

City of Springfield
Work Session Meeting

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION MEETING OF
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL HELD
MONDAY, JULY 26, 2004.

The City of Springfield council met in a work session in the Jesse Maine Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday, July 26, 2004 at 5:30 p.m., with Council President Fitch presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Councilors Ballew, Woodrow, Lundberg, Ralston and Fitch. Also present were City Manager Mike Kelly, Assistant City Manager Cynthia Pappas, City Attorney Joe Leahy, City Recorder Amy Sowa and members of the staff.

Mayor Leiken was absent (excused).

1. Discussion of the Vision and Potential for Urban Renewal Districts in Downtown and Glenwood.

Community Development Manager John Tamulonis presented the staff report on this item. At the July 6, 2004 Work Session, council discussed the vision and plans for Downtown and Glenwood. Council directed staff to return with potentially feasible Urban Renewal District boundaries for redevelopment of Downtown and Glenwood, considering 1) each Urban Renewal District's overall feasibility and 2) limiting the length of time an Urban Renewal District is in place. Council also asked for more information regarding the steps necessary to set up an Urban Renewal District in Downtown and, for Glenwood, the potential for working with Lane County to redevelop Glenwood.

Attachment 1, included in the agenda packet, indicates the assessed and real market values have been growing at rates that include about 2.5 percent for inflation and additional improvement value added to property. Real market values are growing substantially faster than assessed values. Desired projects and their costs, the potential revenue stream, and the duration of the Urban Renewal District are typically considered in selecting a boundary. In Downtown and Glenwood there are numerous projects that could be done depending on the estimated revenue and the duration of the Urban Renewal District (Attachment 2 in the agenda packet). The possible project list for Downtown and Glenwood and initial estimates of potential project costs indicate that Urban Renewal Districts in place for longer periods (like 25 years) would be needed to pay for a full array of projects. However, in a shorter duration (like 20 years) the full array of projects might be included in the plan to cover the potential need for a project during the 20-year life of the plan, but the financial participation level would be scaled back to fit available funding. (So instead of building a facility, the district might instead provide modest financial support.)

Attachment 3 in the agenda packet focuses on the steps for City Council establishing a Downtown district in 2004. Attachment 4 in the agenda packet includes the steps necessary for the city going

it alone in 2004 for a portion of Glenwood already annexed or partnering with Lane County in establishing a district in 2005 covering all of Glenwood.

Mr. Tamulonis said he would be asking council for their preference regarding which of the two areas should be considered for an Urban Renewal District. He referred to a map outlining the areas in Downtown that are being considered for this district. He discussed the real market and assessed value in this area as outlined in Attachment 1, page 1. He also referred to the map outlining the areas in Glenwood, both currently in the city limits and outside city limits and discussed their real market and assessed value as outline in Attachment 1, page 1. He discussed factors that would cause these values to increase, such as inflation and improvements to existing structures.

Councilor Woodrow asked about the area on the map outside city limits in Glenwood. He asked if Glenwood and the Springfield School District receive tax revenue from Glenwood areas that are annexed to the city.

Mr. Tamulonis said the 4-J School District does receive those taxes from the Glenwood area. In the downtown area, School District 19 would collect the taxes. Willamalane collects tax revenue from both the Glenwood and the downtown area. Lane Community College (LCC) and the Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission (MWMC) also collect from the Glenwood area.

Councilor Fitch asked how much the increase in value is from resale and how much is from remodel or new construction.

Mr. Tamulonis said real market value is based on improvements and resale. On the assessed value the County Tax Assessor thought that 2.5 percent was from normal inflation. The balance would then be from new improvements. The values listed on Attachment 1, page 1 are for each area distinctly and then as a whole.

Councilor Ballew asked if these figures are increasing at the same rate or slower than comparable areas in the region. She was surprised with the increases.

Mr. Tamulonis said there is investment going on in that area. There is also speculation in some areas anticipating some change in the future, such as the sewers in Glenwood. At this time, there are limits on what can be done in the Glenwood area. He referred to Attachment 1, page 2 included in the agenda packet that charted the increase in value in both Glenwood and Downtown. He explained the sharp rise in 1995-1996, followed by a large decrease (due to Measure 5 and Measure 50) and the gradual increase from that point to now. He referred to Attachment 2, page 3 included in the agenda packet which lists the estimated tax increment for Downtown and Glenwood over ten, fifteen, twenty and twenty-five years. He discussed those estimates and how those figures could be used to develop a project list over the different lengths of time. These estimates do not take into account any major projects in the areas. He mentioned the project list that was discussed at the July 6 council meeting. If the district were to be in place for twenty-five years, it may generate enough funding for the projects listed, although the associated costs are listed in today's dollars. He discussed the crossing under the railroad which would allow traffic to

get to the south side without waiting for the train. If this project were done, Area Three would need to be included.

