

AGENDA
VENETA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2016 – 2:00 P.M.
Veneta Administrative Center, 88184 8th Street, Veneta, Oregon

- 2:00 **I. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2:01 **II. PUBLIC COMMENT**
a. Speakers will be limited to 3 minutes each.
- 2:05 **III. ADMINISTRATIVE**
a. Approval of Minutes for November 9th, 2016
b. Other
- 2:10 **IV. UPDATE ON PARTNER INFORMATION**
a. Lane County Rural Prosperity Initiatives: Kim Thompson
b. City Update on NEEC Activities
- 2:15 **V. PROGRAM/PROJECT UPDATES**
a. Downtown Retail Market Analysis
i. Presentation from RDI: Findings and How to Use the Data
- 3:15 **VI. SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES**
a. Summary of Activity
i. Business Connect
ii. Workforce Development
iii. Business Infrastructure
 - Preliminary Broadband Survey Results
- 3:20 **VII. OTHER**
- 3:25 **VIII. NEXT MEETING**
a. January 11th, 2017 at 2:00 p.m. and the Second Wednesday of Every Month
- 3:30 **IX. ADJOURN**

Times are approximate. This meeting will be digitally recorded. Location is wheelchair accessible (WCA). Communication interpreter, including American Sign Language (ASL) interpretation, is available if notice is given at least 48 hours prior to the start of the meeting. Contact the Economic Development Specialist, Marina Brassfield, via phone (541) 935-2191, email mbrassfield@ci.veneta.or.us, or TTY Telecommunications Relay Service 1-800-735-1232.

MINUTES
Veneta Economic Development Committee
Wednesday, November 9, 2016 – 2:00 p.m.
Veneta Administrative Center, 88184 8th Street, Veneta, Oregon

Present: Linda Boothe, Ryan Frome, Gina Haley-Morrell, Jason Alansky, Herb Vloedman (Vice Chair), Len Goodwin (Chair), Thomas Cotter (arrived late).

Absent: Dave D'Avanzo, Charles Ruff

Others: Ric Ingham, City Administrator; Kay Bork, Director of Community Development; Marina Brassfield, Economic Development Specialist; Steve Dobrinich, Program Specialist.

1. Call to Order

- a. Chair Len Goodwin called the meeting to order at 2:00.

2. Public Comment

- a. No public comment.

3. Administrative

- a. Approval of Minutes:
Linda Boothe made a motion to approve minutes from October 12th, 2016.
Gina Haley-Morrell seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 6-0.
Thomas Cotter arrived after the vote.
- b. Goodwin asked if there were proposed changes to the agenda. There were no changes to the agenda.

4. Implementation of Action Plan

- a. Northeast Employment Center (NEEC) Code
Goodwin gave a brief introduction. Development issues concerning the overlay code within the NEEC were recently brought before the Planning Commission. Specifically, Herb Vloedman acquired a parcel of land on the border of the NEEC overlay district. The plot is subject to a 30-foot setback and planting requirements. Vloedman owns another parcel directly east of the district, which is not subject to the same requirements. He wanted to combine the parcels and build facilities on both, but as the code is currently written, the 30-foot buffer would be in the middle of the two properties. The planning commission had an extensive discussion on the matter and was asked to interpret the NEEC plan. Being constrained by the fact that it was a Council adopted plan, the Planning Commission recommended that the NEEC plan be modified to expand and include the other parcel owned by Vloedman. This would eliminate the need for a buffer in the middle of his property. However, this amendment would require Vloedman to place a buffer on the edge of the property not originally part of the NEEC. Vloedman believes this requirement is an impediment to the successful development of the property. Goodwin said the EDC has no power to amend the plan, but can recommend to the Planning Commission and City Council to reconsider whether the 30-foot buffer is an appropriate requirement.

Vloedman brought forth the document outlining the Veneta NEEC Specific Development Plan (SDP), passed in 1999 and amended in 2002. The SDP

functions as an overlay to Land Ordinance 493, meaning properties within the NEEC are subject to both requirements. Vloedman has property zoned Highway Commercial, so he must adhere to those zoning requirements in addition to the overlay requirements. Kay Bork explained that the SDP is a background document. Specific portions of the document were then incorporated into the Land Ordinance which the planning commission adheres to.

