

MINUTES

LANE COUNTY LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION

Eugene City Hall
Council Chamber (777 Pearl Street)

February 7, 2008
7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Clay Myers, chair; Eleanor Mulder, vice chair; Karen Seidel, Christine Larson, Renée Buchanan, Bud Stewart (late arrival as noted)

ABSENT: Van Heeter

I. CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL

Clay Myers, chair, called the meeting of the Lane County Local Government Boundary Commission to order. Commissioners introduced themselves. Executive Officer Paula Taylor, boundary commission staff, called the roll.

II. APPROVAL OF EXPENSES – SEPTEMBER/OCTOBER 2007

* Moved/seconded (Seidel/Larson) to approve the expenses of November (\$7,276.67) and December (\$10,253.65) 2007. The motion passed unanimously, 4:0 (Commissioners Myers, Mulder, Larson, Seidel, and Buchanan voting yes).

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – DECEMBER 6, 2007

* Moved/seconded (Larson/Buchanan) to approve the minutes of December 6, 2007. The motion passed, 4:0:1 (Commissioners Mulder, Larson, Seidel, and Buchanan voting yes; Myers abstaining from the vote as he had not been present at the meeting).

IV. NEW BUSINESS: PUBLIC HEARING

Annexation of Territory to the City of Springfield (International Church of Foursquare Gospel)

- A. BC File C SP 08 – 14
Initiated by Resolution 07-59 by the City of Springfield with consents from property owners
Action under ORS 199.490(2)(a)(A) of the boundary commission law
Received December 31, 2007
Action to be taken by March 30, 2008

Description

The annexation area included two tax lots located in east Springfield, north of Hayden Bridge Way, east of 5th Street, south of Blackstone Street, and west of Old Orchard Lane

Property owner: International Church of Foursquare Gospel
Tax lots: 12600 and 12700, T17S R03W S23 Map 34
Acres: ± 4.13
Estimate of existing population: 0
Existing land uses: Church and related facilities, vacant
Existing zoning in Lane County: I-2/UL, light-medium industrial with urbanizable land overlay.
Applicable comprehensive plan: Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (acknowledged in August 1982 and has been subsequently amended)
Existing public services to the property: Police (Oregon State Police, Lane County Sheriff), schools (Springfield School District 19), roads (Lane County, City of Springfield), fire (Rainbow Water and Fire District contracting with the City of Springfield), water (Rainbow Water and Fire District)

Reason for Annexation

The property owner requested annexation to prepare the site for additional church facility development. The Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan requires properties to annex in order to receive services.

Clay Myers, Chair, solicited *ex parte* contacts and conflicts of interest. There were none.

Commissioner Stewart arrived at the meeting. He had no conflicts of interest or *ex parte* contacts to declare.

Paula Taylor, Executive Officer, reviewed the notice of the hearing. There was no objection to the notice of hearing.

Ms. Taylor reminded the commission that this was the last time it would meet to process annexations as the boundary commission was abolished in the last legislative session. Several applications had been filed before the deadline for filing and were deemed to be valid filings. Hence all applications for annexations would be processed by the annexing jurisdiction. All were presented at the requests of the applicants. Senate Bill (SB) 417 authorized the commission to process the annexations validly filed with it by December 31, 2007. The boundary commission standards would apply. New annexations would be governed by new statutes with new criteria, but they only applied to annexations authorized by a different set of statutes.

Ms. Taylor provided a brief overview of the staff report. She incorporated the staff report and all related materials into the boundary commission record. She had evaluated the application against the boundary commission standards and recommended approval of the application as submitted. She invited questions.

Chair Myers opened the public hearing.

Proponent's Opening Statement – None

Public Officials in Support

Andrew Limbird, City of Springfield, noted the city's support for the annexation and the execution of an annexation agreement that memorialized the land owners' commitment to the public improvements needed to serve the site. The intent of the annexation was to facilitate

church expansion. The triple majority method was used because there were no occupants on the site and none were anticipated. He concurred with the staff report.

Others in Support – None

Public Officials in Opposition – None

Others in Opposition – None

Those Neither in Support nor in Opposition – None

Rebuttal by Proponents – None

Chair Myers closed the public hearing. He called for commission discussion.

Boundary Commission Deliberation and Decision

- * Moved/seconded (Buchanan/Larson) to amend Finding 1 on page 8 of the staff notes replacing ORS 199.490(2)(a)(B) with ORS 199.490(2)(a)(A) to reflect the appropriate statutory reference. The motion passed unanimously, 6:0 (Commissioners Myers, Mulder, Seidel, Larson, Buchanan, and Stewart voting yes).
- * Moved/seconded (Seidel/Larson) to approve BC File C SP 08 – 14, annexing territory to the City of Springfield, based on the findings and reasons in the February 7, 2008, staff report as amended. The motion passed unanimously, 6:0 (Commissioners Myers, Mulder, Seidel, Larson, Buchanan, and Stewart voting yes).

Annexation of Territory to the City of Eugene (Treadmill Joint Venture)

B. BC File C EU 08 – 10
Initiated by property owner petition
Action under ORS 199.490(1)(c) of the boundary commission law
Received December 26, 2007
Action to be taken by March 25, 2008

Description

As submitted, the annexation area included one tax lot located in the Santa Clara region of north Eugene, north of Beltline Road, west of River Road, east of the Northwest Expressway, north of Winery Lane, west of Merryvale Road, and south of Chardonnay Lane

Property owner: Treadmill Joint Venture

Tax los: 1490, T17S R04W S10

Acres: ± 10.60

Estimate of existing population: 0

Existing land use: Vacant

Existing zonings in Lane County: AG/WR/CAS/UL, agricultural with water resource, commercial airport safety, and urbanizable lands overlays; and R-1/SR/WR/CAS/UL low-density residential with water resource, commercial airport safety, site review, and urbanizable land overlays

Applicable comprehensive plan: Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (acknowledged in August 1982 and has been subsequently amended)

Existing public services to the property: Police (Oregon State Police, Lane County Sheriff), schools (Bethel School District 52), roads (Lane County, City of Eugene), water (Santa Clara Water District), fire (Lane Rural Fire/Rescue)

Reason for Annexation

The annexation was requested in order to prepare for future development. The Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan requires properties to annex in order to receive urban services.

