

City of Springfield  
Regular Meeting

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF  
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL HELD  
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2004

The City of Springfield council met in regular session in the Council Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday, November 15, 2004, at 7:00 p.m., with Mayor Leiken presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Mayor Leiken, Councilors Ballew, Lundberg, Fitch, Ralston and Woodrow. 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mayor Leiken.

BUSINESS FROM COUNCIL

1. Ward 6 City Council Position Appointment.

City Manager Mike Kelly presented the staff report on this item. Due to the resignation of Councilor Tim Malloy, in March 2004, the Ward 6 City Council position is vacant. Four candidates ran in the May 18, 2004 Primary Election and two candidates, Debi Baker and Joseph Pishioneri, received the majority of votes during that election. Ms. Baker and Mr. Pishioneri continued as candidates to the November 2, 2004 General Election.

Joseph Pishioneri received the majority of votes at the November 2, 2004 General Election, with a term to begin in January of 2005. Because the position has been vacant since March, council leadership recommends appointing Mr. Pishioneri to the position effective immediately and expiring in January 2005, at which time Mr. Pishioneri will take the Oath of Office as the elected councilor. According to the City Council's operating policies and procedures, this appointment must now be ratified.

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR FITCH WITH A SECOND BY COUNCILOR BALLEW TO APPOINT JOE PISHIONERI TO THE POSITION OF WARD 6 COUNCILOR FOR A TERM TO EXPIRE ON JANUARY 17, 2005. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5 FOR AND 0 AGAINST.

City Attorney Meg Kieran administered the Oath of Office to Joe Pishioneri.

Councilor Pishioneri joined the rest of the council for the remainder of the meeting.

SPRINGFIELD UPBEAT

1. Bookmark Contest Winners Recognition.

Springfield Librarian Judy Harold said for over twenty years the Springfield Public Library has celebrated Children's Book Week to promote reading and the love of books. For over twenty years the Springfield Public Library has had a bookmark contest during Children's Book Week. Patrons of the Library often look for the bookmarks created by the children. The winners get recognition by the Mayor and Council and their bookmark is printed professionally. Those bookmarks are available at the Library throughout the year and are distributed at tours and other events the Library is involved in.

Ms. Harold introduced the following bookmark winners:

- Hillary Smith, Kindergarten – Homeschool
- Mariana Nunez, Second Grade – Moffitt Elementary
- Savannah Knebel, Third Grade – Homeschool
- Tess Lindbloom, Fourth Grade – Page Elementary
- Alexis Amatisto, Fifth Grade – Thurston Elementary
- Becca Stanton, Eighth Grade – Briggs Middle

Ms. Harold presented each winning student with a certificate and the Mayor shook their hands and congratulated them.

2. Recognition for Len Goodwin for 10 Years Service to the City of Springfield.

City Manager Mike Kelly recognized Len Goodwin for his 10 years of service to the City of Springfield. Mr. Kelly discussed Len's many accomplishments here in Springfield and his prior accomplishments as an attorney in New York. Mr. Kelly talked about the many interests Mr. Goodwin has outside of his job including wine collecting and being an Oregon Duck fan. Mr. Kelly presented Mr. Goodwin with a framed certificate acknowledging his years of service with the City of Springfield.

CONSENT CALENDAR

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR FITCH WITH A SECOND BY COUNCILOR BALLEW TO APPROVE THE CONSENT CALENDAR. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6 FOR AND 0 AGAINST.

1. Claims

- a. Approval of the October 2004, Disbursements for Approval.

2. Minutes

- a. October 11, 2004 – Work Session
- b. October 18, 2004 – Regular Meeting
- c. October 25, 2004 – Work Session
- d. October 28, 2004 – Joint Elected Officials Work Session
- e. October 28, 2004 – Joint Elected Officials Public Hearing
- f. November 1, 2004 – Special Regular Meeting

3. Resolutions

- a. RESOLUTION NO. 04-43– A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE EUGENE-SPRINGFIELD METRO AREA MULTI-HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN.
- b. RESOLUTION NO. 04-44 – A RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT PROJECT P20295 FROM WILDISH CONSTRUCTION COMPANY IN THE AMOUNT OF \$128,098.95.
- c. RESOLUTION NO. 04-45 – A RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT PROJECT P20404 FROM EUGENE SAND AND GRAVEL IN THE AMOUNT OF \$97,966.12.