Vloedman said the zoning requirements are confusing and too stringent, which will discourage developers from outside the area to build in Veneta. The requirements are difficult for those unfamiliar with planning language to interpret. He wanted to discuss two requirements specifically: the east end landscape buffer which is a 30-foot setback on the eastside of edge properties that abut residential use zoning areas; and the tree preservation overlay, which is a 20-foot setback along the entire length of Highway 126. The goal is to screen the area for a 300-foot length, leave an opening of 100 feet, and then screen for another 300 feet with trees. However, Vloedman notes these properties need visibility for retail and commercial development. The screening hides what makes the properties most desirable: visibility from the highway. It encourages development at 100 foot lengths instead of entire usage of land. Vloedman's property is C1 zoning and is 46,173 square feet. When the setback overlay is applied, it consumes 13,712 square feet or 29.7% of the lot. The landscape portion of the setback is meant to be dense vegetation (i.e dense trees eight feet tall). Vloedman feels it is a huge burden for the lot. In addition, when Vloedman attempted to incorporate the lot next door to it and the overlays were put in place, they end up consuming 19.1 % of the lot.

Vloedman has discussed the issue with commercial real estate brokers who work in the area. When looking at the document, they see several impediments to marketing the properties. Vloedman said the overlay does not work in practice, and it appears when Bi-Mart constructed their building, the tree setback was not applied and the buffer was not applied when the County put their yard in.

Goodman noted Committee members may agree or disagree with the SDP, but if there are enough questions about the economic development impact of the plan the Committee can recommend to the Council and the Planning Commission that it be reviewed. Bork asked for examples of other impediments within the SDP. Vloedman had a list of various examples provided to him by area brokers.

Goodwin asked staff if the City were to open this plan for update review modification would it typically create a citizen's advisory committee to include members of the development community. Bork answered that it depends how the City wanted to approach the project. If it were a City sponsored project, the City would want a committee of interested parties and people with expertise. In addition, there is an option of hiring a consultant. Ingham notes there is a second SDP within the City for the Southwest Area in Applegate Landing. In that case, the property owners chose to open the review process and brought requested changes to staff, City Council, and the Planning Commission. He explained having a citizen committee is a lengthier process. If it is a City initiated effort rather than a land owner one, it will be in the queue with other priority projects. If it comes up as a land owner application, then there are deadlines and time periods in which the City must respond.

Bork explained that if there was expertise and modification to the plan was very focused and specific, it would be a quicker process. However, a complete overhaul of the plan would take much longer. Vloedman agreed that larger concepts in the plan require lengthier discussion. He noted there could be some short term wins the City could act on in the meantime. There is one lot a party is interested in, but if there is a tree preservation overlay it risks moving forward.

Ryan Frome asked what the original plan was for the document and said there is a conflict between visibility concerns. Ingham explained that during the State's TGM process, planners were pursuing nodal developments with walkable neighborhoods and employment centers. In the Thomas Alternative map, land is designated for commercial, housing, open space, parks, and employment lands. Trees acted as a defining boundary for the nodal development.

Bork said that in recent years the Planning Commission went through a code amendment process so more retail uses were allowed for the NEEC than previously permitted which changes the whole concept of the SDP. Goodwin said the NEEC has been envisioned as true campus industrial with large facilities and very minimal retail. These types of facilities are suitable for isolation. Development of this type of facility has never occurred and one might question whether it ever will occur in Veneta. If one concludes that sort of development will not occur, it may be the wrong plan for the NEEC. In this case, it may be necessary to amend the plan to be more suitable for the type of development that is likely to occur. Linda Boothe explained that when she was constructing the Oregon Dome Facility, the sheriff was not out here on Sunday night and there was very limited security in the area. In Campus Industrial zones, fencing is not permitted and she got dumped on every weekend and also broken into. Campus Industrial poses a risk to property/business owners. Ingham said if there are other property owners who are potentially in discussion with a new business coming into town and they have direct information that the current landscaping requirements may preclude that project moving forward, that type of information could help Council act.

