

MINUTES

Eugene City Council
Eugene Conference Center--Two Eugene Centre

July 10, 1995
5 p.m.

COUNCILORS PRESENT: Shawn Boles, Pat Farr, Kevin Hornbuckle, Barbara Keller, Nancy Nathanson, Tim Laue, Laurie Swanson Gribkov, Jim Torrey.

The regular meeting of the Eugene City Council was called to order by Her Honor Mayor Bascom.

Mayor Bascom noted that a public comment session would follow a briefing presented to the council about locating a Hyundai manufacturing plant in the City.

I. BRIEFING SESSION

City Manager Micheal Gleason presented an overview of the responsibilities of staff to comply with State statutes and municipal ordinances. He described the building development process and indicated that it had not been possible to provide written answers to all questions presented about the Hyundai project by July 10 and that other answers were not available in Hyundai's current conceptual stage. He stated that answers to many questions asked would be provided during the evening's briefing and that others would be researched. He concluded that review and oversight would be maintained throughout the development process to ensure that all code requirements were met with special focus on community safety and the enhancement of environmental quality.

A. Wetlands

Steve Purchase, Oregon Division of State Lands Assistant Director, described his agency as the regulatory authority for development on designated wetlands.

Burt Paynter, US Army Corps of Engineers Chief of the Portland Regulatory Branch, said that the Federal Clean Water Act designated his agency to regulate placement of fill in waters of the United States. He reported that public notice had been issued on an application to fill wetlands submitted by Hyundai on June 30, 1995, and that public comment would be included in the review of the application which will focus on protection of the aquatic environment.

Stan Geiger, Senior Wetland Ecologist with SRI/Shapiro of Portland, stated his company was working with Hyundai to develop its wetland permit application and mitigation plans.

Steve Gordon, Lane Council of Governments Principle Planner, made a presentation about the West Eugene Wetland Plan (WEMP), its mitigation strategy, how restoration fits into the strategy, and its application to Willow Creek Industrial Park and the Hyundai project. He reported that the WEMP was recognized as a national model approved by the City, Lane County, Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission and Division of State Lands, US Bureau of Land Management (BLM), US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and US Army Corps of Engineers. He said it provided a context for decisions about wetlands through the following:

- an inventory of available wetland resources.
- assessment relative functions and values.
- citizen input.
- alternative analysis.
- goals, policies, and plan map of areas designated for protection, restoration, and development.

Mr. Gordon stated that the objectives of the WEMP included protection of wetlands, clean water, endangered species, flood control, open space, wildlife, and wildlife habitat. He said that it was also concerned with urban development, recreation and education and that it was managed by the City, BLM, and Nature Conservancy organization.

Mr. Gordon described 1992-95 WEMP implementation activities by referring to a document distributed to council members entitled "Wetland Plan." He noted that the document described a goal of WEMP to be advanced restoration and enhancement as the primary means of compensating for wetland impacts. He reviewed its description of Mitigation Bank credit and cost processes to finance wetland restoration and enhancement and streamline the wetland permitting process. He said WEMP had been determinative in negotiations that led to development of the draft Memorandum of Understanding with Hyundai.

Mr. Geiger made a presentation using slides showing details of the Hyundai wetland permit application. Included were 1966 and current aerial photographs of the site, a wetland map of the site, a diagram of proposed building "footprints," photographs of site topography, and a conceptual drawing of the proposed wetland restoration plan. He said the plan included a five-year monitoring process, would cost \$300,000-\$400,000, and was compatible with WEMP.

Mr. Paynter stated that when a wetland permit was issued by the Army Corps of Engineers, there would be no net loss of wetlands because of WEMP.

Mr. Purchase said that the State had responsibility to protect wetlands. He indicated that the WEMP was unique in the State and nation. He indicated that it would be followed in the State wetland permit process.

Mayor Bascom invited councilors to discuss the wetlands briefing with presenters.

Ms. Keller asked the following questions of Mr. Gordon.

1. Was Willow Creek Industrial Park property not included in the WEWP wetland inventory because access to the private property was not permitted by its owners?
2. Would wetland mitigation proposed by Hyundai affect the "balance" developed in the WEWP?
3. Will all development phases of the Hyundai wetland mitigation plan be paid for "up front"?
4. Will mitigation areas in the Hyundai plan be affected by the fact that they are surrounded by buildings and paved surfaces?
5. What is the City's liability if Hyundai contracts with it to do wetland mitigation work?

Ms. Keller asked the following questions of Mr. Paynter.

1. Is it of concern that the wetland permit application made no mention of chemicals to be used on the site?
2. Will the extensive construction cut to be made in the site's hillside have an effect on wetlands? Will it be required to be noted in the permit?
3. Will there be an Army Corps of Engineers public hearing on the permit application?

Ms. Nathanson asked the following question of Mr. Paynter and Mr. Purchase.

1. Is it true that there would be no fish and wildlife regulatory influence in the review of Hyundai's wetland permit application?

Mr. Purchase replied that every wetland permit was reviewed by 30 State agencies, including the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, and that each had influence on its approval. Mr. Geiger said that a representative from the Department of Fish and Wildlife had not participated in a recent Statewide Interagency Meeting (SWIM) meeting that discussed the application.

Ms. Swanson Gribkov asked the following question.

1. What is the quality of the wetlands on the Hyundai site?

Mr. Geiger stated that the wetlands were a "disturbed agricultural land" type, that mitigation payments would be made "up front," and that Phase I mitigation would take place on site. He said that his firm was working with McKenzie

Engineering to develop a plan to divert additional groundwater for use in wetland mitigation.

Mr. Farr asked the following questions of Mr. Gordon.

1. Is there a time when a mitigated wetland would require no management?

Mr. Gordon replied that it was hoped that such a time would come, but that urban impingement on the wetlands in question would probably lead to continual encroachment by counter-productive plant species.

2. Who would bear the cost of wetland management after five years?

Mr. Gordon replied that the cost would be shared by WEMP partners in proportion to ownership shares.

Mr. Torrey asked the following questions.

1. Prior to the Hyundai wetland permit application, what was the level of community concern about the WEMP?

Mr. Gordon replied that public interest had been minimal before the application.

2. How does WEMP compare to similar wetland plans?

Mr. Gordon replied that the WEMP was the only one adopted by local and State authorities, and the Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Hornbuckle stated that the decision about whether there was a need for industrial land in Eugene should be a political one, but that it had been made on an economic basis. He asked the following questions.

1. Had Nature Conservatory agreed to allow Hyundai to use its land for wetland mitigation?
2. Will the Army Corps of Engineers require an Environmental Impact Statement before issuing a wetland permit?
3. Will clean air regulations allow burning as a wetland management tool?

Mr. Gordon stated that the Nature Conservatory had agreed to allow Hyundai to use its land for wetland mitigation. He said that burning might be an incompatible wetland management tool and that more labor intensive processes might need to be used.