4. Ordinances

- a. ORDINANCE NO. 6099 – AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING THE WILLAMALANE PARK AND RECREATION COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AS A REFINEMENT PLAN OF THE EUGENE-SPRINGFIELD METROPOLITAN AREA GENERAL PLAN (METRO PLAN) FOR APPLICATION WITHIN THE AREA OF PLANNING JURISDICTION OF THE CITY OF SPRINGFIELD AND ADOPTING A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE.
- b. ORDINANCE NO. 6100 – AN ORDINANCE VACATING A 5’ x 140’ PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWESTERN CORNER OF TAX LOT 5600 ON ASSESSORS MAP 17-03-26-24 AND RUNNING NORTHERLY 140 FEET, WHICH MARKS THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LAND PARTITION PLAT NO. 2001-P1439 SPRINGFIELD, LANE COUNTY, OREGON, CITY JO. NO. LRP2004-00027.

5. Other Routine Matters

ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR

**PUBLIC HEARINGS - Please limit comments to 3 minutes. Request to speak cards are available at both entrances. Please present cards to City Recorder. Speakers may not yield their time to others.**

1. Request to Vacate a Remaining Fragment of Right-of-Way Formerly Known as County Road 221 – Hammer Industrial Subdivision.

ORDINANCE NO. 3 – AN ORDINANCE VACATING A REMAINING FRAGMENT OF RIGHT-OF-WAY IDENTIFIED AS OLD COUNTY ROAD 221, LOCATED ADJACENT TO 42<sup>ND</sup> STREET SOUTH OF INDUSTRIAL AVE. (FIRST READING)

City Planner Mark Metzger presented the staff report on this item. County Rd. 221, a half-mile long abandoned roadway crossing the Hammer Industrial Subdivision, was vacated in April 2003. The vacation followed negotiations between the city and John Hammer concerning an agreement dedicating right-of-way for a multi-use path within the Hammer Industrial Subdivision. Right-of-way (ROW) agreements are often negotiated concurrent with a vacation action. In this case, the vacation agreement was signed several months after staff work for the original application was completed. During negotiations for the multi-use path, a 6636 square-foot fragment of right-of-way was added to the original vacation application. The added fragment was inadvertently

overlooked by both staff and the applicant when the vacation application was submitted for action by Planning Commission and Council.

This action vacates the fragment of County Rd. 221 that was missed during the original vacation process and fulfills Section 1. A. of the "Agreement Providing for the Vacation of Certain Segments of Olympic Street Right of Way and Providing for Dedication of a Multi-Use Path," signed by John Hammer and the City of Springfield in February 2003.

The applicant has complied with the conditions of the original vacation application that called for easements and access ways to be reserved from the right-of-way vacation to protect access to utilities on the site. No further conditions of approval are recommended for the approval of this request.

Based upon the findings made with respect to the criteria for approving vacations of rights-of-ways listed in Section 9.030 of the Springfield Development Code, staff recommends approval of the request. The Planning Commission received no testimony and recommends this be approved.

Mayor Leiken opened the public hearing.

No one appeared to speak.

Mayor Leiken closed the public hearing.

NO ACTION REQUESTED. FIRST READING ONLY.