Vloedman asked how to change the SDP in the short term with the Planning Commission. The City Council would likely direct staff to act on landscaping and buffers immediately because they are a short-term impediment to business development. The Commission would likely take a longer approach for working through the other issues. Bork suggested that the Planning Commission could apply a variance for a quicker response, for those who do not have 180 days to wait for a code amendment. The potential variance could be that the plan is no longer applicable based on the Economic Opportunity Analysis.

Goodwin said commissioners might be reluctant to allow a variance without direction from the Council. It is a Council adopted plan, and Goodwin notes the Committee would not want the Planning Commission to go rogue and unilaterally decide to take power and grant a variance. Goodwin suggested the Committee recommends a two-part approach to Council: give the Planning Commission direction to address the 30-foot landscape buffer and at same time consider a broader review of the SDP as urgently as is appropriate when considering other priorities. Bork said Council could direct staff to look at the buffer issue now, and

when time permits, look at the entire plan. If an economic development opportunity arises in the meantime the Council could direct the Planning Commission to analyze a variance.

Vloedman said it will act as a signal if there is action taken on these being identified now. Vloedman supported taking short-term steps that minimizes some of the known barriers and supports having a broader discussion later to have the plan righted or replaced. He said other NEEC property owners are likely on board as well. Vloedman said a sense of urgency is needed to send a signal to developers that Veneta is open for business.

Councilor Cotter questioned the tree preservation requirement. He said he is fine with making it more pliable, but the intent was never to hide buildings. Its intent was to ensure that industrial development did not take over the delicate area on that side of Fern Ridge, especially when one considers climate changes and drought, and the amount of wildlife that uses that area. He does not think it was a bad plan, but that because there was no one who wanted to invest in it, the NEEC has become an eyesore. He does not want to see that area so infused with industrial activity that it is no longer recognizable and no longer a refuge for wildlife. Ingham noted the demand for industrial lands in satellite cities is not there. It was thought the land would be industrial, but those types of businesses do not want to come to Veneta. It will be small scale development, and the City needs to take a new look at the likelihood of what types of businesses will be there.

Vloedman pointed out that the City treats trees, setbacks, and landscaping differently than it did in 2002, and those pieces are already incorporated at the base-level code. Pieces already exist and those protections are in there. Part of the issue is when an outsider reads the code, they may be unsure of how the development process will be handled as they move forward with their projects. When people read the SDP now, they read that there must be a screen of trees adjacent to their business. If readers are not interpreting it correctly, then the City should fix the wording. Cotter recommends the Committee work toward making this user friendly.

The Committee agrees there is a problem with the SDP and will recommend to Council that in the long term they take a comprehensive look at the SDP to assure that it supports economic development. Regarding the 30-foot vegetation buffer on the east boundary of the NEEC and the tree preservation requirement along Highway 126, the Committee will recommend that there be a mechanism to address those in the short term while the plan is being reviewed.

Ingham suggested the Committee ask Chair Goodwin to present the conversation to the Council on Monday the 14th. The Committee then asked, and Goodwin agreed. Ingham also suggested it would be helpful to have a letter from other property owners in the NEEC explaining the impact of the SDP and burdens they face. Vloedman said he would work with other property owners.

5. Program/Project Updates

- a. BR&E Program 2nd Year Activities
Brassfield reported to the group that the City and RDI are beginning second year business retention and expansion activities. She explained the interview process is generally the same as 2015, but there will be eight businesses interviewed instead of 23, and they will be in focused areas. The training session for volunteers will be an hour, and will resemble more of a refresher than a full training. Brassfield has two volunteers committed but is aiming for four. Goodwin volunteered. Vloedman said he can be available if more volunteers do not step forward.

6. Subcommittee Updates

- a. Meeting summaries
 - i. Business Connect
Brassfield updated the Committee on Business Connect's most recent meeting, which was on November 8th. The group is moving forward in the planning process for a spring event to showcase Fern Ridge area businesses, services, and products. Deep Woods has offered to donate their space as a venue. The event will be on Saturday, April 29th in the late afternoon/early evening. The next steps include creating a draft budget and reaching out to 25-30 local businesses to participate. The second part of that will be to identify and hire catering and music/entertainment options.