Councilor Ballew said improvements in Area One would overflow into Areas Two and Three.

Mr. Tamulonis said that could occur. He discussed industrial, commercial and residential zoning in all three of the downtown areas.

Mr. Tamulonis said in Glenwood, the city has looked at the area inside the city limits and the estimated increase in value over the next ten to twenty-five years. He discussed Attachment 2, page 3 included in the agenda packet, which listed the estimated tax increment for the area in Glenwood inside city limits, outside city limits and the total and discussed each. The project list does not mean that all projects would get done, or that all of the money would be spent on those projects. Over twenty years there would be many variations of what might have to occur. Typically, a plan is written so a project is added for a certain amount of money. Projects are limited to what is in the plan. To add a project, the plan would need to be changed through a vote. The amount to be spent on a project could be adjusted and projects within the plan could be selected as needed. In summary, there would be a certain amount of money anticipated over a period of time and a list of projects with some amounts attached to them. Those projects could be varied over time.

Councilor Ralston said he understood the growth assessment in Downtown, but not in Glenwood. He expected something that isolated the Riverfront area, depicted in yellow on the map. He asked if including Glenwood was one of the options.

Mr. Tamulonis said one option is to include all of Glenwood. He described all three options in Glenwood. He discussed the process for creating an Urban Renewal District and presenting it to the citizens for a vote.

Councilor Ralston said he is interested in seeing the Riverfront area being included in the district, but not all of Glenwood.

Mr. Tamulonis said the value of the Riverfront area, which is about forty-eight acres, is worth about \$10M and there is almost that much in the way of improvement for that area. Typically, the boundary would be expanded to bring in an area that would provide enough tax increments to fund the projects needed in the area. If the area is too small, it is difficult to get enough funds for the projects.

Mr. Kelly said staff is looking for direction from council on whether to proceed on a district formation for Glenwood and/or Downtown and what parts of each. The city charter requires a vote of the people to approve our financing plan for any district council would propose; therefore, this would need to go to the ballot in November. Council will need to hold a Special Regular Meeting in August to hold a public hearing on a proposal. Between now and August 16, Mr. Tamulonis may not have a lot of specifics beyond tonight's information. If council's direction is to proceed with one or both districts between August and the time people vote in November, staff will develop a plan including a project list and costs so the people know what they are voting on.

There is a specified way to draft urban renewal plans, project lists and matching the expected income phased over time. Some of the properties may need common things, such as sewers and storm drainage improvements, and some may need more specific things. Staff would try, with council's direction on August 16 to proceed with a vote on this issue, to develop more specifics. Mr. Tamulonis has said it is best not to be too detailed, but to keep the plan flexible enough to reflect opportunities. More information would need to be available to the people before they vote.

Councilor Lundberg asked about the projects. The way she understands it, the plan has to have specific projects, and there can be no variation outside that project list. On the other hand, we will not have specific projects until after the vote. She asked if the Urban Renewal District Board would put together the project list and when they would need to create that list. We need to let the voters know what they are going to get with their vote.

Mr. Tamulonis said they had a project list at the July 6 council meeting that could support the vision with dollar amounts attached. The plan could outline how to allow flexibility in financing the different projects. The first project might get the most money, the second less, and so on. Financing must cover projects that are anticipated during the period of the district. The funding could be adjusted as needed.

Councilor Lundberg asked if the Urban Renewal District Board would choose the project list.

Mr. Tamulonis said staff would suggest including as many projects as possible on the list. Over time, the board could adjust the funding for each project. The district is not required to do every project.

Councilor Lundberg asked how they could take advantage of opportunities that come along that may not be in the project list.

Mr. Kelly said the board could try to find a way to fit it into the project list. If not, an amendment to the district would need to be made by a vote of the people. Many communities that use urban renewal are not required to go to a vote of the people. The staff would bring an urban renewal plan and project list to the Urban Renewal District Board, which typically consists of the council, for approval. If the board approves the plan, it essentially goes into effect. That plan would have all the maps, financing and project lists. Staff is looking to see if council is willing to go forward with urban renewal. If council would like to go forward, staff will prepare a ballot title for one or both districts for the August 16 public hearing. Staff will do as much work on the plan and project list between August 16 and the vote in November.