2. Supplemental Budget Resolution.

RESOLUTION NO. 04-46 – A RESOLUTION ADJUSTING RESOURCES AND REQUIREMENTS IN THE GENERAL FUND; STREET FUND; SPECIAL REVENUE FUND; TRANSIENT ROOM TAX FUND; COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND; RIVERBEND DEVELOPMENT FUND; BUILDING CODE FUND; FIRE LOCAL OPTION LEVY FUND; POLICE LOCAL OPTION LEVY FUND; BANCROFT REDEMPTION FUND; BOND SINKING FUND; SEWER CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND; DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT CAPITAL FUND; DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS FUND; G.O. BOND CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND; REGIONAL WASTEWATER CAPITAL FUND; STREET CAPITAL FUND; TRANSPORTATION SDC FUND; SEWER SDC FUND; REGIONAL WASTEWATER SDC FUND; SEWER OPERATIONS FUND; REGIONAL WASTEWATER FUND; EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES FUND; BOOTH KELLY FUND; REGIONAL FIBER CONSORTIUM FUND AND VEHICLE AND EQUIPMENT FUND.

Budget Officer Norma Barton presented the staff report on this item. At various times during the fiscal year the council is requested to make adjustments to the budget to reflect needed changes in planned activities, to recognize new revenues such as grants, or to make other required adjustments. These adjustments to resources and requirements which change the current budget are processed through supplemental budget requests that the Finance Department schedules on an annual basis.

This is the second of four schedule FY04 supplemental requests to come before council. The supplemental budget being presented includes: adjusting beginning cash, recognizing new revenues and reflecting additional resources; adding 1.0 FTE, and adjusting expenditure authority for department operating, capital projects and non-department accounts. The first supplemental budget of the fiscal year is usually the largest of the year; however because our first supplemental budget was for emergency purposes (Museum Fund adjustment to pay Museum and Litigation expense adjustment for MWMC), this second supplemental budget will most probably be the largest of the year. This is because staff requests adjustments in the beginning cash accounts to reflect varying grant cycles, capital construction projects in progress mid-summer and truing up the reserves balances to reflect the previous year's actual revenues and expenditures.

After the FY05 budget was adopted, a decision was made that altered the citywide FTE count. This change is the addition of a computer programmer/analyst in the Information Technology department. This addition is for the purpose of assisting with the implementation of the new Fire Department Records, Reporting and Information Management System. Dedicated funds from the Emergency Management Fund (615) are being used to fund this position. This 1.00 FTE increase changes the total city FTE count from 410.25 to 411.25 FTE.

The City Council is asked to approve the attached Supplemental Budget Resolution.

The overall financial impact of the Supplemental Budget Resolution is to increase total appropriations by \$6,412,424 and to increase total City FTE by 1.00 FTE.

Councilor Ballew asked if the position in the Information Technology Department was permanent.

Ms. Barton said it was a limited duration position.

Mayor Leiken opened the public hearing.

No one appeared to speak.

Mayor Leiken closed the public hearing.

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR FITCH WITH A SECOND BY COUNCILOR BALLEW TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 04-46. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6 FOR AND 0 AGAINST.

3. Public Hearing and First Reading of Ordinance of City of Springfield Approving the Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan.

ORDINANCE NO. 4 – AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SPRINGFIELD APPROVING THE GLENWOOD URBAN RENEWAL PLAN. (FIRST READING)

Economic Development Manager John Tamulonis presented the staff report on this item. Since the July 26, 2004 when council considered forming an Urban Renewal District in Glenwood, the voters of Springfield on November 2, 2004 approved overwhelmingly Ballot Measure 20-92 to approve allocating taxes from Glenwood properties to the Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan and thus meeting City Charter provisions. Lane County approved the proposed Glenwood Urban

Renewal Plan by resolution on November 10, 2004 and asked for further revisions to be brought back for their approval on November 23, 2004. After the Public Hearing, council may then consider any written recommendations of the governing body of each taxing district (to be accepted, rejected, or modified by City Council) and the Ordinance (Attachment 4 in the agenda packet) approving the Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan. This would be the first reading, with the second on December 6, 2004. The Plan must be adopted by nonemergency ordinance.