Mr. Boles asked the following questions.

1. What is the replacement ratio established for wetland mitigation?

Mr. Gordon replied that one acre would be replaced with three in enhancement mitigation, one acre with one in restoration mitigation.

2. What is the probability of wetland mitigation success?

Mr. Gordon replied that it was high.

3. Have rare plant and hydrology studies been completed on the site?

Mr. Geiger replied that a rare plant survey of the site had been completed and that none had been identified.

4. Was the Army Corps of Engineers under pressure to process the Hyundai wetland permit quickly?

Mr. Paynter replied that the process had been expedited, but not changed in any way. He said that no political or other pressure to speed the process had been exerted, but that the presentation by Eugene and State representatives had been influential. He indicated that the normal processing time line was 90 to 120 days.

Mr. Boles commented that it would be helpful to know if any elected officials were part of the presentations to the Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Laue asked the following questions.

1. Would additional information about restoration and enhancement mitigation be provided?
2. Can a description of the overall result of mitigation on the site be provided?
3. Are any natural wetlands being replaced by prairie wetlands?
4. Is the wetland permit being expedited because of the WENP?

Mayor Bascom thanked presenters in the briefing panel.

B. Infrastructure

Les Lyle, City of Eugene Public Works Department, described road improvements planned for the Willow Creek area. He said that all of the proposals were identified in the TransPlan and Capital Improvement Program and would support existing land use plans. He indicated that all Transportation Rule Implementation Project standards would be enforced.

Mr. Lyle listed specific proposed improvements, as follows:

- Willow Creek Road (West 18th Avenue to 11th Avenue)
- West 11th Avenue (Willow Creek to Beltline)
- West 18th Avenue (Willow Creek to Bertelson)

- West Eugene Parkway (Phase 1)
- Beltline
- Fern Ridge Bike Path

Mr. Lyle identified amounts and sources of funding for the proposed improvements. He said that the Lane County Board of Commissioners had approved expenditure of funds which it controls

Steffano Viggiano, Lane Transit District (LTD), described changes that could be made to improve bus service at the Hyundai site. He said expansion of service in the area was under consideration before information about the Hyundai development was available because of increased population. He added that revenue from additional riders would pay for increased services.

Mr. Viggiano described current LTD services as follows:

- Bus Service
- Park and Ride Services
- On-Site Trip Planning for Employees
- Subscription Bus Service
- Bikes on Buses Program
- Car Pool Matching Service
- Van Pool Service

Mr. Viggiano described possible employer incentives to increase use of alternate modes of transportation as follows:

- Group Pass Program
- Bus Pass Vouchers
- Subsidized Car/Van Pooling
- Transportation Allowance
- Employer transportation Coordinator
- Lockers and Showers for Cyclists and Walkers
- On-Site Services (food vendor, child care)
- Guaranteed Ride Home Program
- Flexible Work Scheduling
- Compressed Work Weeks
- Telemarketing

Mr. Lyle displayed a stormwater and wastewater development in the Willow Creek area. He explained that increased use by Hyundai would not overly tax the systems if the company would re-use 40 percent of its water.

Mr. Lyle said that a Wastewater Discharge permit was required for the Hyundai development and that it would require continual monitoring by the company and City. He added that pre-treatment of wastewater would be required on-site.

Mr. Lyle said that National Wastewater Management Division and Construction Erosion Control permits were also necessary which required management plans and regular monitoring. He concluded by saying that Comprehensive Stormwater Management Program goals would be applied to the site plan.

Tom Buckhouse, Eugene Water & Electric Board (EWEB), reported that answers to many utility questions relating to Hyundai were included in a June 30, 1995, memorandum from Marty Douglass (EWEB) to Rosie Pryor (PDD) distributed with the briefing material for the meeting.

Mr. Buckhouse said that, as a public utility, EWEB was required to serve all customers in its territory.

Mr. Buckhouse stated that availability of water was not a problem for EWEB, but that its treatment plant was predicted to reach maximum capacity by the year 2000.

Mr. Buckhouse indicated that EWEB did not foresee a need for additional electrical generating capacity since it was possible to purchase all that could be needed on a wholesale market.

Mr. Buckhouse explained that EWEB rates were based on the cost of services provided and that no rate class subsidized another. He added that Hyundai would pay for all costs of providing service to its site. He concluded by saying that EWEB adopted rates for all customers in a public process.

Mayor Bascom invited councilors to discuss the infrastructure briefing with presenters.

Mr. Laue asked the following questions.

1. Why had West 18th Avenue not been previously widened and outfitted with sidewalks?

Mr. Lyle replied that the work could not be justified with existing traffic and impact on wetlands.

2. Would Federal regulation changes require additional electrical transmission facilities?

Mr. Buckhouse replied that they would not.

3. Are changes possible in EWEB McKenzie River water rights?

Mr. Buckhouse replied that EWEB's rights were among the most senior in existence.

4. Have discussions been held with Hyundai representatives about encouraging alternative modes of transportation?

Mr. Viggiano replied that they have and that their initial response has been favorable.

Ms. Nathanson asked the following questions.

1. Will street improvements include those needed in the area or only those necessitated by Hyundai developments?
2. Would transit route changes only benefit Hyundai or also the general public?
3. Can a "real life" example of water re-use be provided?
4. How can the City influence construction activity to minimize heavy truck traffic on residential streets, noise at inappropriate hours and other construction nuisances?
5. What action can the City take to increase safety on West 11th and West 18th avenues?
6. What projects will the City initiate to increase personal safety, convenience, and neighborhood livability in Ward 8?

Mr. Lyle stated that realignment of Willow Creek Road was accelerated by the Hyundai development, but that all other proposals had been requested by area residents.

Mr. Viggiano stated that expansion of bus service would be designed to benefit all residents, especially residents in new housing developments in the area.

Mr. Buckhouse stated that water could be re-used in microchip manufacturing if it was "detonized" and heavy metal particulate matter was removed.

Ms. Keller asked the following questions.

1. Will Hyundai pay assessments in addition to Systems Development Charges (SDCs)?
2. Are SDCs charged to Hyundai dedicated to improvements for its site?
3. Will requests be made of Hyundai to promote alternate transportation modes in addition to posting bus schedules?
4. Is there a "backup plan" for additional traffic congestion on 18th Avenue?
5. Is Subscription Bus Service legal?
6. What is the percentage of LTD cost of service paid by riders?
7. On what is the estimate of a 40 percent re-use of water based? Can it be enforced?

8. Can "teeth" be put into requirements for monitoring of wastewater? Who pays for the training of City and Hyundai monitors?
9. Are segregated wastewater lines to be treated on-site by Hyundai?
10. Is it possible to protect wetlands from wastewater storage?
11. What is the time line for permit granting? Is there a comment mechanism?
12. Have EWEB water rights ever exceeded the available flow?
13. Will Hyundai pay for a new water treatment plant?
14. How can payments be guaranteed if Hyundai leaves the area?