Clay Myers, Chair, solicited *ex parte* contacts and conflicts of interest. There were none.

Paula Taylor, Executive Officer, provided the notice of the hearing. Mr. Myers determined there was no objection to the notice of hearing.

Ms. Taylor provided the staff report, incorporating the report and all related materials into the boundary commission record. She said the commission had received written consent from the owner. The property contained a tax lot planned for low-density residential and it was not contiguous to the main body of the city of Eugene. She said staff evaluated the application against boundary commission standards and recommended approval as submitted. She invited questions.

Commissioner Seidel asked if the schools were in Bethel. Ms. Taylor confirmed the Bethel district was the correct district.

Ms. Taylor asked the commission to add a finding regarding the non-contiguous nature of the annexation. Commissioner Seidel recommended that the word “not” be added to finding 2. Ms. Taylor concurred, and noted there was generally a finding specific to the issue.

Chair Myers opened the public hearing.

Proponent’s Opening Statement

Boyd Iverson, Treadmill Joint Venture, supported the annexation request and noted that it was bounded by the city of Eugene on three sides. He offered to answer questions.

Public Officials in Support

Kurt Yeiter, City of Eugene Senior Planner, expressed appreciation for the commission’s work on annexations involving the City of Eugene. He supported the staff recommendation for approval of the annexation and noted utilities were available and the property was surrounded on three sides by annexed property.

Others in Support – None

Public Officials in Opposition – None

Others in Opposition – None

Those Neither in Support nor Opposition – None

Rebuttal by Proponents – None

There being no further requests to speak, Chair Myers closed the public hearing.

Ms. Taylor reviewed the finding to be added.

Boundary Commission Discussion and Deliberation

- * Moved/seconded (Buchanan/Larson) to amend the staff notes as suggested by commission members and staff to correct references in the staff notes as follows: change reference to the Eugene School District on page IV-B-7 to Bethel School District 52; add “not” to Finding 2 between “was contiguous;” and add a new finding under the second standard: “The proposed annexation met the criteria for noncontiguous annexations in the boundary commission law and the Metro Plan.” The motion passed unanimously, 6:0 (Commissioners Myers, Mulder, Seidel, Larson, Buchanan, and Stewart voting yes).
- * Moved/seconded (Mulder/Buchanan) to approve BC File C EU 08 – 10 annexing territory to the City of Eugene based on the findings and reasons in the February 7, 2008, staff notes, as amended. The motion passed, 5:0 (Commissioners Mulder, Larson, Seidel, Stewart, and Buchanan voting yes).

Annexation of Territory to the City of Eugene (Dream Crafters LLC)

- C. BC File C EU 08 – 13
Initiated by property owner petition
Action under ORS 199.490(1)(c) of the boundary commission law
Received December 28, 2007
Action to be taken by March 27, 2008

Description

As submitted, the annexation area included one tax lot located in the Santa Clara region of north Eugene, north of Beltline Road, east of River Road, south of Hunsaker Lane, north of Helen Street, and east of Ross Lane
Property owner: Dream Crafters LLC
Tax lot: 5800, T17S R04W S12 Map 31
Acres: ± 0.37
Estimate of existing population: 1 (one residential unit)
Existing land use: Residential
Existing zoning in Lane County: R-1/UL, low-density residential with urbanizable lands overlay
Applicable comprehensive plan: Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (acknowledged in August 1982 and has been subsequently amended)
Existing public services to the property: Police (Oregon State Police, Lane County Sheriff), schools (Eugene School District 4J), roads (Lane County, City of Eugene), water (Santa Clara Water District), fire (Santa Clara Rural Fire Protection Department), wastewater (City of Eugene), electricity (EWEB)

Reason for Annexation

The annexation was requested in order to prepare the annexation area for possible future partition and residential development. The Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan requires properties to annex in order to receive urban services.

Clay Myers, Chair, solicited *ex parte* contacts and conflicts of interest. There were none.

Paula Taylor, Executive Officer, provided the notice of the hearing. Chair Myers determined there was no objection to the notice of hearing.

Ms. Taylor provided the staff report, incorporating the report and all related materials into the boundary commission record. She said staff evaluated the application against boundary commission standards and determined it was consistent with ORS 199 and boundary commission standards recommended approval of the application as submitted. She invited questions.

Chair Myers opened the public hearing.

Proponent's Opening Statement – None

Public Officials in Support

Kurt Yeiter, City of Eugene Senior Planner, concurred with the staff recommendation.

Others in Support – None

Public Officials in Opposition – None

Others in Opposition – None

Those Neither in Support nor Opposition – None

Rebuttal by Proponents – None

There being no further requests to speak, Chair Myers closed the public hearing.

Boundary Commission Discussion and Deliberation

- * Moved/seconded (Larson/Seidel) to approve BC File C EU 08 – 13 annexing territory to the City of Eugene based on the findings and reasons in the February 7, 2008, staff notes. The motion passed, 6:0 (Commissioners Myers, Mulder, Larson, Seidel, Buchanan, and Stewart voting yes).

Annexation of Territory to the City of Eugene (Santa Clara Properties LLC)

- D. BC File C EU 08 – 18
Initiated by property owner petition
Action under ORS 199.490(1)(c) of the boundary commission law
Received December 31, 2007
Action to be taken by March 30, 2008

Description

As submitted, the annexation area included one tax lot located in the Santa Clara region of north Eugene, north of Beltline Road, east of River Road, north of Green Lane, and south of Hunsaker Lane

Property owner: Santa Clara Properties LLC

Tax lot: 800, T17S R04W S11 Map 44

Acres: ± 0.10

Estimate of existing population: 0
Existing land use: Commercial
Existing zoning in Lane County: C-1/UL, neighborhood commercial with urbanizable lands overlay
Applicable comprehensive plan: Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (acknowledged in August 1982 and has been subsequently amended)
Existing public services to the property: Police (Oregon State Police, Lane County Sheriff), schools (Eugene School District 4J), roads (City of Eugene), water (Santa Clara Water District), fire (Santa Clara RFPD), wastewater (City of Eugene), electricity (EWEB)

Reason for Annexation

The annexation was requested to prepare the area for redevelopment along with other property already in the same ownership in the city. The Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan requires properties to annex in order to receive urban services.

Clay Myers, Chair, solicited *ex parte* contacts and conflicts of interest. There were none.