Mr. Tamulonis said Springfield must get permission from the voters to go forward with splitting and using funds for this purpose. That approval is needed first. After that, the plan would be sent out to all taxing bodies that are affected by the district. In Glenwood, those taxing bodies include the 4-J School District, Lane Community College (LCC), Willamalane and Lane Education Service District (ESD). Staff would like to draft the plan before the next council meeting that would include most of the components of the final plan. As the Urban Renewal District Board, council has not met yet to see the details of the plan. That would occur between August 16 and September. He discussed the different areas in Glenwood under consideration. The current

Riverfront Plan doesn't conform to the existing planning documents. If council wants to implement this vision, it can't be done just yet, but they can implement the vision that has already been approved. Urban renewal plans have to conform to existing refinement plans and Metro Area Plans. It is very complicated.

Councilor Ballew said she would support the area in Glenwood within the city limits. If the county would put in a separate Urban Renewal District in their areas, that would be fine. There is no point in developing an unincorporated area because sewers can't be put in until they are annexed to the city. As properties are annexed into the city, they could then be included in the district. She felt that Areas One and Two in the downtown area would be the best to start. Area Three would be affected by improvements in the other two areas.

Councilor Ralston commented that he supports smaller areas for a shorter amount of time, maximum fifteen years. He would suggest Glenwood as first priority including the northwest corner and riverfront. If the city is installing sanitary sewer in that area, it would be worthwhile. The ultimate goal is to have them annex to the city. He said the market needs to drive development. If it doesn't make sense, it will not do any good to force something. He is opposed to subsidies and if we try to force it, it could become subsidies. The more complicated this is, the more likely the voters will vote against urban renewal because they will look at it as a subsidy. He supports Glenwood over downtown. He would support Area One in the downtown area if it would spur a convention center in the Island Park area. He would prefer keeping a smaller area to see if it works. If it works, we could expand the area.

Councilor Fitch said she agrees this is something new for our citizens. She would prefer starting with Glenwood. The city is putting in the large trunk line on Franklin Boulevard in Glenwood and that opens access for Glenwood to put in feeder (laterals) lines. Potentially the entire Glenwood area could see massive redevelopment. There have already been several developers and property owners that have interest. The land that is in the county does have to annex; however, if only the part of Glenwood that is in city limits is included in the Urban Renewal District, we would have to go back to the voters any time we would want to change boundaries.

Mr. Leahy said that is correct.

Councilor Fitch said we would need to hold an election and a vote every time additional property would be added to the Urban Renewal District. We have an urban growth boundary to use the land to develop or redevelop to its highest use. We have this wonderful acreage that is between the two cities that is now the responsibility of Springfield. Developers want in, but if they are not allowed into the Urban Renewal District, the district loses the tax increment and the ability to do more projects.

Councilor Fitch said state law requires that residents of mobile home parks must be given one year's notice to vacate. There is concern from some of the citizens in Glenwood who live in mobile home parks that, unless it is written in the Urban Renewal District that assistance could be given to move these residents, those homeowners would be forced to move without assistance. She wants to encourage development, but does not want to overlook the citizens in this community in the process. She would like to meet with Lane County. The central area of Glenwood has

some wonderful residential property and as development occurs it could affect their septic systems. Within an Urban Renewal District, one of the projects could be to put lateral lines down the streets, which could assist these property owners. We have an opportunity in Glenwood to create something more than a piecemeal development. Riverfront property is at a high premium. There are some businesses that may want to locate off the river at their advantage. If businesses relocate in Glenwood, the district could capture that expansion and growth. If we are to convince our citizens one way or another, she feels it is all of Glenwood. She does not want to go back to the voters every time an additional thirty or forty acres are added to the district. The county would need to work with us. Twenty years is more likely, especially when working with the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and other agencies. It could take more time along the riverfront.

Councilor Woodrow asked Bob Keefer from Willamalane Parks and Recreation District if an Urban Renewal District would adversely affect Willamalane.

