

## South Ridgeline Study Public Workshops: All Results Compiled

### April 30, 2007

#### Key

- Numbers in the table indicate the number of participants who contributed that response at a specific workshop.
- Each dot (last table only) indicates one participant's ranking of the conservation measure specified in the shaded row.

Question #1: Do you support any additional conservation of habitat on undeveloped land in the Study area?

	SE Neighbors	Crest Drive	General Public	Churchill	Laurel Hill	Biz/Dev
YES	31	11	7	1	12	1
YES, WITH RESERVATIONS	5	4	1	2	5	3
NO	1				1	1
(No response given)		(2)				

Question #2: What are the most important interests and concerns that contribute to your view of conservation in the study area?

INTERESTS	SE NA	Crest Drive	General Public	Churchill	Laurel Hill	Biz/Dev
Biodiversity (animal and plant habitat) would be conserved	28	16	6	2	12	2
Recreation would be enhanced	7	2	3		4	1
Scenic values would be preserved	7	4	1	2	4	
Neighborhood livability and character would be preserved	19	9	2		9	
Elements of the historic landscape would be conserved	10	6	4	1	1	
Other environmental benefits would be preserved (stormwater quality, stream stability, etc.)	29	9	6	1	10	1
A specific piece of land in the Study area would be protected. Opportunity to protect unique habitat (1 – BD)	5		1		2	1
Positive impacts of conserved land on neighborhood property values.	3	2	1		2	
Other:	9	1	1	2		
Provides educational opportunities	(1)	(1)		(2)		
Specific wildlife species, or amenities e.g. corridors	(4)					
Responsibility for stewardship for the future	(2)					
Watershed, streams and riparian protection	(3)					
Contribution to prevention of global warming	(1)					
Supportive of all of the above, but believe the City's regulatory tools are counter productive and that more aggressive tools such as condemnation may be needed.		(1)	(1)			

<b>CONCERNS</b>						
	<b>SE Neighbors</b>	<b>Crest Drive</b>	<b>General Public</b>	<b>Churchill</b>	<b>Laurel Hill</b>	<b>Biz/Dev</b>
Existing amount of conserved land is enough.					<b>1</b>	
Other high value habitats, for instance outside the UGB, would be a better value.	<b>2</b>				<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>
Rights of property owners would be adversely affected.	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>			<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
Costs and impacts on property taxes would be too high.	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>				<b>1</b>
Loss of developable land / unacceptable level of density in my neighborhood and other Eugene neighborhoods.	<b>1</b>					<b>2</b>
Loss of developable land would contribute to higher housing costs that disproportionately affect lower income people.		<b>1</b>			<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>
Other:	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>
Should not be a barrier to thoughtful development.		(1)				
Goals of the study are unclear.	(1)					
Stewardship by humans is the real issue.	(1)					
Fairness to property owners is important. / Need to balance property owner and citywide interests.	(3)					
Reduced land available is driving people to outlying cities, and creates more commuting, more use of fossil fuels and CO2 emissions.	(1)					(1)
Maintenance required of restored areas.	(1)					
Non-native plants must be prohibited.	(1)					
City departments with development responsibilities should coordinate efforts.	(1)					
Property owners will not have "say" in habitat maintenance practices.	(1)					
Support for conservation depends on the tools used.				(1)		
Support for conservation depends on the conservation value of the property.				(1)		
Concern about Study methodology, i.e. boundaries do not include large private properties and the criteria doesn't address rehabilitating historic prairie OR lack of inclusion of other economic/development-related studies.					(1)	(1)
The PUD requirement already over-regulates						(1)

Question #3: If additional habitat IS conserved in the Study area, what costs of that conservation would be most acceptable? Which would be least acceptable?

	MOST ACCEPTABLE						LEAST ACCEPTABLE					
	SE NA	Crest	GP	Church	LH	BD	SE NA	Crest	GP	Church	LH	BD
A bond measure or other form of public funding to pay for the acquiring additional conserved land.	30	11	8		10	5	2		1		2	
Increased residential density in this neighborhood and other Eugene neighborhoods to replace land lost to residential development.	18	5	7		11	1	7	6			2	2
Replacing land for residential development through expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary that could affect habitats, forest lands or farm lands.	5	2			2	5	23	10	6		7	
Increased costs of housing in the community.	4	2					13	2	3		7	4
Limitations placed on use of private land through regulations.	11	8	4		2		7	4	2		1	3
Other	8	2	1		2		1				1	1
Don't force growth into outlying cities.							(1)					
Cluster development to preserve natural areas.	(1)											
Voluntary measures like education and partnering, neighborhood-managed programs.	(2)											
Take a moderate approach, e.g. focus efforts on undevelop-able land or impose moderate regulation	(2)											
Raise fees (infrastructure costs, application fees) to developers, PUD, other applicants	(1)											
Condemn property and city pay owner fair market value	(1)		(1)									
Raise more funds by eliminating tax breaks to big corporate entities that move to the area.	(1)											
Increased residential density in this neighborhood. <sup>1</sup>		(1)										
Increased residential density close to downtown.		(1)										
Measures such as life estates, tax valuation reduction, conservation easements <sup>2</sup>					(1)						(1)	
Criteria which weights values e.g. watershed protection over habitat if purchase of habitat outside the UGB is feasible and possibly less expensive.					(1)							
Costs are borne primarily by developers of individual properties as they come up.												(1)