With approval of Ballot Measure 20-92 and the Lane County Board of Commissioners approving the Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan by resolution on November 10, 2004, council may now conduct the required Public Hearing to take testimony and then consider approving the Plan that includes areas in Glenwood not yet annexed to the city. Key to Lane County's approving the Plan was involvement with the city in constructing the list of projects. Special notice (Attachment 3 included in the agenda packet) was mailed October 22, 2004 to the electors registered in Springfield and within the area of the proposed Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan.

Attachment 1 included in the agenda packet describes the process this evening for the City Council to approve the Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan and Report (Attachment 2 included in the agenda packet). The Plan provides the text of the Plan, a list of projects, their estimated costs in 2004 dollars, while the Report shows the financial feasibility of the Plan over the planned duration of 21 years based on estimates of growth, development, and participation by other agencies, property owners and developers.

Mr. Tamulonis reviewed the process being taken this evening to consider the Urban Renewal Plan and the events that would occur following adoption of the plan.

Mayor Leiken asked if the City Council was responsible for the areas annexed into the city of Springfield regarding the Urban Renewal District.

Mr. Tamulonis said as development proceeds in Glenwood there will be some annexation of properties as key urban services become available. As property owners submit applications for annexation, the City Council would forward their recommendation for annexation to the Boundary Commission. This is not an annexation process with the SEDA, but a financing mechanism to allow development to occur and the public infrastructure to be built in Glenwood. About a third of the property in Glenwood is in city limits at this time and two thirds are outside the city limits.

Mayor Leiken said that is why Lane County Board of Commissioners have participated in this process.

Mr. Tamulonis said that the Lane County Board of Commissioners has asked that two Lane County Commissioners are added to the SEDA Board bringing the total to nine. That is part of the county's resolution.

Councilor Ballew asked why the Board of Commissioners wanted two commissioners to serve on the board when it only covers one commissioner's territory.

Mr. Tamulonis said the commissioners felt that the area of Springfield that is in city limits and the area within Glenwood which is outside city limits are represented by two county commissioners.

The County Commissioners have interest in all development in Lane County whether inside the city or outside the city.

Mr. Kelly said what was once Glenwood is now partially inside Springfield city limits due to the jurisdictional transfer from Eugene that happened several years ago. The largest part of Glenwood is still outside city limits and that is why the Lane County Commissioners want representation on the Board. The County Commissioners also want an advisory board created allowing representation from Glenwood residents. County staff indicated that the commissioners approved of the City Council taking this action, but when going forward for their approval, the city would add the two commissioners. The action this evening as the SEDA Board is not expected to include the two County Commissioners. Some properties over the next twenty years will be considered for development or redevelopment, and many will stay outside the city limits initially. If they wish to develop, most likely they would have to annex to the City of Springfield. By the time the SEDA Board takes action approving some developments that require infrastructure, those properties would be in city limits. The county wants to be involved in the beginning to make sure there is due process, logic and practicability in SEDA's decisions early in the process. Through the process of development, many properties will become City of Springfield properties.

Councilor Ralston said there is a budget committee to be assigned for each board member. He asked if there would be a budget committee member assigned to each of the County Commissioners on the board.

Mr. Tamulonis said under state law that would be the requirement.

Councilor Ralston asked if they would be from the incorporated Glenwood area or the unincorporated Glenwood area.

Mr. Tamulonis said he does not know the answer to that.

Councilor Fitch said if the SEDA Board chooses to create an advisory board, to have representation on an advisory committee they would want to include a citizen at large, a representative from a mobile home park, a representative from the industrial area and a representative from the commercial area. The latter two would not have to be Glenwood residents, but have ownership of either industrial or commercial property in Glenwood. Potentially, once the Board is complete, they may decide to ask some of the advisory committee members to serve on the budget committee. That has to be acted on by the SEDA Board.

Councilor Ralston asked if the County Commissioners request to add two commissioners to the board was required or if it was negotiable.