Mr. Keefer said Willamalane would like to work with the city as a partner to find the advantageous parts for each entity. Willamalane looks at Island Park, the future of Glenwood and a riverfront park on the Glenwood side of the river. Mr. Tamulonis and Development Services Director Bill Grile gave a presentation to the Willamalane Board. The board was very interested in this issue and was not afraid of the proposal.

Councilor Woodrow said he agrees we should include all of Glenwood. He does not want it to be piecemealed. It is important to put in a good plan now and make it advantageous for the citizens that are there or developers who may come into the area. He thinks a twenty-five year time frame would be best to ensure enough money to fulfill the projects. If we go out for fifteen years, and the funding runs out, we have to go back to voters. Tell the voters the amount of money needed up front; don't come back saying it wasn't enough. Voters want to know up front. We need to have the district in place when the property owners need the sewers and stormdrainage. Regarding downtown, he agrees that Areas One and Two would be the best. Area Three would come along following One and Two.

Councilor Lundberg agrees that Glenwood would probably be her priority. Downtown has enough momentum on its own without an Urban Renewal District, although a district would help. She asked if the county would have to go to an election for their part of urban renewal.

Councilor Fitch said they do not have to go out to a vote, but the commissioners must approve the district.

Mr. Tamulonis said, as an example, the county could set up the Urban Renewal District in Glenwood. They could put together a plan on their own and send it out to all the organizations for comment. City Council could return comments and the county could form the district on their own. If the city had interest in membership on the Urban Renewal District Board, it would have to go to a vote. Council cannot approve any plan that has any tax allocation in it without a vote. If the city portion was to be included in the district, a vote would be needed.

Mr. Kelly asked if it would be enough for the city to come up with a plan for all of Glenwood, get the commissioners approval, set up the board to consist of the council plus two county

commissioners, and go out for a vote for the financing part of it. He asked if Lane County would have to go out for their own vote.

Mr. Tamulonis said we can't have an Urban Renewal District outside of city limits without the county's approval. It would be less complicated if the county created the Urban Renewal District and the city came along as a partner.

Councilor Lundberg asked if the city would have any input if the county created the Urban Renewal District.

Mr. Tamulonis said the city would have comment as a taxing body within the district.

Councilor Fitch said in order for development to occur, people have to connect to the sewer. In order to connect with the sewer, property owners must annex into the city, which would take them out of Lane County's jurisdiction.

Mr. Tamulonis said it is more complicated. The tax increment that the county collects would not include the city in that unincorporated area. The city would collect its own share of taxes and the county wouldn't collect the city's share of the taxes as increment for the Urban Renewal District.

Discussion was held on the county and city's roles in an Urban Renewal District in Glenwood and the disbursement of the tax increment.

Councilor Fitch said if we were to create the Urban Renewal District and the county agreed the city would run the district, that arrangement could be written in the plan. The county would authorize the City Council to constitute the Urban Renewal Board. The county would continue to collect the tax they currently collect.

Mr. Tamulonis said the county would continue to collect their same taxing authority as established on January 1, 2005 or January 1, 2006. Even city residents pay county taxes.

Councilor Lundberg asked if that would occur before any decisions are made. It is important for the voters to know who receives the money and who is in charge of it.

Mr. Tamulonis said neither the county nor the city would be in charge of the money. The Urban Renewal District Board would make all decisions on how the money is used. The board members would depend on who constitutes the organization. If the county constitutes the district, they would determine who was on the board. It is possible to have the City Council on the board even if the county creates the district. Staff will have the answers to these questions before bringing it to a vote. There is a meeting later in the week with council leadership, staff and two County Commissioners to discuss the implications. There is also a consultant coming to town to talk to the county about Urban Renewal Districts. There would not be much in the way of development even if something was put on the ballot this fall. Sewers are going in this year, but are not available until later in 2005 or early 2006. Whatever is on the ground on January 1, 2005 would be the base value in Glenwood now or January 2006 could be the tax base. A County Commissioner, the County Tax Assessor and the County Administrator agreed it would probably be six to twelve

months to work out the details for an Urban Renewal District that combined both the city and the county process. Urban renewal in Glenwood does not need to be on the ballot mechanically, financially or politically by November 2, 2004. If council chose to only include city property in the Glenwood area for urban renewal, the November 2, 2004 ballot would be ideal.