Mr. Torrey asked the following questions.

1. Can the LCOG computer traffic model describe the impact on the West Eugene Parkway and West 11th Avenue?
2. What will be the "real" traffic count on West 18th Avenue?
3. Are there additional measures to slow traffic on West 18th Avenue?
4. Does the City have the ability to adjust wastewater and stormwater permit requirements if it is determined that its best interests are not being protected?

Mr. Farr asked the following questions.

1. What will be the total SDCs paid by Hyundai? Will they all be dedicated to improvements at its site?
2. Will Hyundai pay Payroll Taxes to LTD?

Mr. Viggiano replied that they would at the same rate as all other businesses.

3. What will be the monthly EWEB bill of Hyundai?

Mr. Buckhouse said that a rough estimate would be \$1 million a month.

Mr. Hornbuckle stated that the type of questions being asked by councilors should have been asked before a Memorandum of Understanding was signed. He expressed the opinion that government tended to support the needs of corporations, not its citizens. He said that solutions to societal problems should be provided as easily as those of corporations.

Mr. Hornbuckle asked the following question.

- .. What does the Eugene Charter say about EWEB service to Hyundai?

Mr. Buckhouse replied that the meaning of the Code section was that when a utility provider is given a territory, it has an obligation to give service to all potential users. Mr. Hornbuckle commented that he did not believe such service was required and that ENEB was making an extraordinary effort to be able to provide the required service.

Mr. Boles stated that he believed elected officials primary responsibility was to be a steward of municipal resources and services, not be concerned about the income of its residents. He said that SDCs were assessed to provide for increased demand on City services by new developments.

Mr. Boles asked the following questions.

1. What are the volume discounts provided to large utility users?
2. Will a new water main be required to serve the Hyundai plant?

Mr. Buckhouse replied that one would be required, in addition to the replacement of existing facilities and that Hyundai would bear the cost of both.

3. Why were not adequate water mains installed originally?
4. Can evidence be supplied to support the contention that it is possible to re-use 40 percent of microchip manufacturing water?
5. Is there a way to enforce self-reporting of wastewater monitoring?

Mayor Bascom asked the following questions.

1. How much unused industrial land will remain in the Willow Creek area after full development of the Hyundai plant?
2. Will it be possible to encourage bicycle use for Hyundai employees?

Mayor Bascom thanked presenters in the briefing panel.

On the suggestion of Ms. Swanson Gribkov, councilors agreed to take a 10 minute break in the meeting agenda, and resume a shortened briefing agenda.

C. Incentives/Economics

Jon Jaqua, Oregon Economic Development Department, made a presentation on State economic development strategies, the Oregon high tech phenomenon, and an economic analysis of the impact of the Hyundai development.

Mr. Jaqua explained background and priorities of the State's direction of strategic economic development, such as:

- Commitment to development of the Oregon work force to be the best in the nation by the year 2000 and equal to any nation in the world by the year 2010.
- Diversifying the state's economic base while maintaining its quality of life.
- Establishing an international frame of mind for companies and communities.

Mr. Jaqua said that the Legislature established 13 key industries in the state to lead in its diversification effort, from established natural resource industries, such as agriculture and forest products, to value-added emerging industries, such as environmental services, software, and biotechnologies. He explained that the Legislature directed that the State invest in the priority industries. He reported that the Economic Development Department developed strategies such as high tech vocational training programs, enterprise zones, infrastructure goals, and state tax abatements.

Mr. Jaqua explained that tax abatement was needed to lure large companies to Oregon because a "quirk" in its system taxed semi-conductor manufacturing equipment as personal property.

Mr. Jaqua provided a summary of the economic analysis of the effects of the three-year enterprise zone in relationship to Hyundai, as follows:

- Hyundai would receive \$28.7 million worth of tax abatements.
- Total employment in manufacturing jobs is estimated to be 1,144, or six percent of the county's manufacturing employment.
- Total increase in all jobs would be approximately 2,500, or two percent of the county's employment.
- The increase in population is expected to be 2,270, or one percent of the county's population.
- The total annual personal income increase is projected to be \$123 million.
- Construction employment is estimated to require 600 workers during the construction period.
- Local purchases by Hyundai after it is established will be over \$100 million.
- Hyundai will pay approximately \$1 million a year in property taxes during the abatement period and approximately \$5 million a year in the following years.
- General purpose governments will see no increase in revenue from the taxes of Hyundai as the property tax rate would decrease.
- School districts would should see an increase in revenue of \$350,000 or more each year, more than \$2 million in five years, offset by reductions in basic school support by the State.

If Hyundai applied for and received an additional two years of tax abatement, it would receive a savings of approximately \$39 million.

Jack Roberts, Oregon Labor Commissioner, discussed the kind of jobs and pay levels to be created by Hyundai. He said that no firm figures were available

from the company, but that the "going rate" in the industry would be paid. He said there was high growth in Oregon, but that wages were six percent behind the nation.

Mr. Roberts said that some administration jobs would be created by the Hyundai plant, that they would receive market rate pay, but would have little influence on the overall economy of the area.

Mr. Roberts said that engineer jobs created by the Hyundai plant would pay average annual wages of \$55,000 and more. He guessed that recruitment for them would be done on a regional and national scale, some would come from within the state, and current employees would be encouraged to advance into them.

Mr. Roberts said that operator jobs created by the Hyundai plant would require a high school diploma, be entry-level jobs paying initial annual wages of \$20,000, raised to \$23,000 to \$25,000 and up to \$27,000 to \$29,000 with shift differentials and cash benefits within a year.

Mr. Roberts said that technician jobs created by the Hyundai plant would require a two-year college degree, often gained after employment and paid for by the employer. He said that the annual wages for such jobs would vary from \$29,000 to \$48,000 with comprehensive benefit packages.

Mayor Bascom invited councilors to discuss the incentives/economics briefing with presenters.

Mr. Hornbuckle commented about "job blackmail" and suggested that contributions to city councilor campaigns from large business could be influential. He asked the following questions.

1. Is the real purpose of attracting Hyundai to Eugene to develop its job base or something else? Will the contributors to the Metropolitan Partnership not receive other benefits?
2. If the real goal of the project is to create jobs, would not a public works program paid from taxation of the rich, or cutting the work week by six hours without any cut in pay be better alternatives?

Mr. Roberts replied that he did not like either alternative, but would happily use a more appropriate forum to discuss the issues raised.

Ms. Keller asked the following questions.

1. Would you please supply copies of the relevant policies of the City of Portland?
2. Would you please supply the preliminary economic analysis developed by the Oregon Economic Development Department?