Paula Taylor, Executive Officer, provided the notice of the hearing. Mr. Myers determined there was no objection to the notice of hearing.

Ms. Taylor provided the staff report, incorporating the report and all related materials into the boundary commission record. She said the annexation included one tax lot located in an area totally surrounded by the City of Eugene. It was an islanded area, and if annexed only one non-annexed property would remain in the area. It was designated for commercial use and annexation would prepare the site for redevelopment or other uses consistent with the plan designation. She said staff evaluated the application against boundary commission standards and concluded the area could be served. She recommended approval of the application as submitted. She invited questions.

Chair Myers opened the public hearing.

Proponent's Opening Statement

Rick Satre, Satre and Associates, representing the property owner, concurred with the staff report and offered to answer questions.

Public Officials in Support

Kurt Yeiter, City of Eugene Senior Planner, agreed the property should be annexed.

Others in Support – None

Public Officials in Opposition – None

Those Neither in Support nor Opposition – None

Others in Opposition – None

Rebuttal by Proponents – None

There being no further requests to speak, Chair Myers closed the public hearing.

Boundary Commission Discussion and Deliberation

- * Moved/seconded (Seidel/Buchanan) to approve BC File C EU 08 – 18 annexing territory to the City of Eugene based on the findings and reasons in the February 7, 2008, staff notes.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Stewart, Ms. Taylor said that the remaining property owner in the unannexed area did not wish to annex, which was why the property was not being annexed.

- * The motion passed, 6:0 (Commissioners Myers, Mulder, Larson, Seidel, Buchanan, and Stewart voting yes).

Annexation of Territory to the City of Eugene (3585 Emerald LLC)

- E. BC File C EU 08 – 21
Initiated by property owner petition
Action under ORS 199.490(1)(c) of the boundary commission law
Received December 31, 2007
Action to be taken by March 30, 2008

Description

As submitted, the annexation area included one tax lot located in the Santa Clara region of north Eugene, north of Beltline Road, east and adjacent to Ferndale Drive, north of Irving Road, and south of Oak Leaf Drive

Property owner: 3835 Emerald LLC

Tax lot: 600, T17S R04W S11 Map 31

Acres: ± 0.65

Estimate of existing population: 0 (one residential unit)

Existing land use: Residential

Existing zoning in Lane County: R-1/UL, low-density residential with urbanizable lands overlay

Applicable comprehensive plan: Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (acknowledged in August 1982 and has been subsequently amended)

Existing public services to the property: Police (Oregon State Police, Lane County Sheriff), schools (Eugene School District 4J), roads (Lane County, City of Eugene), water (Santa Clara Water District), fire (Santa Clara RFPD), wastewater (City of Eugene), electricity (EWEB)

Reason for Annexation

The annexation was requested in order to prepare for annexation area for future residential development. The Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan requires properties to annex in order to receive urban services.

Clay Myers, Chair, solicited *ex parte* contacts and conflicts of interest. There were none.

Paula Taylor, Executive Officer, provided the notice of the hearing. Chair Myers determined there was no objection to the notice of hearing.

Ms. Taylor provided the staff report, incorporating the report and all related materials into the boundary commission record. She said the annexation, if approved, would create an island of two properties. The properties would be totally surrounded by the City of Eugene. The owners of those properties were sent a copy of the staff report but did not consent to annexation. The annexing tax lot was contiguous to the main body of Eugene because Ferndale Drive was annexed all the way to River Road. She had evaluated the application against the boundary commission criteria and administrative rules and recommended approval of the annexation.

Chair Myers opened the public hearing.

Proponent's Opening Statement – None

Public Officials in Support

Kurt Yeiter, City of Eugene Senior Planner, concurred with the staff recommendation. He said it was unusual for such an island to be created. The city council had an adopted policy not to force annexations against property owners' will, and there was no attempt by the city to annex those properties. He anticipated any change in policy would involve the public. He said that new legislation mandated a phased tax differential over a ten-year period should the city's policies change.

Others in Support – None

Public Officials in Opposition – None

Others in Opposition

Jim Seaberry, 1475 Green Acres Road, Eugene, opposed the annexation, asserting it was illegal. He cited the *Cosco* case in support of his remarks.

John Dotson, 2477 Canterbury Street, Eugene, asserted that the annexation of Ferndale Drive was a violation of city policy. Chair Myers reminded him the street was already annexed.

Those Neither in Support nor Opposition – None

Rebuttal by Proponents

Mr. Yeiter responded that the city's policy in regard to islands was to pursue the logical and appropriate extension of the streets, but not if the annexation modification created an island of unincorporated properties in the River Road or Santa Clara neighborhoods.

There being no further requests to speak, Mr. Myers closed the public hearing.

Boundary Commission Discussion and Deliberation

- * Moved/seconded (Larson/Buchanan) to approve BC File C EU 08 – 21 annexing territory to the City of Eugene based on the findings and reasons in the February 7, 2008, staff notes.

Commissioner Mulder recalled that Ferndale had been annexed long before the city policy was adopted, which was less than a year ago.

- * The motion passed, 6:0 (Commissioners Myers, Mulder, Larson, Seidel, Buchanan, and Stewart voting yes).

Annexation of Territory to the City of Eugene (Wallace)

- F. BC File C EU 08 – 01
Initiated by property owner petition
Action under ORS 199.490(1)(c) of the boundary commission law
Received November 27, 2007
Action to be taken by February 25, 2008

Description

As submitted, the annexation area included one tax lot located in the Santa Clara region of north Eugene, north of Beltline Road, east of River Road, south and east of River Loop 1, west of Admiral Street, and north of Grizzly Avenue

Property owners: Terry and Loretta Wallace

Tax lot: 2401, T17S R04W S12 Map 20

Acres: ± 0.74

Estimate of existing population: 2 (one single-family residential unit)

Existing land use: Residential

Existing zoning in Lane County: AG/UL, agricultural with urbanizable lands overlay

Applicable comprehensive plan: Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (acknowledged in August 1982 and has been subsequently amended)

Existing public services to the property: Police (Oregon State Police, Lane County Sheriff), schools (Eugene School District 4J), roads (Lane County, City of Eugene), water (Santa Clara Water District), fire (Santa Clara RFPD), wastewater (City of Eugene), electricity (EWEB)

Reason for Annexation

The property owners requested annexation in order to prepare the property for future residential development. The Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan requires properties to annex in order to receive urban services.