<sup>1</sup> Note – this respondent may have meant to identify this as a “least” acceptable cost.

<sup>2</sup> Note – this respondent listed this “other” comment as both a “most” and a “least” acceptable cost.

Question #4: Given your concerns and interests and those of your neighbors that you have heard expressed at this meeting, which approach to conservation of habitat in the Study area can you support?

	SE Neighbors	Crest Drive	General Public	Churchill	Laurel Hill	Biz/Dev
None. No increase in conservation of habitat.					2	2
Increase conservation sufficient to conserve these values only: (SE) Acquire Amazon Creek stream corridors to connect neighborhoods to ridgeline trails. (1) (CD) Preservation of neighborhood character. (1) (CD) Biodiversity and scenic values. (2) (CD) Balance responsibility to provide housing with conservation of high value habitat.(1) (CD) <i>None indicated</i> (1)	1	6			1	
Conservation of these specific sites only: (SE) "All but mine ☺" (1) (SE) <i>None indicated.</i> (1) (SE) The highest of the high value habitats only. (1) (SE) Only those that cannot be preserved otherwise (1) (BD) Land contiguous to public areas and habitat corridors (1)	4				1	1
Conservation of all high value habitats in the study area.	14	5	4	1	10	1
Conservation of as much of the undeveloped habitat in the study area as possible, regardless of its habitat value.	13	5	5	2	1	
Other	4				1	1
Conserve all high value habitat plus enough lower-value habitat to create connective corridors	(1)					
Conserve as much as the City can afford (to buy at market value)	(2)					
Preserve areas residents agree to keep, e.g. areas the neighborhood uses for recreation	(1)					
Identification of/incentives for/rules for alternative areas where restoration of habitat would mitigate habitat loss.					(1)	
Unable to answer until the criteria for selecting among high value habitat is defined.						(1)

Question #5: Which conservation measure or mix of measures would work best for your neighborhood?

	#1: Most Workable	#2: Workable	#3: Less Workable	#4: Least Workable	Not ranked
<b>Voluntary Education and Incentives</b>					
SE Neighbors	●●●●●●●●	●●●●●●	●●●●●●●●	●●●●●●●●●●	
Crest Drive	●●●●	●●●	●●●	●●	○○○
General Public		●●	●●●	●●●	○
Churchill Neighbors		●●			○
Laurel Hill		●●●●	●●	●●●●●●	○○○
Business / Developers	●	●●	●	●	
<b>Voluntary Financial Incentives</b>					
SE Neighbors	●●●●●●●●●●	●●●●●●●●●● ●●●●●●●●●●	●●●		
Crest Drive	●●●●●	●●●●●●●	●		○○○
General Public	●●●	●●●	●●		○
Churchill Neighbors		●			○○
Laurel Hill	●●●	●●●●	●●●●●		○○○
Business / Developers		●●	●●		○
<b>Acquisition and Market-Based Incentives</b>					
SE Neighbors	●●●●●●●●●● ●●●●●	●●●●●●	●●●●●●●●●● ●●●		
Crest Drive	●●●●●	●	●●	●●	○○○○
General Public	●●●●●	●●	●●		
Churchill Neighbors	●●●				
Laurel Hill	●●●●●●●●●●	●	●	●	○
Business / Developers	●●●●				○
<b>Regulatory Strategies</b>					
SE Neighbors	●	●●●●	●●●●●●●●	●●●●●●●●●● ●●●●●●	
Crest Drive	●	●●	●●●●	●●●●	○○○○
General Public	●	●	●	●●●●●	○
Churchill Neighbors					○○○○
Laurel Hill <sup>3</sup>		●●●●	●●●●●	●●●	○○○
Business/Developers			●	●●●	○

<sup>3</sup> \* One Laurel Hill participant ranked none of the conservation measures.