3. Is it possible that citizen tax bills will increase from Hyundai establishing a plant in Eugene?
4. Can you please explain the projected increase in revenue for school districts? What part of that increase will be the result of an increase in population?
5. What would be the economic impact on the area of Hyundai leaving after establishing its plant and attracting a population of lower skilled workers?
6. Why are the wage scales reported possible in Eugene different from those of San Jose, California?
7. Is it true that a large percentage of those holding this type of job in the Silicon Valley are women and minorities?
8. Can you please prepare a report about rumors of anti-employee activity by Hyundai?

Mr. Jaqua stated that he was willing to meet to discuss the issues raised in Ms. Keller's questions, in addition to replying in writing to as many as possible. He commented that the large investment of Hyundai is a "big deal" and is daily reported on in the news in Korea. He expressed the opinion that for the company to "walk away" from such a commitment would be intolerable. He added that the availability of human resources in the Eugene area would be an important factor in determining that Hyundai remained.

Mr. Roberts stated that the wage rates used in his presentation had been based on reports from Oregon companies. He said that investigation of labor relations was within the purview of the Federal government. He added that rumors about Hyundai's poor labor practices are from countries that do not have effective labor laws such as exist in the United States.

Mr. Laue said he was concerned about the accelerated treatment being given to Hyundai permit applications. He asked the following question.

1. What are the depreciation rates allowed for microchip manufacturing equipment?

Art Ayre, Oregon Economic Development Department, responded that the standard five percent depreciation rate was being used and that it was correct to assume it resulted in 20 percent of assessed value remaining after three years of depreciation. He added that a high value was assigned to specialized building features, such as clean rooms, which were not subject to the same rate of depreciation. He said that replacement of equipment within five years was normal in microchip manufacturing.

Mr. Farr asked the following question.

1. Will you please supply documented information about the companies studied to provide wage scale information?

Ms. Nathanson commented on the work of the City Council Committee on Economic Development, saying its recommended criteria should have been considered by the council at the time of the committee's report. She asked the following questions.

1. Would the Oregon Economic Development Department analyze the recommendations of the City Council Committee on Economic Development?

Mr. Jaqua replied that value could result from doing so. He added that he would provide the council with examples of economic development strategies being used in other communities.

2. What balance needs to be maintained in a healthy economy between retail/service, manufacturing, and other employment sectors? Are there formulas for their development?

Mr. Ayre responded that goods and services supporting a community's lifestyle needed to be supported by "exported" products. He said that the Oregon Econometric Model would provide information about retail and service area employment growth resulting from the creation of manufacturing jobs.

Ms. Swanson Gribkov asked the following question.

1. Is underemployment calculated into the economic analysis provided by the Oregon Economic Development Department?

Mr. Ayre replied that studies of "discouraged job holders" have been made, but that rates were not considered completely accurate. Mr. Jaqua said that he would provide available information to the council.

Mr. Boles asked the following questions.

1. Is it possible to devise a method to require repayment of tax abatements if Hyundai leaves the area before a certain length of time?
2. How can the community recoup additional costs to the municipality created by new residents?
3. Can you provide relevant information about the "second paycheck phenomenon" and lower wages?

Mr. Roberts said he agreed that municipalities faced difficulties paying for growth from the current tax structures. He commented that all of the new population attracted by Hyundai would not reside in Eugene and that, consider-

ing the entire area, the new Hyundai plant would not be a dominating influence.

Mr. Torrey observed that the briefing received by the council was accomplishing its purpose. He said that he believed that the City had lost credibility from the process followed in the Hyundai project. He added that he would have preferred to have ten corporations employing 100 workers than a large company such as Hyundai, but that all lawfully enacted ordinances had credibility in both situations. He asked the following question.

1. Has the Oregon Economic Development Department studied how buildings and infrastructure could be used if Hyundai left the area?

Mr. Jaqua responded that companies similar to Hyundai have continued to expand since they were established and no major facilities had been abandoned. He felt any infrastructure or facilities developed in the Hyundai project would be reusable and that the trained work force would be an attraction to many businesses.

Mayor Bascom thanked presenters in the briefing panel.

D. Environment

Dave Nuss, City of Eugene Planning and Development Building and Permit Services Division Manager, reported that City staff had visited Austin, Texas, and Aloha, Oregon, to study code requirement experience with Hyundai-type facilities. He said the conclusion had been reached that expert assistance was needed to develop adequate regulations and technical inspection skills. He introduced Reinhard Hanselka of Advanced Industrial Designs, Inc., Danville, California, who had been hired as City consultant for the Hyundai project.

Mr. Hanselka reported that he had been involved in development of building code regulations for a significant number of high-tech facilities and that he served as a consultant to the EPA. He said that the semiconductor industry was maturing and that its manufacturing processes were becoming well known since its early days when it had produced a bad environmental record. He illustrated the development of codes and agencies regulating the industry. He stated that discharge, emission, and hazardous material standards were becoming increasingly rigorous. He said his responsibility as consultant was to provide support to staff and council to develop standards for and insure compliance in technical matters.

Scott Williams, Quasar Engineering, reported that he was the chief architect responsible for the Hyundai project. He displayed conceptual drawings of Hyundai Phase I and II building development. He described plans for interaction of vehicular traffic, hill cut intentions, building arrangement and design, vista usage, hazardous material storage, and parking plans. He said that Hyundai wanted to be a model citizen in Eugene and welcomed regulation and public scrutiny of the development of its facility.

Steve Greenwood, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), described the responsibilities of his agency in the Hyundai project. He said that the company had applied for a stormwater construction permit and that it would require a plan for runoff control and the elimination of sediment during construction. He reported that there was no public comment period in granting the permit since no specific requirements were made of any applicant.

Mr. Greenwood said that wastewater pre-treatment would be required at the Hyundai facility. He indicated that wastewater inspection would routinely be performed by the City and that DEQ inspections would take place at least annually. He reported that similar facilities currently have successful programs in which acids are effectively neutralized and metals precipitated out of waste.

Mr. Greenwood said that Silicon Valley hazardous waste problems resulted from processes no longer in use in the semiconductor industry. He said strict liabilities are imposed on companies for safe handling, control, and monitoring. He commented that "cradle to grave" record keeping and control are in force for all hazardous materials and that regulations are intended to prevent hazardous waste release and spill, but provide containment in the case of an accident. He said weekly company inspections are required and that DEQ performs regular inspections and when complaints are filed.

Mr. Greenwood described DEQ involvement in "401 Certification," a process designed to insure that wetland fill projects do not violate regulations.

Mr. Greenwood said that a local DEQ office would monitor the environment-affecting work of Hyundai, the City of Eugene, and Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority. He added that the Federal EPA monitored DEQ and that it was important for the public to also "watchdog" environmental concerns. He said that all relevant inspection reports and records were public documents available for inspection.

Don Arkell introduced himself as the Director of Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority (LRAPA). He said the agency was the air emission permitting authority and that it operated under Federal, State, and local regulations. He said that toxic standards were set on a case-by-case basis, using state-of-the-art requirements. He reported that LRAPA's approach was to emphasize pollution prevention, then recycling and reuse, and, finally, emission control through such processes as wet scrubbing and concentration-thermal oxidation. He said that outside-the-area expertise was available and would be used as needed.