Mr. Tamulonis said if these additions were not made, it would prolong the process with a longer discussion. Looking at the January 1, 2005 baseline form the Lane County Tax Assessor, these changes would have to be accepted at this time. If they do not choose to add the commissioners to the board, the process would be delayed a year. He referred to a chart showing the area in Glenwood that is still in the county, within the urban growth boundary and not yet annexed into Springfield.

Councilor Ballew asked if the county had a role in the Urban Renewal District in the future if the County Commissioners are appointed to the board and the county takes final approval.

Mr. Tamulonis said not unless there was a major adjustment in the plan which would require the same process that is being gone through now. He gave examples of changes that would require the entire process to be repeated.

Councilor Ballew said once the agency is established, it is set.

Mr. Tamulonis said the City Council and County Commissioners could make changes as the Board. In the future as more properties are annexed into the city, the county may choose to be less involved.

Councilor Ralston referred to the section of the plan which stated that the Urban Renewal Agency would be responsible for all costs associated with the relocation of the Lane County Receiving Station. He asked how that would work.

Mr. Tamulonis said the text changes the county suggested in the plan, state that the Lane County Solid Waste Facility would be evaluated to see if it had an adverse effect on development. If the county's Solid Waste Plan figures out a way of relocating that facility, there may be participation by other agencies besides Lane County. If that occurs, the cost may be so high there is further discussion from all organizations that may have an interest in that to work out an arrangement. It is a large project and they do not yet know how it will go. It is premature to speculate on it at this time.

Councilor Ralston asked if that was a county facility now.

Mr. Tamulonis said it is.

Councilor Ralston said it sounds like the county is shifting their costs to the Urban Renewal District (URD).

Councilor Fitch said only if it was the recommendation of the SEDA Board that it would be advantageous to move it for development. They wanted the URD to pay for the cost of the study for the relocation of that facility. Language was added that stated that if that occurred and there was a sale of the property, the county would repay the URD all of those costs before they saw profit. That could mean in other areas the district could get a grant to help facilitate that.

Councilor Lundberg asked if the relocation of the transfer site had been discussed with the county in the past. She asked if the county was planning on moving it anyway.

Mr. Kelly said the core issue is that the transfer station has a certain economic life. If SEDA suggested moving the station for economic reasons, SEDA should pay for that cost. Long term the county sees a need for a transfer site further northwest of the metropolitan area. The county has plans when that station might be relocated, but if SEDA closes it prematurely because of economic development reasons, the county wants SEDA to pay the costs.

Mayor Leiken opened the public hearing and continued the public hearing to reconvene after the Springfield Economic Development Agency (SEDA) meeting.

Audience member Fred Simmons said he opposed the process.

Mayor Leiken adjourned the City Council meeting to convene as the SEDA Board at 7:14pm.

(The SEDA Board held a meeting from 7:15pm to 8:18pm)

Mayor Leiken reconvened the City Council meeting and continued the public hearing.