Councilor Fitch said from a political standpoint, people are looking at purchasing land and requesting annexation. Without a vision or a plan, less than desirable businesses will come into the area that do not add value. If it is zoned commercial, these requests will come in. Unless council denies any annexation requests during the time prior to a district being put in place, any and all types of commercial development could come in to this area. It will not be the long-term development that a lot of the property owners have been holding out for to create the diamond it could be, rather than just some property between two cities. In a perfect world, we would have a year or two to work out the details. Her preference would be to work very hard in the next two to three weeks to see what problems we might have facing us and whether or not they could be overcome before the public hearing August 16. The answer might be no and we may have to delay it, but we may need to delay all annexation as well.

Mr. Kelly said if council gives staff direction for urban renewal in downtown, they can package that and bring it to the public hearing on August 16. They could also package all of Glenwood as an Urban Renewal District by ballot title for the August 16 public hearing. They could request that county leadership meet with council leadership as soon as possible to see if anything is possible for the November ballot. Based on the conversation with commissioner leadership, a determination would be made as to whether or not urban renewal for Glenwood could go forward to the November 2004 ballot. If it is too complicated, council has a choice on August 16 on whether or not to proceed with downtown and to wait for the May 2005 election. There is a lot of staff work involved and they can begin the work if there is enough consensus from council for staff to move forward.

Mr. Tamulonis said staff could create a reasonable rough draft of the urban renewal plan. It would not be the final plan, because the Urban Renewal District Board would need to finalize that plan. Staff would bring the draft plan and a ballot title on August 16 for council's consideration of whether or not it was enough to put to the voters.

Councilor Fitch asked for an educated guess of whether we could be ready for Glenwood for the November ballot.

Mr. Kelly said staff could be ready with the legal portion such as the ballot title, for council's approval and could have enough by November for the people to vote on. The issue is whether or not the Lane County Commissioners would agree with council's vision, plan, project list, board membership and timing in time for the city to submit it to the ballot on September 2, 2004 for a vote. We cannot control the commissioners' agenda and political views on this issue. Staff could be ready with the mechanics on August 16 with both Glenwood and downtown. The rest depends on council's relationship with the commissioners.

Councilor Fitch said a meeting is being scheduled with Lane County Commissioners, staff and council leadership later this week. She suggested that if the indication from the commissioners is

that their calendar is fully booked prior to September 2 and they cannot meet to work on this before that time, we not have staff put in overtime hours to get this ready. She summarized council's preferences for urban renewal:

Councilors Lundberg, Woodrow, Fitch and Ballew agreed on Areas One and Two in downtown. Councilor Ralston felt Area one was enough. Councilor Ballew wanted a twenty year district. Councilors Lundberg, Woodrow, Ralston, and Fitch agreed Glenwood was the number one choice, if it could happen for the November ballot. Councilor Ballew disagreed, saying it was not something that could be done in time.

Councilors Lundberg, Woodrow, Ralston, Ballew and Fitch all agreed that if the county could not be ready for the November ballot, they would pursue having it ready for the May 2005 ballot.

2. Glenwood Riverfront Plan Implementation: Update on Public Involvement Process.

City Planner Susanna Julber presented the staff report on this item. A 2004 goal of the City Council is to spark redevelopment in Glenwood. The city, with the assistance of grants from the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCDD), has been completing concept plans for the Glenwood Riverfront with the help of consultant Poticha Architects. Currently, staff is preparing a package of Plan Amendments and Zone Changes to implement the Glenwood Riverfront Plan. Part of the plan implementation strategy involves public review and comment. Numerous opportunities for public input on the Riverfront Plan were provided over the past several years.

Staff held public meetings on June 29 and July 1 in order to receive public input regarding the Glenwood Riverfront Plan. These meetings were attended by approximately 25 people.

On July 19, staff held a third public meeting specifically for residents of Ponderosa Mobile Village. The meeting was held at Roaring Rapids Pizza. There was a lot of concern from these citizens regarding planning issues, annexation and possible relocation of their mobile homes. The meetings were generally successful with about twenty people at the first meeting and fifteen at the second. Most of the other property owners are supportive of the city's plan over the next few months. Ms. Julber and Mr. Tamulonis have also met individually with property owners and have had good discussions regarding their plans. The residents from the Ponderosa Mobile Village are concerned they will be put out on the street. Staff tried to explain that currently the land the mobile home park is located on is zoned commercial and is in a mixed use refinement plan area. At any time, the property owner could give the residents a year's notice, whether the city adopts this planning vision or not. Residents understood that and were glad to have a lot of city staff available to answer their questions. It will not be the last meeting with these residents. More outreach is needed to adopt this plan successfully.