Mr. Arkell said that LRAPA permitting was an open process with opportunity for public comment and involvement. He described the status of Hyundai permits, as follows:

- Indirect Source Permit: application received, review completed, public comment period completed on July 19, 1995.
- Construction Permit: application received July 6, 1995, preliminary review begun.

- **Air Contamination Discharge Permit:** application received July 6, 1995. Processing normally takes 45-60 days.

Mr. Arkell reviewed potential criteria pollutant and hazardous air pollutant emissions in Phase I of the Hyundai project. He stated that they were anticipated to be very low.

Mr. Arkell reviewed enforcement, monitoring, and penalty and abatement procedures of LRAPA.

Mr. Nuss reviewed model and local building code regulations relating to the Hyundai project. He said that such uses were H-6 occupancy and included in Section 901 of the Eugene Code, and Articles 51 and 80 of the Uniform Fire Code. He stated that the occupancies were highly regulated, that regulatory agencies were in place, that ongoing compliance would be assured by Eugene Fire/EMS inspections, and that the Hyundai permit applications would be "nit picked" at the Permit and Information Center (PIC) in the same way as all that it received.

Mr. Nuss stated that the work load of the PIC would be increased by the Hyundai project, that the anticipated revenue it generated would allow addition of staff, that consultants would be used as necessary, and that every attempt would be made to eliminate its impact on PIC work on other projects.

Mayor Bascom invited councilors to discuss the environment briefing with presenters.

Mr. Boles asked the following questions.

1. What is the estimated cost to the City of staff involvement in the Hyundai project?

Mr. Nuss replied that determination of the cost was underway and that the information would be supplied to councilors.

2. Can you provide a list of the codes established in the Silicon Valley relative to the semiconductor industry?

Mr. Hanselka said that a list of relevant codes would be provided.

3. Are effective earthquake standards included in established codes?
4. How does "site cut" construction provide increased safety in a microchip facility?

Mr. Williams said that "safety" was not a factor, but that large expanses of level building area were required and would be impossible without excavation in the hill area of the project.

5. What is meant by "siting mitigation" in this project?

Mr. Williams responded that it would involve attempts to make the large scale buildings appear smaller.

6. What is meant by "very clean" stormwater?

Mr. Greenwood replied that the reference should be to wastewater and that it implied that water in that condition would not produce any "upsets" in the treatment plant.

7. Is it possible to determine the annual "environmental burden" of the Hyundai project?

Mr. Greenwood said that frequency of DEQ inspections varied with the type of plant involved and complaints that were received. He indicated that typical inspections took place once a year. He described the explicit and detailed hazardous waste tracking requirements of DEQ and how a plant's "chemical balance" was a tool it used.

8. How can a "deeper level" of coverage of company reporting be insured?

9. Is it possible that there is an over-reliance on the EPA to provide surveillance of the monitoring of a site like Hyundai?

Mr. Greenwood said that recent environmental control changes brought on by political decisions might bring a need for more reliance on local monitoring.

10. What is meant by "state of the art" in air pollution matters?

Mr. Arkell replied that there are no standards for ambient air quality, only for control of emissions and that they are constantly evolving, requiring development of new methodologies and techniques.

11. Can you provide information about the potential emissions of the fully developed Hyundai plant?

Mr. Arkell replied that information was available only about Phase I of the project, but that he would speak to the architect and prepare a report, with the caveat that it would contain approximations.

12. Can you provide an example of how a company violating environmental standards is dealt with?

Mr. Arkell stated that he would prepare a synopsis of work of his agency over the last two-and-a-half years.

Mr. Boles commented that elected officials are charged with short- and long-term decisions and that he appreciated the opportunity to consider the Hyundai project. He said that in the short term he was most concerned with health and safety issues and in the long term he wanted to look at the decision process.

Mr. Torrey asked the following questions.

1. Is it possible to develop a matrix of environmental regulations that are currently in force and those that are recommended at the Wednesday meeting of the City Council?

Mr. Hanselka said that he would try to do so.

2. Will regulations developed in connection with the Hyundai project apply to already existing industries?

Mr. Nuss replied that hazardous materials regulations apply to all industries using such supplies.

3. Will "negligible risk" factors be possible in Eugene?
4. Will it be possible to require Hyundai to have zero emissions?

Mr. Greenwood replied that it was not possible, but that industry control redundancy led to minimal emissions.

Ms. Keller thanked the audience for its patience. She said that she had hoped for written answers to questions she had submitted to shorten the discussion during the briefing period. She said that she was trying to convey questions that she had received from members of the public. She expressed appreciation for the hiring of Mr. Hanselka and expressed the hope that he would realize that Eugene was highly environmentally sensitive. She asked the following questions.

1. Can you provide copies of the chart of existing environmental regulating codes and agencies to the council?
2. Can you provide information about the dangers of providing on-site child care in a microchip manufacturing plant?
3. Why do various Phase I drawings differ? Will such changes continue after a permit is granted?
4. What "worry" makes hillside construction of a microchip manufacturing facility seem safer?
5. What efforts are being made to prevent runoff of polluted wastewater stored on-site?
6. Why are roads designed to cross wetlands?
7. Will metal particulate used in the manufacturing process be filtered out of wastewater from the plant?

8. Will training be required of City and plant staff assigned to deal with waste effluent spills? At what cost? Who pays for the training?
9. Can you explain "strictest liability" standards?
10. Can environmental standard reports from the Silicon Valley be analyzed for their relevance to Eugene?
11. How good are we at predicting future problems?
12. Who are the experts/consultants that will be used when problems of the environment will be under consideration? Who will pay?
13. How much pollution can the area atmosphere hold?
14. Does the type of chemical pollutant matter?
15. Is there a regulatory agency responsible for what "drops out" of the atmosphere?
16. What type of monetary guarantees can be imposed to insure that no pollution is left if the plant leaves the area?
17. What type of inspections will be performed at the plant? Who pays for them?
18. How much of the cost of providing permits for the Hyundai plant will be paid for by fees paid by it?
19. Who will pay for the Hazardous Material training?
20. Will it be possible for the council to have adequate time to study all of the factors involved in this matter?

Mr. Laue stated that he appreciated the description of regulations and agencies presented by Mr. Hanselka. He asked the following questions.

1. Where is the "grave" in "cradle to the grave" control of hazardous material?
2. Where and how will toxic waste from the Hyundai plant be disposed?
3. How will additional wastewater produced by the plant affect the planned improvements of the Treatment Facility?
4. For what seismic level is the plant being designed?

Mr. Nuss replied that the design was planned to seismic level three.

5. What precipitated metals will be produced at the plant?

Mr. Hanselka replied that very few heavy metals are used in the semiconductor industry.

