in the facility to ensure that all employees would not be leaving/arriving at the same time. He said county transportation staff is content with the conditions that were agreed upon by the Junction City Council.

In response to a question from Ms. Kirkham regarding how those mitigations would be monitored, Jason Lein said the company was legally bound to follow the terms of the agreement. He said staff would hear from the public if the terms were not being met but noted that there were no set agreements for monitoring the situation.

In response to a question from Mr. Sullivan regarding whether it would be a county expense to improve the intersections concerned in the issue, Jason Lein said it would be a combination of Oregon Department of Transportation and the County. He noted that as new development occurred in the area there would be traffic analysis that would contribute to addressing traffic problems.

Ms. Arkin commented that the mitigation plan was backwards in that it 'barely avoided failure'. She said staggering the shifts would simply dilute the problem into a longer period. She suggested that the company could produce its own busses to shuttle employees to work. She commented class one soils were much too valuable a county resource to pave over to produce 550 new parking spaces.

Jason Lein said the shift changes made sense because 90 percent of the time the intersections in question were nowhere near peak capacity. He remarked that the solution would mitigate extreme traffic congestion peaking at a given time each day.

In response to a question from Ms. Nichols regarding how the traffic agreement was enforceable, Jason Lein said there was no real penalty but noted that the City of Junction City and the County would both be involved if the agreement on traffic were not met.

Mr. Dignam said the commission could not insure that the conditions for approval would be met. He said it was outside the purview of the commission to regulate any future penalties if conditions for approval were not met.

Ms. Kirkham stressed that the role of the commission was to decide whether the applicant had met the criteria/conditions for approval. She said much of the current discussion had nothing to do with the decision at hand.

Mr. Dignam agreed and stressed the importance of keeping discussion to the relevant criteria. He said the commission needed to make its decision on the appropriate criteria for approval.

Mr. Becker said he did not believe Goal 6 requirements would be met. He said he did not believe there could be maintenance or improvement of air quality by adding 60 tons of pollutants into the air. He suggested a condition for approval requiring scrubbers and burners similar to what Monaco had installed to mitigate pollutants released into the air.

Ms. Arkin noted that car emissions also caused those pollutants and remarked that there had not been enough effort to reduce the number of vehicle trips to the facility. She suggested a condition of approval that would require a program for reducing emissions from the facility and from vehicle trips to the facility.

Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki said the applicant's response to OAR 660 -004-0020(b) dealing with Goal 14 urbanization and transferring agricultural land to industrial land within an urban growth boundary was to the conflicting interpretation of the rule. He suggested delaying approval until the results of the rule changed to be clearer.

Ms. Schulz said new rules would not apply since the application had to be judged by the rules that applied when the application was submitted.

Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki said he wanted the issue in the public record.

Ms. Kirkham questioned whether the deliberations could be continued into another work session since a decision could not be made in the remaining time allotted.

Mr. Carmichael noted that the Junction City Planning Commission and City Council had both approved the application with certain conditions. He said he would be willing to put forward a motion for approval that included all of those conditions and also called for more clarification on how traffic and air emissions would be handled. He noted that no more data would be forthcoming into the current record.

Mr. Dignam stressed that if commissioners did not feel the information in the application was enough to form a basis for approval then they should make a motion to deny the application. He stressed that no new information would be added to the record until the matter went before the Board of County Commissioners.

Ms. Arkin said she wanted to discuss the 17 acres of land on which the facility planned to build a parking lot for 566 cars. She said this was the reason that the company needed the additional land in the current application. She said she would like to see a better use of the 17 acres already in possession and for the company to come back with a proposal that used less of the 74 acres in the current application. She stressed that the goal was to conserve farmland.

Mr. Dignam called for a motion.

Mr. Carmichael, seconded by Mr. Sullivan, moved to approve the application in the matter amending the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan and the Junction City Comprehensive Plan to expand the urban growth boundary to include 74.26 acres of City land to facilitate expansion of Country Coach Inc. As well as adding the following conditions:

1. Adopt consideration of Junction City Council and planning commission.
2. Fully address pollution issues regarding emissions from the facility
3. Address traffic mitigation plans more completely
4. Address Storm water runoff issues from the site

Ms. Arkin offered a friendly amendment which was accepted to use BACT practices on air quality when addressing pollution issues.

Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki raised concern that the commission was rushing the issue. He suggested continuing the deliberation after the public hearing. He said would not vote for the motion.

Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki, seconded by Ms. Kirkham, moved to table the motion until the conclusion of the evening's public hearing. ...

The motion passed 7:1 with Mr. Carmichael voting in opposition.

The work session adjourned at 7 pm.

Commission Chair Steve Dignam reopened the work session at 8: 10 pm. He reiterated the motion that was on the table.

Mr. Becker commented that the Board of County Commissioners had a very full schedule and investigating the items mentioned in the motion fell within the duties of the planning commission to make recommendations. He said he would not support the motion.

Mr. Sullivan said new material could not be added to the record without reopening that record. He said the commission could not act on new information that it uncovered. He added that he was interested in moving the issue forward but expressed a desire to recommend the Board of Commissioners concentrate on one big issue. He said the issue of air quality should be that issue. He stressed that it was a potentially large problem that no one had discussed. .

Ms. Kirkham said the application had not convinced her that the conditions had been met on Goal 3 to preserve prime agricultural land, Goal 6 to maintain air quality, and goal 12 to mitigate transportation issues, and Goal 14 for urbanization. She added that she was not convinced that prime agricultural land should be converted to industrial uses.

Ms. Arkin expressed her pleasure that the commission was concerned over potential air quality impacts from land use.

Ms. Arkin said the applicant had not met the burden of proof for approval of the application to convert agricultural land to industrial land. She reiterated that Country Coach had plans to immediately expand into 17 acres to build additional parking. She