The group's second project is a small business assistance center. It is on hold until Wineries Without Walls is cleared out. To liquidate the inventory, the Chamber is holding an event on November 30th. After the room is empty, the subcommittee will begin searching for and purchasing necessary furniture and equipment.

- ii. Workforce Development
Brassfield said the Workforce Development Subcommittee will meet on November 10th. The group is advocating to LTD for a fall route change. LTD has offered to present to a group of community stakeholders. Brassfield will extend the invitation to the Committee once a date is finalized.
- iii. Business Infrastructure
Ingham said a few projects are underway. One is a community wide survey on a broadband project. Dobrinich reported that the survey was sent in the November water bill. He has received 70 responses online, and many paper surveys have been dropped off at a box at City Hall and the library. At the next meeting, he will have a report for specific findings. The second project is the downtown retail analysis which is well underway. Ingham said four retail anchors and six commercial real estate brokers have been interviewed. RDI will package all the information found and create a progress report to share with the Committee.

7. Other

- a. Chamber of Commerce Event
Alansky said a social hour to sell leftover bottles of wine at the Chamber will be held on November 30th at 6:00 p.m. There will be refreshments and bottles of

wine will be marked down \$5. Ingham said the Chamber board will be having elections soon, which may encourage more business participation.

8. Next Meeting

- a. The next meeting was confirmed for December 14th at 2:00 p.m. and the Second Wednesday of Every Month.



[Print This Page](#)



Limited staff time, funding, and technical expertise are barriers for rural communities seeking to strengthen their local economies. Knowing this, the newly developed Rural Prosperity Initiative calls for the Lane County Community and Economic Development Division to dedicate additional time and resources toward “filling the gaps” for these communities.

The overarching goal of the Rural Prosperity Initiative is to offer a coordinated support system which draws on local expertise, builds capacity, and caters to the individual needs of each rural community. Or, as Lane County’s economic development manager puts it: “We are committed to assisting our rural communities in the most effective way to improve their economic autonomy. We want to work with them as partners.”

This has long been on the County’s Community and Economic Development Division work plan. But until recently, staffing challenges limited the time spent in the rural areas of the county. Over the past year, staff worked with both the City of Florence and the unincorporated area of McKenzie River to pilot aspects of this initiative. As the pilots unfolded, Lane County staff discovered the best way to

benefit rural communities is to work as partners with community members. The intent expressed by Sarah Means, Lane County's economic development manager, is that this program will change the county's responses to community needs from reactive to proactive.

Fostering connectivity between the county and rural communities will take a lot of work. In fact, Lane County has hired a full-time analyst to take on this initiative. Kim Thompson, who has spent close to twenty years working in the workforce and economic development field for the State of Oregon, will be Lane County's new economic development officer.

Ms. Thompson is already very familiar with Lane County and its communities. She went to school at the University of Oregon and has lived in the county for most of the 20 years following her graduation. Ms. Thompson has a passion for serving Lane County that goes beyond working for the State and now for the County. She currently serves with the Springfield Chamber Board of Directors, Eugene Chamber Economic Development Community, Willamalane Parks Foundation, Springfield Library Board, and is a member of the Florence Chamber of Commerce.

Her service with these boards has allowed her to gain a deep understanding of community needs. Taking on the role of economic development officer with Lane County will bring her even closer to local and rural areas. The position will be very hands-on, allowing Ms. Thompson to travel into the communities she serves, asking the right questions to resolve economic growth issues in rural areas.

Kim Thompson says of her new appointment with Lane County: "Because our county is so spread out and we have so many different geographies and industries, it can be difficult to know what every community needs. It's important to have someone coordinating the effort, who will make sure every voice is heard in the larger discussion. My intentions are to be a strong advocate and helpful liaison between the local communities and the county. "

The Rural Prosperity Initiative was purposefully created to be a nimble and flexible plan, recognizing that each community has different needs and different points of view on how these needs should be met. There is no one-size-fits-all plan when it comes to rural economic development. This is why Kim Thompson defined the first steps she will be taking as: "Sitting down and meeting with all of the communities, getting an idea of what they are looking for and how they want to communicate."