6. What type of acid neutralizing process will be used at the plant?

Mr. Hanselka replied that it was a three-stage process that brought the elements to a very safe level.

7. Can you provide more information about model environmental codes?

Ms. Nathanson said that she would raise issues related to Ward 8. She asked the following questions.

1. Can you describe the real and/or theoretical additional risk for the surrounding area, and put it in context with the risk to areas surrounding industrial activities elsewhere in the City? What actions will the City take to reduce the risks? What will the City do to prepare for specific kinds of emergencies?
2. What are Oregon cities doing about environmental regulations? Does Eugene need special and additional regulations, or means to ensure adequate monitoring and enforcement of those that exist?
3. What will be the long-term impact of new developments? Are the impacts always negative? Can you describe any potential positive impacts?

Mr. Hornbuckle commented that the Hyundai plant was not going to be built in a political ward but a natural wetland. He asked the following questions.

1. Will dioxins used in the Hyundai plant be monitored?

Mr. Hanselka stated that the use of organic compounds was very limited in the semiconductor industry.

2. What happens to the real "citizens" of Eugene if Hyundai Corporation becomes a "model citizen"?
3. Should not environmental standards be raised if Hyundai is committed to abiding by standards that are higher than those that exist?
4. How can more democratic control of the economy be established?

Mr. Farr commented on the positive values of being and serving customers.

Ms. Swanson Gribkov stated that the council needed to assure the safest possible conditions surrounding the development of the Hyundai project.

Mayor Bascom thanked presenters in the briefing panel.

Mayor Bascom reported that John Lively, the scheduled presenter in the conclusion of the briefing had chosen to forego presentation of his prepared comments.

Mayor Bascom declared a break in the meeting agenda.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

Mayor Bascom invited members of the public who had submitted Request to Speak Forms to present their comments on the Hyundai project to the council. She stated that each presentation would be limited to two minutes.

Dave Sweet, 2519 Kincaid, suggested that the mayor and council members were venal and mercenary in their governance. He advocated the protection of the environment and children.

Paul Harrison, 440 West 23rd Avenue, asked if it was appropriate to compromise the environmental qualities of the City for its economic prosperity. He suggested that the Hyundai project would provide prosperity for only a few.

Mike Drennan, 2574 West 28th Avenue, stated that he was very impressed with the economic development progress of the Eugene area.

Jennifer Woodruff, 366 Clark Street, said that the Hyundai project disregarded the need of a healthy future for children of the community. She said that it did not support life.

Mary H. O'Brien, Post Office Box 12056, stated that she represented the Citizens for Public Accountability interest group which was proposing a covenant to guarantee that Hyundai would commit itself to basic community protections, as follows:

1. Inform us of the toxic chemicals and metals Hyundai is releasing into the work place and our community during facility operations.
2. Use the most worker- and community-protective technologies utilized within the semiconductor industry.
3. Fund an independent community monitoring process that will report on Hyundai's toxics release reporting and toxics use reduction efforts in Eugene.
4. Provide secure family wages, benefits, and whistle blower protections for workers in the Eugene Hyundai facility.
5. If Hyundai leaves this community within six years, pay back to the taxpayers the value of the property tax abatements the corporation has received.

Jean Phelps, 1639 Arden Dale, said that she believed children were in danger and most unsafe when their families suffered unemployment. She agreed that the quality of life was most important in Eugene.

Lynn Simons, 655 Goodpasture Island Road, said he believed that health care and child care benefits provided by employers in the semiconductor industry greatly increased the value of employee compensation. He said that it was undemocratic to change rules for specific situations and that he was bothered by the negative characterization that had been given to potential jobs to be offered by Hyundai.

David Stein, Post Office Box 2134, Jasper, urged that the "fast track" that had been provided to Hyundai be halted to allow analysis of wages that would be offered, of the environmental impact of its proposed operation, and of its effect on other quality of life factors. He suggested that no statute of limitations be allowed for liability for negative health effects caused by Hyundai's plant.

Karl Sorg, 2222 Willamette Street #13, said that he was concerned about the lack of public participation that had been allowed in the decision to invite Hyundai to establish a manufacturing plant in Eugene. He suggested that elected officials were inappropriately allowing the staff to run the City.

Michael T. Williams, 3369 Storey Boulevard, stated that he was a residential real estate agent opposed to the Hyundai project. He said he believed there were only costs, no benefits involved.

Jan Cox, 3418 Chancer Way, encouraged councilors to not foster a hostile environment for Hyundai. She said she welcomed the wage scale and business of the company.

Susan Choppy, 440 West 23rd Avenue, indicated that she was distressed that the briefing panel presentations were biased in favor of establishment of the Hyundai plant. She said that tax abatement should not be needed with other benefits that were provided by living in the area.

Joe Kassel, 255 East 38th Avenue, suggested that the Hyundai project was less than an open and honest opportunity. He said that, as a health professional, he was worried about the negative effects of chemical pollution.

Larry Worford, 2375 Panorama Drive, stated that he was the Vice President of Lane Community College. He described the employment training programs of his institution and stated that it supported the Hyundai project because of its potentially positive effect on the area economy.

Bonny S. Bettman, 2191 Friendly Street, said that she supported the enactment of local standards to protect the air and water of the area because of the weakness of State and Federal regulatory agencies.

Jean Tate, 5008 Blanton, said she had a strong interest in Eugene, was environmentally concerned, and believed that controls could be put into place

to make Hyundai a good citizen. She thanked the City Council and economic agencies for their efforts to make it possible.

Derek Johnson, 1145 East 21st Avenue, said that Hyundai should be warned that Eugene is an activist and informed community, that its actions would be screened, and that there is seasonal flooding in the area in which it planned to build.

Patrick Bronson, 861 Adams Street, stated that he believed that population growth was a problem and that it should be discouraged in the Eugene area.

Gretchen Pierce, 3434 Fox Hollow Road, stated that she was an Oregon Development Commissioner and a member of the Eugene City Council Committee on Economic Development. She recommended that the council adopt its recommendations. She commented that Eugene should debate whether it should re-apply to be an Enterprise Zone and, in the meantime, not discriminate against any company that applied to receive its benefits.

Jan Spencer, 283 North Polk Street, said that he did not feel reassured by the presentations in the council briefing. He said he appreciated the questions raised by female members of the council and urged the council to be critical in its dealing with the issue. He urged consideration of other, more locally controlled economic development.

Jeff Miller, 2425 Laryette Meadows Drive, said that planned growth in Eugene had begun many years before. He suggested that the community needed to work together and not use a single company as its "whipping person."

Elizabeth Hopla, Post Office Box 38, Elmira, stated that the Hyundai project had developed a sense of lack of trust. She said she was concerned about the tax "give away" and that the economic situation did not warrant it.