Councilor Fitch commended staff for attending these meetings and introducing themselves to the residents. It gave the residents someone at the city to talk to about their concerns. Change is difficult for everyone.

Ms. Julber said she would be back before council in September to ask council to initiate the plan amendments to get the process started.

3. Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) I-105 Reconstruction Project.

Transportation Planning Engineer Gary McKenney presented the staff report on this item. ODOT will be reconstructing I-105 from Delta Highway to I-5 during the spring and summer of 2005. This work will have significant travel impacts to the I-105 corridor and other major street routes in Springfield. Mr. McKenney introduced Bob Pirrie, Area Five Manager from ODOT and Ann Sanders, Project Lead from ODOT.

During the spring and summer of 2005, ODOT plans to reconstruct the I-105 freeway from Delta Highway in Eugene to the west side of I-5 in Springfield. This work will require closures lasting several days on portions of the I-105 system. ODOT is considering various options for implementing these closures.

City transportation staff are working with ODOT and other metro-area agencies to plan and coordinate detour plans and traffic management during necessary I-105 closures. Based on recent experiences with vehicle crashes that closed portions of this route, it has been concluded that the impacts of closing the freeway for both directions simultaneously would be unacceptable. ODOT is currently evaluating options that would, at most, close the freeway for only one direction at a time. However, in the best foreseeable case there will be significant traffic impacts to Springfield streets that parallel the I-105 corridor, such as Main/South 'A', Centennial Boulevard and Harlow/Hayden Bridge Road.

No significant financial impact to the city is anticipated at the present time.

ODOT and city staff presented details of the closure options being considered for the I-105 project and were available to answer questions.

Mr. McKenney noted that on August 16 during council's Special Regular Meeting, he will be presenting an item on the consent calendar. This item will be a request from ODOT to work twenty-four hours on this project. The driving force for this request is because the freeway has to be shut down partially and working around the clock could help the project move faster.

Councilor Fitch asked if that would mean they would have double the workers during the night shift to get as much done as possible during those hours.

Mr. McKenney said a project such as this is very difficult to work on during the daytime. At night there is less traffic to manage, allowing more work to be completed. Working during the night hours shortens the amount of time the road is closed and it is safer because fewer people are on the road.

Maps were on display showing the area this project would encompass.

Mr. Pirrie distributed a Project Fact Sheet regarding this project.

Mr. Pirrie thanked council for allowing him to present this to them. ODOT has been working on this project for five years. He described the project area and referred to the maps outlining this

area. They will be replacing the concrete with asphalt along this stretch of highway, which is about three miles long. The project is scheduled to go to bid in November 2004, with preliminary work to begin in April or May 2005, and a sixty-six day traffic impact on the mainline. They are replacing the concrete with asphalt to help with the noise levels on that portion of the highway. A barrier along the Harlow soundwall would also be included. One of the advantages of this project is the extension of the auxiliary lanes that will help to eliminate weave traffic movement. He pointed out the areas on the map where these auxiliary lanes would be constructed.

Mr. Pirrie said they have had good results offering incentives to contractors to get projects done more quickly. ODOT would like this project to get done in less than sixty-six days. One piece that is critical is that when adding the auxiliary lane, especially over the seven two lane bridges, the entire lane must be closed. There will be an eight day closure east bound and an eight day closure west bound to give the contractor time to get in, do the work and get out. He discussed the incentives which may cut down the time needed. ODOT has worked with Fire and Emergency Services, the Police, and county and city staff to find the best option to get this work done in the best possible way. He described how the contractor would get in to work on the highway using a work ramp. This work ramp would also allow fire and emergency services to get through if there was an accident along the route. They are still working through the traffic details and are hoping to keep one lane open at all times, even during the major closures.

Councilor Fitch asked when the work on the project would occur.

Mr. Pirrie said that would depend on the contractor and how they schedule their work. The sixty six days must be completed by August 1, 2005. That will allow them to be off the road prior to the Lane County Fair and sports activities in the area. It could start near May 20, 2005. Some work, such as tree removal, could occur this fall or winter. They are also looking at a three-day closure of the Delta ramp to allow the replacement of the concrete. ODOT has worked with the trucking industry to find alternative routes for them. They are in agreement that this plan could work.

Councilor Lundberg asked if the dates of the closures would be constant.