Ms. Thompson is particularly suited to creating partnerships between communities and companies that promote economic growth through education. She has spent the last six years doing presentations to local communities in Springfield, Florence, Cottage Grove and Veneta regarding industry and workforce needs. Several of these presentations have been geared toward helping high school students look at their next steps, once they are ready to enter the workforce.

The Rural Prosperity Initiative is expected to assist all cities and communities in Lane County utilizing direct community involvement. Also, Lane County staff are working with local partners and statewide and regional organizations to benefit rural areas. This is an exciting time for the county and our local communities, so be sure to keep up-to-date with the changes we are making through our email newsletter and our website.

VENETA PLANNING COMMISSION

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

TITLE/TOPIC: OPTIONS FOR THE NORTHEAST EMPLOYMENT CENTER

Meeting Date: December 6, 2016
Department: Community Development

Staff Contact: Kay Bork, Director
Email: kbork@ci.veneta.or.us
Telephone Number: 541-935-2191 Ext.314

ISSUE STATEMENT

The NEEC SDP was developed in 1998-2000 as a means of stimulating job growth and reducing travel to Eugene, Noti, and elsewhere for employment. Since the plan was adopted in 2000, little development has occurred within the Plan boundary. Recently however the City is experiencing an increase in interest from potential developers with a couple of impending development proposals.

Recently staff working on the Market Analysis project received comments from property owners and a commercial real estate broker that the landscape buffer and HWY 126 tree preservation standards may hinder development on certain sites within the NEEC. These issues were brought to the Economic Development Committee for discussion who presented the issue to City Council on November 14, 2016.

As a result the Veneta City Council wishes to re-examine the Northeast Employment Center (NEEC) Specific Development Plan (SDP) standards to identify and amend significant barriers to development. City Council asked staff to present options to pursue a review the SDP and address development issues. Below staff is presenting several options for Council consideration. The options address tree preservation and landscape buffer regulations to accommodate immediate development opportunities as well as long term solutions to update the SDP.

BACKGROUND

Current Standards

1. Northeast Employment Center Specific Development Plan - Landscape Buffer and Tree Preservation Policies

Landscape Buffer Overlay

To mitigate potential noise, visual, and other impacts from non-residential uses at the eastern end of the Employment Center on adjacent and nearby rural residential uses outside of the project area and Veneta UGB, the SDP identifies a landscape buffer overlay. This overlay consists of a 30' wide development setback with a 20' wide landscaped buffer to effectively screen adjacent parcels. Evergreen plants within the buffer area must form a continuous hedge or treed buffer reaching a height of at least 8' within 3 years of establishment, and all plants must be watered with automatic irrigation systems until established. Solid fencing may be used to supplement, but not replace, landscaping.

Tree Preservation Overlay

Existing trees lining the north side of Highway 126 bordering the project area, particularly that area west of Hope Lane should be conserved to maintain the rural gateway appeal of the major crossroads

gateway to Veneta. Abutting property owners and tenants shall preserve and enhance the tree canopy bordering Highway 126, but will be allowed to establish “windows” to provide greater visibility to future businesses and greater solar access. Trees greater than 8” diameter at breast height within 20’ of the Highway 126 right-of-way will be preserved unless determined to be impracticable. Cleared “windows” through the canopy shall be no greater than 100’ in length and must have at least 300’ of canopy between windows unless exempted upon City site review.

2. Veneta Land Development Ordinance 493, Section 4.15(7)(a)(4) NEEC Specific Development Plan - Setbacks

“a. East end landscape buffer: 30' building setback, twenty (20)' landscaping consisting of evergreen plants forming a continuous hedge or treed buffer reaching a height of at least 8' within 3 years of establishment. All plants must be watered with automatic irrigation systems until established.

b. Highway 126 tree preservation setback: thirty (30) foot building setback, twenty (20) foot tree preservation area in which trees greater than eight (8) inch diameter at four (4) foot from the ground will be preserved unless deemed to be impracticable. Cleared "windows" no greater than 100 foot in length are allowed. "Windows" shall be spaced to provide at least 300 foot of tree canopy between "windows" unless exempted as part of site review.”