Anne Marie Teters, 366 Clark Street, said she was opposed to giving homeless persons jobs in enclosed factories. She proposed using tax benefits for organic farms, a community tea house, and child care.

Emily Schue, 3122 Willamette, emphasized the importance of providing information to the community. She said that the decision to bring Hyundai to Eugene began in the 1970's and that there was a great deal of public involvement in the planning of the West End Industrial Development.

Trish Binder, 10 Crest Drive #83, said she resented the implication that the process to approve the Hyundai project was completed. She expressed appreciation to the council for its efforts and asked that information related to its investigations be made available to the public at the library. She said she was concerned about the lack of honesty from Hyundai about child care in its factory.

David Zupan, 2209-B Monroe Street, said that the public comment session was flawed. He urged analysis of language used in connection with the Hyundai project because it was an attempt to create false impressions.

John Mosely, 2140 Essex Lane, said he was interested in the long-term economic viability of the area. He supported encouraging investment and creation of work in a positive manner. He said he believed Hyundai would be a good citizen.

James Poyner, 441 East 17th Street #21, thanked the council for the public comment session and emphasized that the process to bring the Hyundai plant to Eugene was not completed.

Steven Frankel, 2000 City View Street, stated that he was a health care professional and that he was concerned about toxics in connection with the Hyundai project. He said he was also concerned about the "sweet deal" that Hyundai was receiving. He said he supported the Citizens for Public Accountability covenant, but would add that Hyundai should be required to provide a written agreement that it would seek to find non-toxic manufacturing methods.

Nancy Glines, 1706 Jefferson Street, stated that she worked at an area vocational training institute and was excited about the possibility of new jobs being available.

John Geyer, Eugene, stated that he was a University of Oregon employee, was impressed with members of the City Council, and needed information about the chemicals that would be used in the Hyundai plant.

Trond Jacobsen, 141 West 19th Avenue, asked why tax abatements were given to corporations when children were hungry. He said that Hyundai had demonstrated contempt for environmental and people concerns.

Jim Forbes, 3800 Vine Maple, said that his experience working with troubled youth made him realize the negative effects of an economic downturn. He expressed pleasure about the area move to a more diversified economy and the chance that there would be for youth to work in the community. He said that the Hyundai project was a "win-win" opportunity.

Moshe Immerman, 674 West 24th Place, expressed hope that decisions about Hyundai would be made with sensitivity. He said he was concerned about the fast way decisions were being made and that the Memorandum of Understanding should be voided. He stated that he had heard that Hyundai had a bad reputation.

Neal Hyatt, 740 Madison Street, reported his experiences with the Union Carbide Corporation. He said he did not appreciate that Hyundai seemed to not be telling the truth about its real reasons for choosing to establish a plant in Eugene.

Dave Hauser, 2904 Wolf Meadow Lane, stated that his relatives reported that no offers of transfer to Eugene had been made to workers at a Hyundai plant that was closing. He expressed appreciation that the Eugene community was ready for Hyundai. He reported that other companies had used the benefits of the Enterprise Zone in the years of its existence and created 900 new jobs. He

submitted written testimony from 31 area residents and business representatives supporting the establishment of the Hyundai plant in Eugene.

Bob O'Brian, 3525 Gilham Road, urged councilors to seek experts who disagree with the development of a Hyundai plant in Eugene for a second briefing session.

David Gusset, 1611 Lincoln Street, spoke about the ecological and aesthetic contributions of wetlands. He said he was opposed to the wetland mitigation plan and tax abatement for corporations.

Tervi Saxon-Hill, 29188 Willow Creek Road, expressed concern about the lack of baseline stormwater plans and flooding preparation in the Hyundai plant. She said the Environmental Assessment Plan goals were not in alignment with the goals of Hyundai.

Sharon Genasci, 2217 Northwest Johnson, Portland, said she was impressed with Eugene residents' support of the area's quality of life. She reported on problems connected with common delivery systems for stormwater and sewage and expressed the opinion that adequate discussion about the issues had not been carried out for the Hyundai project. She expressed concern about air quality issues.

Tracy Miller, Willow Creek Road, reminded councilors that the Hyundai plant would be surrounded in its planned location by apartments, individual housing, and an industrial park. She questioned the proposed placement of an access road to the plant, saying it showed insensitivity to the area residents, was dangerous, and should be on the western edge of the plant.

Paul Engelking, Post Office Box 286, Lowell, distributed a document to councilors entitled "Semiconductor PSNS Effluent Limitations." He said the document summarized EPA semiconductor regulations and he urged that regulations be enacted in Eugene to control the use of toxins not covered.

Russ Brink, 2278 Corinthian Court, said he was speaking as an individual and supported establishment of the Hyundai plant because it would provide needed basic industry employment. He urged councilors to not reject the project when other Oregon communities accepted similar ones with success.

Bob Hughes, 2895 Southeast Glenn, (city not noted), said he was a member of the Oregon Chapter of the American Fisheries Society and urged councilors to consider the potential effects of the Hyundai plant on the Upper Willamette River, suggesting that it would be similar to degradation he said existed in other areas. He said he identified the greatest threat of the project to be additional effluent and warm water in the river.

Adam Anatequi, 115 West 18th Avenue #120, stated that small businesses provided benefits to employees and that he was opposed to City planning processes.

Neil Radgosky, 1637 Orchard, asked councilors to remember that Eugene was a beautiful place. He said he worried that the beauty might be destroyed by the Hyundai project.

George Alvergue, 430 East 46th Avenue, expressed concern that the quality of life available in the area would be affected by an increase in its population. He also expressed appreciation of the planning, political, and social sophistication evident in the Hyundai project. He supported providing employment opportunities to young people.

Hillary Johnson, 2550 Polk Street, expressed concern about the accelerated wetlands permit permitting process provided Hyundai. She asked how many "pollution tax credits" had been received by the Hyundai project.

K. Ray Minert, 2011 Harbor Drive, described the personal experience of his architect son in the Silicon Valley and said additional information was available.

Gerry Gardos, 440 East Broadway #300, expressed appreciation to councilors for "hanging in." He expressed the opinion that many good questions and statements had been presented in the public comment section of the meeting. He recognized the care and planning that had been invested in the Hyundai project and said that economic viability was part of the quality of life of the area.

Ron "Mia" Seymour, 1313 Lincoln #306, reported treatment of workers by Hyundai and questioned the wisdom of rushing to establish a plant in Eugene. He said "livability" was the reason he had moved to Eugene and that he mistrusted Hyundai.

Michael Fox, 330 North Adams, stated that he was a member of the 4J School Board and said that estimates of increased revenue to the district as a result of the establishment of the Hyundai plant during the three-year tax abatement period was \$195,000 each year and \$1,395,000 each year thereafter.

John Newson, 2999 Gilham Road, said that the Hult Center was an illustration of reasons to not trust elected official's commitments. He said he was convinced that electrical service for the Hyundai plant would be subsidized by other rate payers and that its use of water would reduce the amount available for area farmers.