Clay Myers, Chair, solicited *ex parte* contacts and conflicts of interest. There were none.

Paula Taylor, Executive Officer, provided the notice of the hearing. Chair Myers determined there was no objection to the notice of hearing.

Ms. Taylor provided the staff report, incorporating the report and all related materials into the boundary commission record. She reviewed the annexation request and reported that the annexation included on tax lot. The tax lot involved was not contiguous to the main body of Eugene. The City of Eugene requested the inclusion of the road right-of-way for River Loop 1, and the staff notes reflected that request. The commission could choose to include the right-of-way or leave it out; either approach would be consistent with boundary commission standards. If the road was annexed, the property would be connected to other properties previously annexed to Eugene. She recommended the commission modify the annexation with the inclusion of the segment of River Loop 1 as requested and approve the application.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Seidel, Ms. Taylor acknowledged an error in the staff notes in that the annexation was not in the River Road Park and Recreation District. She indicated she would double-check the findings.

Chair Myers opened the public hearing.

Proponent's Opening Statement

Terry Wallace said he wanted to annex the property to preserve his rights to develop the property in the future. He feared changes in State law could preclude his ability to develop the property. He did not plan to develop the property in the near future. He did not know the street would be proposed for inclusion.

Public Officials in Support

Kurt Yeiter, City of Eugene Senior Planner, said the annexation was a relatively small property in an area with scattered annexations. Services were available. Regarding the street annexation, he said the city looked to such annexations, particularly in the River Road area, for logical and appropriate street segments to bring in the city to provide for more efficient service delivery. The inclusion of road right-of-way streamlined the development process in case street improvements were necessary as the developer was not required to coordinate with multiple jurisdictions for permits. He reiterated the council policy related to the creation of islands and unwilling annexations. He said Eugene had been working on new rules with the realization it would no longer be able to do noncontiguous annexations. While the annexations involved regarded logical street segments, property owners were asking how they could annex in the future if not contiguous. Either they could not develop or must become contiguous to the city, which could spur discussion of larger scale annexations in the future. Mr. Yeiter referred to a letter in the record from Peggy Keppler of the city's public works department stating that the annexation would not change maintenance and operational agreements between the city and Lane County, which coordinated service delivery in the area. No street improvements were planned at this time; generally such improvements only occurred in the majority of property owners petitioned the city for them. He supported the staff recommendation to modify the annexation request.

Others in Support – None

Public Officials in Opposition – None

Others in Opposition

Jim Seaberry, 1475 Green Acres Road, Eugene, thought Mr. Yeiter's statements contrary to what was occurring. The street did nothing to change services to the area. He said when the commission annexed a street, the only way the street ever became part of the city was through use of an Oregon Revised Statute 373.270, related to the transfer of streets inside cities. He said the street was not inside the city, but it was used to justify the transfer of streets. He asserted that the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan was not the law.

John Dotson, 2477 Canterbury, Eugene, asserted that the *Costco* decision, related to island annexations, was applicable to the application and there could be no taxation without representation. He saw a definite connection. He denied that the street could be annexed.

Those Neither in Support nor Opposition – None

Rebuttal by Proponents – None

There being no further requests to speak, Chair Myers closed the public hearing.

Boundary Commission Discussion and Deliberation

Responding to a question from Commissioner Buchanan, Ms. Taylor called the commission's attention to the notice sent by the City of Eugene in regard to the annexation request and soliciting feedback. The notice was accompanied by a list of individuals who received the notice. She noted the notice was not required by law but was sent at the commission's behest. She said the commission could modify the finding with the results of the mailing, but it was not related to its standards.

Chair Myers determined that the commission did not wish to modify the findings with reference to the list.

- * Moved/seconded (Seidel/Buchanan) to modify the annexation area to include a segment of River Loop 1 right-of-way as recommended.

Commissioner Stewart asserted that the application was "under a legal cloud," but it was not of the applicant's making. He wanted to separate the annexation from the road issues because he felt to do so would correct any inequity the applicant suffered due to the inclusion of the right-of-way.

Commissioner Larson believed the commission had the right to include the right-of-way in question.

Commissioner Mulder assumed that the city had checked the issue with its attorneys and she would defer to legal counsel as opposed to someone in the audience. Ms. Taylor said the issue of jurisdictional transfer was not within the boundary commission's purview, but it could only work if the right-of-way was annexed by the boundary commission. The city and county then went through a separate process that allowed for the jurisdictional transfer. It had nothing to do with annexation, but regarded who was legally responsible for the road. The testimony might be correct, but it did not address the annexations. She was not familiar with the Land Use Board of Appeals and court cases cited.

Commissioner Larson suggested that given the lack of county road fund money, it might be better if the street was annexed.

- * The motion passed, 5:1 (Commissioners Myers, Mulder, Larson, Seidel, and Buchanan voting yes; Commissioner Stewart voting in opposition).
- * Moved/seconded (Buchanan/Larson) to approve BC File C EU 08 – 01 annexing territory to the City of Eugene as modified, based on the findings and reasons in the February 7, 2008, staff notes. The motion passed, 5:1 (Commissioners Myers, Mulder, Larson, Seidel, and Buchanan voting yes; Commissioner Stewart voting in opposition).

Annexation of Territory to the City of Eugene (Minor/Pound)

- G. BC File C EU 08 – 07
Initiated by property owner petition
Action under ORS 199.490(1)(c) of the boundary commission law
Received December 13, 2007

Action to be taken by March 12, 2008

Description

As submitted, the annexation area included one tax lot located in the River Road region of north Eugene, south of Beltline Road, east of River Road, north of McClure Lane, south of Oakleigh Lane, and west of the Willamette River

Property owners: Joe Minor and Carol Pound

Tax lot: 5800, T17S R04W S24 Map 24

Acres: ± 0.62

Estimate of existing population: 2 (one single-family residential unit)

Existing land use: Residential

Existing zoning in Lane County: R-1/UL, low-density residential with urbanizable lands overlay

Applicable comprehensive plan: Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (acknowledged in August 1982 and has been subsequently amended)

Existing public services to the property: Police (Oregon State Police, Lane County Sheriff), schools (Eugene School District 4J), roads (Lane County, City of Eugene), water (River Road Water District), fire (River Road Water District contracting with the City of Eugene), parks (River Road Park and Recreation District), wastewater (City of Eugene), electricity (EWEB)

Reason for Annexation

The property owners requested annexation in order to prepare the property for future residential development. The Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan requires properties to annex in order to receive urban services.