Options

1. Land Use Review

There are two land use review processes that can address the trees preservation and landscape buffer standards.

a. Variance Procedure

This option would apply to specific development sites that can comply with the Variance criteria. The site in question was discussed by the Economic Development Committee as being severely constrained due to the buffer and tree preservation requirements. This parcel is the only site in the NEEC that is subject to both the tree preservation and landscape buffer standards.

Staff and legal counsel analyzed the site, applying the variance criteria and agree findings can be made to support a variance for the 30-foot landscape buffer, especially since the site is the only one in the NEEC subject to both the tree preservation and buffer standards — a requirement not applied to other lots in the NEEC.

b. Site Plan Review Exemption Procedure

Per Veneta Land Development Ordinance, all new commercial development is subject to Site Plan Review. The SDP tree preservation standards include two exemption opportunities that can be applied during site plan review. The code reads as follows and the exemptions are highlighted:

*Highway 126 tree preservation setback: thirty (30) foot building setback, twenty (20) foot **tree preservation** area in which trees greater than eight (8) inch diameter at four (4) foot from the*

ground *will be preserved unless deemed to be impracticable.* Cleared "windows" no greater than 100 foot in length are allowed. "Windows" shall be spaced to provide at least 300 foot of tree canopy between "windows" *unless exempted as part of site review.*

The Planning Commission would review the proposal and consider the exemptions if justified. Some of the reasons that could constitute an exemptions to the tree preservation standards: 1) there are no trees to preserve, 2) the existing tree canopy is less than 300 feet, or 3) a proposed retail use depends on visibility from passing vehicles along Hwy 126 requiring a reduction or elimination of tree canopy. The burden of proof is upon the applicant to provide.

Minimum Timeline:

Month 1	Month 2	Month 3	Month 4	Month 5
Applicant submits proposal/application	Work Session with PC to review final amendment language	PC Hearing CC Hearing	CC Adoption	Ordinance Effective 30 days later

2. Amend landscape buffer and/or tree preservation standards.

This will require an amendment to both the Veneta Land Development Ordinance and an amendment to the SDP to amend the tree preservation and buffer standards. This is because amendments to the VLDO would have to be consistent with the SDP which was adopted into the code by reference.

The NEEC Specific Development Plan states: “Preservation and enhancement of trees along Highway 126 to provide gateway appeal to the community and project area, while allowing “windows” of visibility for uses bordering Highway 126.”

Staff would prefer to undertake a more complete review of the SDP rather than focus on one specific issue. An amendment process is time consuming regardless of the number of amendments, therefore addressing as many issues at once is a more efficient use of staff time and resources. The code amendment process is somewhat lengthy and the timeline uncertain since the plan is open to public comment. The amendment process may not respond quickly enough to near-term development. Focusing on one specific issues also runs the risk of amending or removing standards that could result in unintended consequences.

Minimum Timeline:

Month 1	Month 2	Month 3	Month 4	Month 5
Work Session with PC to review draft amendment language	Work Session with PC to review final amendment language	PC Hearing CC Hearing	CC Adoption	Ordinance Effective 30 days later

3. Remove the SDP from the VLDO and zoning map with the intention of a future project that would analyze the SDP and VLDO for possible amendments.

This will require an amendment to both the Veneta Land Development Ordinance and an amendment to the Zoning Map. The code and amendment process is somewhat lengthy and the timeline uncertain since the plan is open to public comment. The amendment process may not respond quickly enough to coming development.

Staff would prefer to take a more complete review of the SDP and address all issues at once. There is a risk of removing standards that could result in unintended consequences such as removing allowed uses within the SDP that are not permitted in the underlying zoning.

There is no benefit of removing the entire SDP since the most pressing issue (tree preservation and buffer) can most likely be addressed through the land use review process.