Barney McCabe, 2816 Ione, commented that processes work best when one agrees with their results. He expressed appreciation for the work of City staff in developing the Hyundai project and urged them and the City Council to be vigilant in the process that would lead to its establishment.

Randy Prince, Post Office Box 927, said that lack of sustainable jobs was a major problem in the area. He encouraged development of environmental work in the wood products industry and expressed concern about the adequacy of seismic standards required of the Hyundai project.

David C. Woods, Post Office Box 187, Cheshire, said he was opposed to the Hyundai project because it was not an "honorable" corporation. He said he was concerned about toxic questions and the greed that was involved in the project. He said citizens should be allowed a longer period of time to express their opinions about it.

Dana Siebert, 175 West Broadway, stated that she was an employee of Symantec and thanked the community for its support of high tech industry. She said that diversity of the area's economy was important.

Jerome Hobbs, 2529 Riverview Street, stated that he was a naturopathic physician and requested that Hyundai be required to list all chemicals it would use in its processing and to allow public access to the information.

William O'Brien, 2894 Friendly Street, questioned the objectivity of a survey regarding the Hyundai project report in *The Register-Guard*. He expressed the opinion that technology to control toxins was unavailable.

Jim Craven, 707 13th Street Southeast #275, Salem, stated that he was government affairs manager for the Oregon Council of the American Electronics Association, representing 100 electronics and software companies in Oregon. He discussed the positive role of the electronics industry in the development of environmental law in Oregon.

Kim Krichbaum, 411 West 15th Avenue, said she was appalled by the lack of objectivity in the briefing presenters. She suggested it was evidence of a "shadow government" of City employees seeking to control its destiny.

Eban Fodor, 394 East 32nd Avenue, expressed appreciation for the public comment period. He said he did not think Eugene should participate in the enterprize zone program because it benefited only land owners.

Ruth Dremler, 1745 Fircrest, expressed the opinion that the Hyundai project was evidence that results of the "County Sustainability Conference" were being ignored. She recommended reading *For The Common Good* and suggested there was an analogy between the Hyundai project and the experience of Union Carbide in New Mexico.

Dennis Orem, 2819 Spring, stated that he was a member of the City Council's Economic Development Committee and commented on the appropriateness of City involvement in economic development.

David Wilde, 87016 Greenridge Drive, Veneta, stated that he was a member of the Fern Ridge School Board and suggested that a partnership with his board and other jurisdictions in neighboring areas should be formed to avoid potential negative impacts from the development of the Hyundai plant.

Gerry Kissler, 2122 Kimberly Circle, stated that he was a member of the University of Oregon faculty and that he calculated that the investment of Hyundai was higher than normal for the number of jobs its plant would create.

He emphasized the importance of communities establishing new jobs because there are twice the number of persons entering the job market than leaving.

Kathy Ging, 2678 Harris Street, stated that she was a real estate agent who was not pleased with toxic problems associated with the Hyundai project. She said that the project was evidence of lack of intelligence in growth planning because all negative factors were not being considered.

Ellen Klonden, 2449 1/2 Potter Street, suggested that briefing panels had been presented biased information, but that she appreciated the possibility of testifying during the public comment portion of the meeting. She said that she supported the covenant proposed by Citizens for Public Accountability. She advocated the use of enterprise zone benefits for human service programs.

Stan Paulic, 255 East 33rd Avenue, expressed appreciation for the public comment opportunity and said that many excellent questions had been raised. He recounted his personal experience with chemical contamination when he lived in Delaware.

Dave Jewett, 854 Fairview Drive, stated that he was the president of the Springfield Chamber of Commerce and McKenzie Business Association. He commented that neighboring communities shared the experience of Eugene in the benefits of new area industry.

Dave Rapaport, 1227 West 10th Avenue, thanked councilors for the meeting. He expressed concern over health and environmental hazards potential in the Hyundai project. He suggested that regulations controlled only a portion of those used in the semiconductor industry and charged the City Council with devising those that were more adequate.

Alan Stein, 1049 Almaden, said that the increased incidence of cancer was a concern to him. He said he was upset that a public comment session had not been held earlier in the process of establishing the Hyundai project.

Robert Castleberry, 86701 Franklin Boulevard, reported on attempts to establish nuclear power plants in Oregon and suggested that history should teach that experts cannot tell what future was most appropriate.

Jens Andersen, 260 East 11th Avenue, stated that he was a Certified Public Accountant and had calculated that Hyundai would pay its share of taxes. He listed taxes for which it would be liable during the tax abatement period and said that they would benefit the community.

Gerald McDonnell, 2672 Baker Boulevard, encouraged careful consideration of the Hyundai project and especially the issue of its retention of workers. He said that the company offered an opportunity to diversify the profile of area employment.

Bob Fenstermacher, 899 Pearl Street, said he was concerned about misrepresentation of the business community in comments made at the meeting. He illustrated his point with his personal experience and concern about liveability and quality of life factors.

Curtis Irving, 1142 Willagillespie, said that he appreciated the diversity of the area and celebrated progress made by industry since 1980. He said regulations controlling it needed to be in place to offer it freedom.

Dave Carlson, 1601 Willamette Street, stated that he represented the Eugene Association of Realtors and that it strongly supported establishment of the Hyundai plant in Eugene. He said that "moving the goal posts" for Hyundai would be a blot on the City that would negatively affect it for years.

Mike Schwartz, 2390 Lariat Drive, presented reminders of area rejection of Hewlett Packard, Data General, and Rohr Industries plants in the past. He said that concerns about environmental and safety issues were appropriate and that it was important to look to the future of the area.

Bob Vogel, Post Office Box 7811, stated that he represented the interests of Lane Community College. He described worker training programs being developed by the school.

Bill Royle, 1430 West 12th Avenue #18, said that the reality of life in Eugene was that jobs were needed. He expressed the opinion that enterprize zones were not a drain on the economy but returned more than they spent. He described his personal experience with the need for employment and a concern for the environment.

David Duemler, 820 East 36th Avenue, said that he had heard abstractions and nothing concrete that would make him want to work at Hyundai. He said he wanted pictures of what the proposed building would look like and cared about people who would work there.


Tony Camilleri, 88230 Chita Loop, Springfield, complimented briefing panelists and recounted his personal experience of dealing with Korean regulations. He suggested that opposition to establishment of the Hyundai plant was based on fear derived from not knowing about another country.

John Flinn, 84320 Enterprise Road, Pleasant Hill, said that the quality of life in the area had led him to move to Eugene. He said that Hyundai should be encouraged to develop laser cleaning processes of its chips and recommended that references be secured before the company was allowed to move into the area.

Mayor Bascom asked if others wished to present comments to the council. There being none, she closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 1:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael Gleason
City Manager

(Recorded by Dan Lindstrom)
cc50010.075