Clay Myers, Chair, solicited *ex parte* contacts and conflicts of interest. There were none.

Paula Taylor, Executive Officer, provided the notice of the hearing. Chair Myers determined there was no objection to the adequacy of the notice of hearing.

Ms. Taylor provided the staff report, incorporating the report and all related materials into the boundary commission record. She reviewed the annexation request, reporting that the annexation involved a single tax lot designated for residential development. The tax lot was contiguous to the main body of the City of Eugene, and the city subsequently requested the inclusion of a segment of Oakleigh Lane. The staff report analyzed the annexation as submitted and as modified with the inclusion of the right-of-way, and found both approaches consistent with the commission's criteria and standards.

Chair Myers opened the public hearing.

Proponent's Opening Statement – None

Public Officials in Support

Kurt Yeiter, City of Eugene Senior Planner, supported the staff recommendation of the annexation as modified. The city added the street to facilitate future voluntary annexations. No street improvements were planned at this time. He suggested it might be more logical to annex the road to River Road, but that would have created islands. He noted that legal counsel had indicated previously the court cases cited were not applicable to annexation.

Ms. Taylor called attention to the notice sent by the City of Eugene to property owners in the area.

Others in Support – None

Public Officials in Opposition – None

Others in Opposition

Jim Seaberry, 1475 Green Acres Road, Eugene, said he was opposed to C EU 08 – 01 and wished to reiterate his testimony for the previous item, C EU 08 – 21.

“Jim Seaberry, 1475 Green Acres Road, Eugene, opposed the annexation, asserting it was illegal. He cited the *Cosco* case in support of his remarks.”

Jim Dotson, 2477 Canterbury, Eugene, averred he would be appealing the commission’s decision because of the Supreme Court decision. He said the court’s ruling was clear that cities in the State of Oregon do not have inherent home rule authority outside its borders.

Those Neither in Support nor Opposition – None

Rebuttal by Proponents

There being no further requests to speak, Chair Myers closed the public hearing.

Boundary Commission Discussion and Deliberation

- * Moved/seconded (Larson/Buchanan) to modify BC File C EU 08 – 21 to include a segment of Oakleigh Lane as recommended. The motion passed, 6:0 (Commissioners Myers, Mulder, Larson, Seidel, Stewart, and Buchanan voting yes).
- * Moved/seconded (Larson/Buchanan) to approve BC File C EU 08 – 21 as modified, based the findings and reasons in the February 7, 2008, staff notes. The motion passed, 6:0 (Commissioners Myers, Mulder, Larson, Seidel, Buchanan, and Stewart voting yes).

Annexation of Territory to the City of Eugene (Hummel)

H. BC File C EU 08 – 08
Initiated by property owner petition
Action under ORS 199.490(1)(c) of the boundary commission law
Received December 21, 2007
Action to be taken by March 19, 2008

Description

As submitted, the annexation area included one tax lot located in the River Road region of north Eugene, south of Beltline Road, west of River Road, north of Horn Lane, south of Santa Rosa Street, east of Dalton Drive, and west of Sunny Drive

Property owner: Judy Hummel

Tax lot: 6700, T17S R04W S014 Map 43

Acres: ± 0.39

Estimate of existing population: 0 (one single-family residential unit)

Existing land use: Residential
Existing zoning in Lane County: R-1/UL, low-density residential with urbanizable lands overlay
Applicable comprehensive plan: Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (acknowledged in August 1982 and has been subsequently amended)
Existing public services to the property: Police (Oregon State Police, Lane County Sheriff), schools (Eugene School District 4J), roads (Lane County), water (River Road Water District), fire (River Road Water District contracting with the City of Eugene), parks (River Road Park and Recreation District), wastewater (City of Eugene), electricity (EWEB)

Reason for Annexation

The property owner requested annexation in order to prepare the property for additional residential development. The Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan requires properties to annex in order to receive urban services.

Clay Myers, Chair, solicited *ex parte* contacts and conflicts of interest. There were none.

Paula Taylor, Executive Officer, provided the notice of the hearing.

John Parsons, 1274 Sunny Drive, Eugene, said that he only became aware of the request to include the right-of-way earlier in the week. Ms. Taylor said the notice Mr. Parsons referred to was the courtesy notice sent by the City of Eugene. The notices required by law were all done in the appropriate time line. The posting of notices along Sunny Drive occurred January 23, 2008.

Chair Myers determined that Mr. Parsons understood that he received a courtesy notice. Ms. Taylor indicated that in the past the modification request generally had been received in time to add it to the posting notice, but that had not occurred. The first notice adjacent property owners would have received was that notice. Ms. Taylor reiterated the notice was not legally required and noted that residents would be able to express their views about the subject. If the commission determined that the residents did not receive adequate notice, they could chose to continue the notice or decide against modifying the application.

Commissioner Larson said if the right-of-way of Sunny Drive was not included in the annexation, it was possible that there would be property owners of properties along the street who wished to annex in the future, but would not be able to do so. Ms. Taylor concurred with Commissioner Larson's statement.

Ms. Taylor provided the staff report, incorporating the report and all related materials into the boundary commission record. She said the boundary commission received a request from the City of Eugene to include the right-of-way of Sunny Drive from Horn Drive north to the existing city limits. She recalled that the commission declined to annex the road right-of-way in a previous annexation on Sunny Drive.

Ms. Taylor briefly reviewed the annexation request, and recommended the commission modify the application to include the road right-of-way.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Stewart, Ms. Taylor said the annexation would be noncontiguous, but it would not create any islands.

Chair Myers opened the public hearing.