Minimum Timeline:

Month 1-2	Month 3	Month 4	Month 5
Hold one or two work sessions with PC to analyze outcomes of removing SDP	PC Hearing CC Hearing	CC Adoption	Ordinance Effective 30 days later

4. Amend the NEEC SDP

Staff supports re-examining the Northeast Employment Center (NEEC) Specific Development Plan (SDP) to identify and amend significant barriers to development and to determine if the zoning, lot configuration, and development standards will likely impede the desired type of development, and if the SDP supports the findings of the recently adopted 2015 Economic Opportunity Analysis and Veneta Economic Development Strategy: Five-Year Action Plan, 2015-2019.

The outcomes could include amendments to the Specific Development Plan, amendments to development standards, or even a removal of the SDP overlay zone if justified. Any proposed amendments could require amendments to the Land Development Ordinance, Veneta Zoning Map, and/or Comprehensive Plan Diagram.

Staff contacted Bob Parker at UO Community Planning Workshop about the project. Mr. Parker will provide the City a draft work plan and cost estimate to complete an analysis and proposed amendments for the NEEC. The CPW is available to work on the project beginning in January 2107.

Minimum Timeline:

Month 1	Month 2-3	Month 4	Month 5	Month 6	Month 7	Month 8
Staff Prep	Work Session with PC and or EDC to review issues and draft	Work Session with PC and or EDC to review draft amendment language	Work Session with PC and or EDC to review final amendment language	PC Hearing CC Hearing	CC Adoption	Ordinance Effective 30 days later

PLANNING COMMISSION OPTIONS

City Council asked staff to bring back options to address regulations that may be hindering development opportunities on December 12, 2016. Planning Commission is being asked to review the options and provide feedback to staff and City Council.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Conduct a re-analysis of the NEEC with Community Planning Workshop and direct property owner to pursue a Variance to the tree setback and landscape buffer requirements with their development proposal.

December 14th, 2016

Economic Development Committee Meeting

Update: Workforce Development Subcommittee Activities

The Workforce Development Subcommittee (WDS) met on November 10th. Since then, the group invited Lane Transit District's Service Planner, Bret Smith, to give a presentation to community members on December 6th. The presentation explained proposed route changes to LTD's current routes. Smith specifically explained changes to Route 93 (EUG-VEN). The proposed changes (which will be available online at ltd.org) will create a total of 10 weekday trips, three Saturday trips, and two Sunday trips. Currently, there are only two on Saturday and no service on Sunday. Those who attended the presentation seemed pleased with the proposed changes. Renee Jones of LTD will administer a survey for community members to provide feedback on specific times wanted. WDS and the City will assist in sharing the survey to residents. It is worth reaching out to LTD with comments, suggestions, and concerns since they are in the planning stages. Smith and Jones were both adamant that they want to meet the needs of Lane County residents, and that they are responsive to feedback. The presentation slides are available upon request (contact Marina Brassfield).

WDS is also moving forward on three other projects. First, Brassfield submitted a project proposal on December 5th to the Veneta/Fern Ridge Area Chamber of Commerce Board regarding a partnership in creating an online job board. The job board will be tailored to Fern Ridge Area businesses, and share hiring business' open positions and a link to the description/application. The goal is to share opportunities in Veneta with community members, and encourage people to seek employment locally instead of commuting.

Second, Brassfield and WDS members are hoping to connect with Fern Ridge School District. Brassfield and Krystina Burns of FCR have drafted a letter to Chair Board Twinkle Morton to invite her and other members of the School District to a meeting. WDS would like to understand which types of career technical education and career preparedness skills are being taught in area high schools. WDS is also interested in possibly partnering to create a youth engagement program; either student tours to local businesses, resume writing workshops and mock interviews, or internship opportunities.

Third, Brassfield and Dobrinich have drafted two surveys for WDS to review. The surveys are to further understand the skills gap Veneta businesses are facing. One survey is intended for employers, and focuses on what skills are needed for success. The second survey is intended for employees and focuses on what skills they utilize most in their position, what skills they would like to improve, and whether they would be interested in receiving additional training.

WDS will meet again in early January.