Mr. Pirrie said the contractor would probably take a break between the closure of the east and west bound lanes.

Councilor Ralston asked if they would have two-way traffic going on one side when the other side is closed.

Mr. Pirrie said they looked at that option, but with the crossover, if they have two-way traffic on the westbound lane, it eliminates the opportunity for the contractor to get up there while the crossover is happening. Also the fire and emergency services staff did not favor that option. There will be alternate routes.

Ms. Sanders described some of the alternate routes.

Councilor Ballew asked why they were replacing concrete with asphalt, when concrete lasts so much longer.

Mr. Pirrie said they received input from the public and there was high demand from elected officials and residents of the Harlow area to put the asphalt mix over the concrete because it is perceived to be quieter.

Mr. Kelly said there will be a significant impact on our streets and Mr. McKenney can give council a brief description of those impacts. This will be slightly better than emergency situations that have closed off roadways because of the planning, but it will be a significant impact.

Mr. McKenney said city staff are working with ODOT staff to reduce the impacts to the city's streets as much as possible. Detour signs will be in place and analysis work will be done to determine how the city can adjust traffic signals on the other cross town streets to accommodate the substantial amount of traffic that will be generated when one direction of the freeway is closed. By using signs to direct people through the preferred alternate routes, it will help with traffic congestion.

Mr. Pirrie said the main line paving work will be completed by August 1, 2005. There will be additional work along the shoulder, sign bridge work and clean-up after that date. The main traffic impact will be during the sixty-six days ending August 1, 2005.

Mr. McKenney said there was concern about lane closures that could interfere with Springfield's Filbert Festival the first weekend of August. It would appear the lane closures would be completed prior to this event.

Mr. Pirrie said he is not sure of when the eight day closures will occur during the sixty-six days. ODOT is asking for twenty-one days notice so they can notify the trucking industry. He discussed possible scenarios of the work schedule. Tonight's meeting is the twenty-fifth meeting ODOT staff has had with different groups. The goal is to put out a list of dates these closures will occur to allow citizens the opportunity to look at other transportation options or use of vacation time during the closures.

Councilor Woodrow asked if the heavy haul traffic, which is currently using detours due to the current bridge construction, would be out by that time.

Mr. Pirrie said that is correct. ODOT anticipates that I-5 traffic will be completely open by September 2004. ODOT has learned that the manufactured home industry must transport their homes down Delta Highway and go south on I-5 toward California. They have also learned about other oversize vehicles. Their goal is to give fair warning regarding the closures to lessen the impact as much as possible.

Councilor Lundberg reminded them of school schedules and the problems that occurred with the tanker trunk incident. It is important to give schools routing patterns if these closures occur while school is in session.

Mr. Pirrie said they learned from tanker experience. ODOT will work with schools to make certain traffic can flow.

Councilor Ralston asked if they were adding additional barriers.

Mr. Pirrie said this was a request from the Harlow neighbors and political leaders for additional barriers. The additional barrier will run parallel with Harlow wall.

Ms. Sanders said the sixty-six days includes the major traffic impacts. The project will actually last from about February 1, 2005 through November 2005. A large portion of that work will be nighttime work. She clarified that the closures would be one direction, which would be two lanes, closed during the two eight-day periods.

Councilor Fitch said twenty-one days is not enough notice. She would like to know at the beginning of the sixty-six days when the bridge would be closed. The additional notice is needed to allow opportunities for people to take the right time off.

Ms. Sanders said they could update the schedule daily or weekly, but because of the incentives, the schedule could change slightly.

Councilor Woodrow asked which end of the project the contractor would start.

Mr. Pirrie said they don't know that yet because the contractor has not yet been chosen. ODOT is hopeful an Oregon contractor will bid and receive this contract, although some Oregon contractors are not large enough to run two crews. ODOT staff have one opinion about what should be done first, but it will be up to the contractor to make the final determination. As soon as ODOT knows the schedule they will get the word out. ODOT cannot hold the contractor to specific dates to do the work or the incentive is ineffective.

Councilor Fitch asked if this would be bid as one project or multiple projects.

Mr. Pirrie said it would be bid as one project.

Councilor Woodrow asked about local contractors.

Mr. Pirrie said some have subcontractors that can team up.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:08 pm.

Minutes Recorder – Amy Sowa

Sidney W. Leiken
Mayor

Attest:

Amy Sowa
City Recorder