Proponent's Opening Statement – None

Public Officials in Support

Kurt Yeiter, City of Eugene Senior Planner, supported the staff recommendation of the annexation as modified. He agreed the notice to adjoining property owners was short and apologized for that. He thought it more logical to include the street now due to the new rules. He pointed out the city could show up at the public hearing and request the modification without any previous notice, but it generally knew when it would request a modification and tried to give notice to Ms. Taylor so she could schedule it accordingly. He said that because of the number of applications submitted to the boundary commission, it had been challenging for city staff to submit the needed maps and legal descriptions. Hence, notice was not mailed until February 1 or February 4. Some neighbors might not have received notice of the request yet. The inclusion of the street would put the street inside the city limits; eventually the street would be jurisdictionally transferred to the city. The city had no plans to improve the street and annexation of the street would not affect adjacent property owners' taxes. He estimated there were 17 properties not continuous to a piece of Eugene who would not be able to annex under the new rules unless the street was annexed. He agreed that the commission could choose only to annex part of the street.

Others in Support – None

Public Officials in Opposition – None

Others in Opposition

Jim Seaberry, 1475 Green Acres Road, Eugene, asked if the city could modify annexation applications through the addition of streets under the new rules. He reiterated his previous testimony.

“Jim Seaberry, 1475 Green Acres Road, Eugene, opposed the annexation, asserting it was illegal. He cited the *Cosco* case in support of his remarks.”

Dave Anson, 2057 Grove Street, Eugene, said the platted property line was to the middle of the street. He suggested that the result of the annexation proposal would be the gradual annexation of the entire street. He said that people could still annex to Eugene if they were adjacent to it.

Grace Parsons, 1274 Sunny Drive, Eugene, said she wanted to be part of Eugene, but did not want to be singled out for partitioning into higher densities. Her remarks were focused on her concerns about development in her area and the potential Sunny Drive could become a street of rental units with higher traffic levels. She recommended that annexation of the entire area be done at once and that one street not be picked on. She submitted written testimony from herself and her neighbor. She asked that the street annexation be put off.

John Parsons reiterated his wife's testimony and expressed concern over the statement in the staff notes that Sunny Drive lacked street trees, and the potential of street tree removal as a result of annexation. He felt that there were other errors in the staff report that called it into question.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Mulder, Mr. Yeiter suggested that there could be more pressure for partitions and infill development if properties in the area were not annexed. Mr. Yeiter believed that over time, more street segments would be annexed. He did not know

how the new annexation rules would play out in regard to the issue of contiguity and street annexations, reminding the commission of the city's interest in street connectivity.

Rebuttal by Proponent – None

Chair Myers recognized Mr. Seaberry for a question. Mr. Seaberry asked if the commission could modify the application given the new rules. Ms. Taylor said yes.

There being no further requests to speak, Chair Myers closed the public hearing.

Boundary Commission Discussion and Deliberation

- * Moved/seconded (Buchanan/Larson) to modify BC File C EU 08 – 08 to include the right-of-way of Sunny Drive to the extent of the Hummel property.

Ms. Taylor reviewed the notice provided by the City of Eugene, emphasizing it was a separate, non-boundary commission process.

Commissioner Stewart preferred not to include the segment of Sunny Drive.

Commissioner Mulder pointed out that the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan dictated that the area would be part of the City of Eugene and she was inclined to support the original modification.

Commissioner Larson withdrew her second. Commissioner Mulder offered a second to the motion. She believed that it would save the property owner a trip to the county to seek an access permit.

Chair Myers favored the original modification proposed and did not support the motion.

Commissioner Seidel said it never had made sense for the city to modify annexation requests to include small street segments. However, she was prepared to support a commission majority.

Commissioner Mulder withdrew her second. Commissioner Buchanan withdrew her motion.

- * Moved/seconded (Mulder/Seidel) to modify BC File C EU 08 – 08 to include the right-of-way of Sunny Drive as recommended in the staff notes. The motion failed on a tie vote of 3:3 (Commissioners Myers, Mulder, and Seidel voting yes; Commissioners Buchanan, Larson, and Stewart voting in opposition).

- * Moved/seconded (Buchanan/Stewart) to modify BC File C EU 08 – 08 by excluding all road right-of-way.

Chair Myers asked Mr. Yeiter to discuss the effect of the motion. Mr. Yeiter said there were 17 properties that might not be able to be annexed to the city as a result of the motion. He said that generally, when the city requested modifications, it was not its intent to harm the applicant, particularly in the case of such small applications.

- * The motion failed on a tie vote of 3:3 (Commissioners Myers, Mulder, and Seidel voting no; Commissioners Buchanan, Larson, and Stewart voting yes).

Chair Myers suggested a street right-of-way modification that included Sunny Drive from the existing city limits to the southern property line of the last parcel along Sunny Drive currently in the city.

- * Moved/seconded (Buchanan/Mulder) to modify BC File C EU 08 – 08 to include Sunny Drive right-of-way from the existing city limits to the southern most corner of the southern most lot along Sunny Drive already annexed.

Commissioner Larson suggested the city annex all the roads.

- * The motion passed, 5:1 (Commissioners Myers, Mulder, Seidel, Buchanan, and Larson voting yes, Commissioner Stewart voting no).
- * Moved/seconded (Larson/Buchanan) to approve BC File EU 08 – 18 annexing territory to the City of Eugene as modified, based on the findings and reasons in the February 7, 2008, staff notes. The motion passed, 5:1 (Commissioners Myers, Mulder, Larson, Seidel, and Buchanan voting yes; Commissioner Stewart voting no).

Annexation of Territory to the City of Eugene (Evans/Castelloe Lane)

- I. BC File C EU 08 – 15
Initiated by property owner petition
Action under ORS 199.490(1)(c) of the boundary commission law
Received December 31, 2007
Action to be taken by March 24, 2008

Description

As submitted, the annexation area included three tax lots located southwest of Eugene, east of Bailey Hill Road, and south of West 18th Avenue, and including Castelloe Lane right-of-way

Property owners: James and Norma Evans

Tax lots: 4800, 4901, and 5000 T18S R04W S03

Acres: ± 16 (± 15.42 in tax lots; ± 0.61 in rd r/w)

Estimate of existing population: 3 (three residential units)

Existing land uses: Residential, vacant, agricultural

Existing zonings in Lane County: R-1/UL, low-density residential with urbanizable land overlay; and R-1/UL/WR, low-density residential with water resource and urbanizable land overlays

Applicable comprehensive plan: Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (acknowledged in August 1982 and has been subsequently amended)

Existing public services to the property: Police (Oregon State Police, Lane County Sheriff), schools (Eugene School District 4J), roads (Lane County, City of Eugene), fire (Zumwalt RFPD contracting with the City of Eugene), electricity (EWEB)

Reason for Annexation

The property owners requested annexation in order to prepare for future development. The Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan requires properties to annex in order to receive urban services.

Clay Myers, Chair, solicited *ex parte* contacts and conflicts of interest. There were none.

Paula Taylor, Executive Officer, provided the notice of the hearing. Chair Myers determined there was no objection to the adequacy of the notice of hearing.

Ms. Taylor read testimony from Dan and Yvonne Leahy objecting to the inclusion of right-of-way in the application.

Ms. Taylor noted that the commission was provided with a copy of a page missing from the staff report, and called attention to the notice sent by the City of Eugene and the list of those who received it. The commission also received a letter from City Engineer Mark Schoening regarding the inclusion of right-of-way and services to the area and a memorandum from Peggy Keppler regarding the modification.

Ms. Taylor provided the staff report, incorporating the report and all related materials into the boundary commission record. She reviewed the annexation request, reporting the city requested the commission modify the application to include Bailey Hill Road and the city-owned parks land. She said that she analyzed the proposal using boundary commission standards and found it consistent with those standards. The application, as submitted, included road right-of-way but no islands; if the boundary commission agreed to include the park land and Bailey Hill Road, then islanded areas would be created.

Ms. Taylor recommended the commission modify the proposal as requested by the City of Eugene. The staff report included a list of owners, who were provided the staff report. None of the properties being islanded were being annexed. The Leahys lived in one of the areas that would be islanded if Island Ridge Park was annexed. The inclusion of right-of-way would create three additional islanded areas. She noted a contact she received from someone living outside the UGB who had expressed concern about being annexed.

Chair Myers opened the public hearing.

Proponent's Opening Statement

David Nichols, Pacific West Engineering, represented the owners, who supported the annexation and the city's recommendation to modify the annexation to include the Bailey Hill right-of-way and city park land.

Public Officials in Support

Kurt Yeiter, City of Eugene Senior Planner, said he had spoken to Mr. Leahy, and expressed support for his willingness to submit written comment. He recalled a similar annexation with similar issues except that the city had been buying park land in the area and the application was a logical way to annex the park property to ensure policy response to complaints from the area. He reviewed city policy related to street annexation in the River Road and Santa Clara areas, and said that because the property was not in that area, staff felt comfortable adding the right-of-way. He reiterated the city's policy about involuntary annexation. There were no planned improvements to Bailey Hill Road and he anticipated no assessments. He acknowledged the late courtesy notice provided.

Others in Support

Darrell Weider, 4121 Castelloe Avenue, Eugene, supported the annexation. He said Mr. Evans had an access road to Bailey Hill Road and he was concerned because of jurisdictional issues related to the maintenance of that road. He would support annexation if it did not increase his property taxes.

Public Officials in Opposition – None

Others in Opposition

Jim Seaberry, 1475 Green Acres Road, Eugene, opposed the annexation on behalf of those who did not. He believed there were too many unknowns and the “road was premature” for “us to be maintaining the road” “not knowing how long it would take to develop the area.” He did not know those facts, but was concerned about such things as a taxpayer.

Those Neither in Support nor Opposition – None

Rebuttal by Proponents

Kurt Yeiter was not familiar with the status of private roads or back accesses. He did not know the status of the road in question. With regard to taxes, Mr. Yeiter said that if a street was annexed, it did not affect the taxes of the adjoining property owners or change the status of the private properties. A property surrounded by incorporated properties did not have its status changed by that fact. If the application was modified to include that property, or the island annexed in the future, the taxes would change.

Commissioner Larson said there had been several rather large annexations in the area in question and asked if the city was planning to hold any neighborhood meetings to address the concerns asked by neighbors. She thought such meetings could be very valuable to answer the kind of questions the commission received. Commissioner Seidel suggested the neighborhood organization would place that on its agenda. Mr. Yeiter noted that neighborhood organizations were provided notice of all such subdivision proposals.

There being no further requests to speak, Chair Myers closed the public hearing.

Boundary Commission Discussion and Deliberation

- * Moved/seconded (Seidel/Larson) to modify BC File C EU 08 – 15 to include Bailey Hill Road right-of-way and city owned property as recommended. The motion passed, 6:0 (Commissioners Myers, Mulder, Larson, Seidel, and Buchanan voting yes; Commissioner Stewart voting in opposition).

Commissioner Mulder commended the concept of having more police service in the area. She supported the modification

- * Moved/seconded (Buchanan/Seidel) to approve BC File C EU 08 – 15 annexing territory to the City of Eugene as modified, based on the findings and reasons in the February 7, 2008, staff notes. The motion passed, 6:0 (Commissioners Myers, Mulder, Larson, Seidel, Buchanan, and Stewart voting yes).

Annexation of Territory to the City of Eugene (Voss/Knode)

- J. BC File C EU 08 – 17
Initiated by property owner petition
Action under ORS 199.490(1)(c) of the boundary commission law
Received December 31, 2007
Action to be taken by March 24, 2008

Description

As submitted, the annexation area included three tax lots located west of Eugene, south of Willow Creek Road, east of Gypsy Lane, and west of Rathbone Street

Property owners: Joann Voss and Kevin and Deanne Knode

Tax lots: 1306, 1314, and 1315 T18S R04W S04

Acres: ± 26.90

Estimate of existing population: 2 (one residential unit)

Existing land use: Residential, agricultural, vacant

Existing zonings in Lane County: AG/WP/CAS/UL, agricultural with waterside protection, commercial airport safety, and urbanizable lands overlays; and AG/CAS/UL, agricultural with commercial airport safety, and urbanizable land overlays

Applicable comprehensive plan: Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (acknowledged in August 1982 and has been subsequently amended)

Existing public services to the property: Police (Oregon State Police, Lane County Sheriff), schools (Eugene School District 4J), roads (Lane County, City of Eugene), fire (Zumwalt RFPD contracting with the City of Eugene), electricity (EWEB)

Reason for Annexation

The property owners requested annexation in order to prepare for future residential development. The Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan requires properties to annex in order to receive urban services.

Clay Myers, Chair, solicited *ex parte* contacts and conflicts of interest. There were none.

Paula Taylor, Executive Officer, provided the notice of the hearing. Chair Myers determined there was no objection to the adequacy of the notice of hearing.

Ms. Taylor provided the staff report, incorporating the report and all related materials into the boundary commission record. She reviewed the annexation request, and recommended the commission modify the application to include the road right-of-way.

Ms. Taylor reviewed testimony submitted by Susan and Fred Hamlin.

Chair Myers opened the public hearing.

Proponent's Opening Statement – None

David Nichols, Pacific West Engineering, represented the property owners. He said the property owners concurred with the staff recommendation and supported the city's modification request.

Public Officials in Support

Kurt Yeiter, City of Eugene Senior Planner, supported the staff recommendation. He said that he had received some calls from residents who were concerned about the potential the streets could be improved prematurely, particularly Rathbone, but there were no plans for improving the streets at this time except where future development might be required to do frontage improvements. The property was further from urban services than the city generally saw. Property owners were aware they would have to extend services at their own expense or wait. He suspected property owners wanted to take advantage of the known boundary commission process. He requested commission approval of the annexation modification. The property owners planned to develop the property and would extend services to the site to benefit both themselves and the adjoining property. He was pleased to hear of the support expressed by the Hamlins.

Others in Support – None

Fred Hamlin, 2977 Gimpl Hill Road, Eugene, supported the annexation request. He recollected his donation of the right-of-way to the city with the understanding it would be made into a public road.

Jim Seaberry, 1475 Green Acres Road, Eugene, favored the annexation. He said that in five years, those properties would not have to go through the new process and it could result in development in the area in five years.

Public Officials in Opposition – None

Others in Opposition

Stuart Ramsing, 87300 Gypsy Lane, Eugene, identified his property in relationship to the annexation. He said the property owners preferred known processes, but the process created unknowns for the neighbors. His wells were inadequate and he was on septic tanks. His concern was about future development. He spoke to the criterion related to the orderly extension of services and maintained that the utilities needed to be in place prior to annexation. If services could not be provided, he speculated that the developer would develop at less intensive levels.

Those Neither in Support nor Opposition – None

Rebuttal by Proponents

Mr. Nichols responded to testimony, saying he had discussed utilities with the owners and they had conversations with the city and EWEB and all parties were in agreement as to what was entailed to get services to the property. EWEB indicated that water service was not currently available at the boundary of the property and the owners and EWEB had agreed on how the extension of water service would occur. In regard to the wastewater system, it was also 3,000 feet away and all parties were aware of what was involved in extending services to the site. A sanitary sewer collector was being enlarged in the vicinity, and until it was completed in 2008 sewer service would not be available to the site. That was the same case as the previous annexation, which faced the same situation and had the same conditions. He suggested that everyone was well aware of what was involved in serving the property.

There being no further requests to speak, Chair Myers closed the public hearing.

Boundary Commission Discussion and Deliberation

Commissioner Larson observed that it was unfortunate the city's public works department was not represented at the meeting. She asked about extending the item to another public hearing.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Mulder, Ms. Taylor said that if the property was annexed and the city indicated services could be provided, it was doubtful the city would let it develop at a lesser density.

Mr. Yeiter said that there was some element of risk. There was very little development potential for properties outside the city limits. Once annexed, if services were not provided and the developer tried to subdivide it, they could put more lots on the property than if it annexed, dependent on septic systems. If the service could not be provided as determined by the county sanitarian, a septic tank could be allowed inside the city limits.

Commissioner Stewart supported the application, suggesting that the issue would be worked out by the applicant and the service providers.

Commissioner Buchanan said the question was the same as for the last hearing item.

Ms. Taylor said that the boundary commission law did not require certainty in the provision of services; it merely required that they could be provided. The Legacy interceptor, once completed, would serve the entire region. She said the commission supported other annexation proposals when the services were not quite ready. She pointed out the commission approved a portion of the Legacy interceptor because it was outside the city limits. In regard to water, she said the same level of information was provided as had been provided in the previous annexation. Those facilities were not in the capital improvements plan (CIP), so the owners offered to pay for them; the same was true for the Hult annexation. Frequently, properties annexed and did not develop immediately. River Road and Santa Clara were unique areas of the community in that services were readily available. It was not uncommon for those services to be several years out. For those reasons, she had no concerns about service provision. She thought it unlikely the developer would chose to do anything less than the full development potential of the property, which was why they chose to bear the costs of the service extensions. The impact on the neighbors was that they would be better served in the future.

- * Moved/seconded (Seidel/Larson/Stewart) to modify BC File C EU 08 – 17 to include road right-of-way and public lands as recommended. The motion passed, 5:1 (Commissioners Myers, Mulder, Seidel, Buchanan, and Stewart voting yes; Commissioner Larson voting no).
- * Moved/seconded (Seidel/Stewart) to approve BC File C EU 08 – 17 annexing territory to the City of Eugene as modified, based on the findings and reasons in the February 7, 2008, staff notes. The motion passed, 5:1 (Commissioners Myers, Mulder, Seidel, Buchanan, and Stewart voting yes; Commissioner Larson voting no).

V. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Court of Appeals Challenge (Florence Annexation)

Ms. Taylor said little progress had been made; the record was still being amended. She had contacted the City of Florence at the commission's behest encouraging that community to participate in the legal defense.

B. Boundary Change Transition Update

Ms. Taylor said four cities, Springfield, Junction City, Creswell, and Coburg, as well as Lane County, had contracted with Lane Council of Governments to help them in their transition processes. Those jurisdictions were in the process of preparing their own annexation ordinances.

C. Other

Ms. Taylor suggested the commission consider meeting one more time as a final wrap-up. She suggested that meeting could occur sometime in April.

On behalf of the City of Eugene, Mr. Yeiter thanked the commission for its time and willingness to review the materials presented to it in such depth. He commended them for their dedication to democracy and noted its impact on services.

Mr. Yeiter presented Ms. Taylor with a map showing the annexations that occurred since she first began to work with the boundary commission, chocolates, and a City of Eugene pin in demonstration of the City of Eugene's esteem for her work. He noted that more than 20 percent of the territory of Eugene had gone through her hands.

Chair Myers adjourned the meeting at 10:40 p.m.

Clay Myers, Chair
Lane County Local Government Boundary Commission

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

LCBC:LCOG: L:\BCMINUTES\MIN080207.DOC
Last Saved: June 19, 2008