1. Laurel Pogue-Powell, 3955 East 17<sup>th</sup> Ave., Eugene, OR Ms. Pogue-Powell thanked the Mayor and council for the opportunity to speak. Ms. Pogue-Powell said her biggest concern is representation of the people of Glenwood. She asked the difference between the board and the advisory committee. The board sounds like it has the authority to act on a recommendation, but the advisory board is limited to just making a recommendation. That is correct. She clarified who the members would be on the board and advisory committee.
2. Fred Simmons, 312 S. 52<sup>nd</sup> Place, Springfield, OR. Mr. Simmons said the notice he received was for City Council public hearing. He said he doesn't know the costs or benefits of urban renewal. He has not had an opportunity to review the plan as it has been amended. Tonight is the first reading of the ordinance with no action to be taken. He said that he watched the County Commissioners and Councilor Fitch discussing the issues and the issue of trying to relocate the Lane County transfer site is an extremely expensive process. That facility is owned by the solid waste division and is funded by rate payers who subscribe to Sanipac and other carriers, as well as others who go to the site on their own. There is no easy place to relocate that facility. One of his objections to the urban renewal process is that the SEDA Board or City Council has the authority for eminent domain and the process of amalgamation begins. He discussed Ballot Measure 37 and issues with amalgamation and resale not for the public purpose but for the purpose of enhancing other developers. There are still a lot of unanswered questions and as a citizen he does not have the answers. He does not believe the board or council has all of the answers. He is supportive of what they want to do, but there are still too many questions which he will continue to ask. He does not believe the board is taking ample time to digest what the people want to say about it. The election was wonderful, but they said there would be no cost.
3. Bill Powell, 3955 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene, OR. Mr. Powell wanted to remind council that everybody on the board talks about crime, but doesn't do anything about it. In Glenwood residents patrol their own neighborhood. He said it is time to quit crying about crime and do something about it. Have the residents patrol their own neighborhoods because police can't do it on their own. He and his neighbors keep their neighborhood clean by policing their own area. He said they don't want to be connected with Springfield regarding the crime issues.
4. Dave Carvo, 4010 East 16<sup>th</sup>, Eugene, OR Mr. Carvo has looked through the copy of the plan without the changes the council received. The copy of the plan has taken parts of the Glenwood Refinement Plan and the Metro Plan and picked and chose things they liked and threw them together in this plan. The city has adopted the Glenwood Refinement Plan as a whole as the guidance of the development of Glenwood and the plan should be the same. The plan should adopt all of the Glenwood Refinement Plan. He would like them to consider incorporating the entire Glenwood Refinement Plan into the Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan. The plan says there is no property specified for acquisition at this time, but looking at the

chart of proposed projects, there are specific things that would require acquisition of property. He asked that the board needs to keep things straight, up front, open and honest. The plan is vague and ambiguous with no specified goals. He referred to discussion from a gentleman from Medford who spoke on urban renewal who said it is important to have a specific goal and vision. The goals in the plan can be changed in the future and that is not a set goal or plan. He said the citizens want to know what is going on regarding development.

5. Kevin O'Reilly, 3910 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene, OR. Mr. O'Reilly said he would like to see the advisory committee expanded to include nine to eleven people. He would like it to include representatives from all classes and groups that have an interest in Glenwood, incorporated as well as the unincorporated area. Residents from both sides of the river, members of the Springfield Chamber of Commerce and others. The more people that are involved, the better the ideas.
6. Jim Guthrie, 1475 S. Brooklyn Ave, Eugene, OR. Mr. Guthrie said he moved to Brooklyn Avenue in Glenwood over thirty years ago. He discussed other plans that were in place at that time. He said architecture students from the University of Oregon designed a project for a sports arena and were told to not consider the idea that anyone lived in Glenwood. He spent eight years helping to start and develop the Neighborhood Economic Development Corporation in the Whitaker neighborhood. He is experienced in economic development and community building at the same time. The only thing he has experienced from the City of Springfield is Economic Development, but no community development. There is an incredible and vital community in Glenwood. He is for economic development and is a property owner and business owner. He thinks a mixed use is an important aspect of what is possible in Glenwood. It could be a world class art colony, but it's going to need community building not community breaking down, which is the way they have been approached in the past. They are a very tight group in Glenwood. If the city wants cooperation, work on building their community not breaking it apart.
7. Kris Maenz, 3930 East. 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene, OR. Ms. Maenz said this meeting is one of the least empowering she has attended. She discussed the set up of the meeting and the confusion of this meeting. She noted that the faded gray area on the map was demeaning to those in Glenwood. She referred to a comment that the representative on the board should be voted on, but the Glenwood residents didn't get to vote for any of the members on the board, how their taxes would be used in this situation nor what developments would move into their neighborhoods. Throughout the country downtowns are dying as less and less money is put into them. She attended some of the meetings regarding the development between Glenwood and the river. She said the Urban Renewal Plan could allow strip malls and she would rather see the money going to make downtown Springfield more usable. She would like to see a bike trail put in, more access for Glenwood to downtown Springfield and more green space. She would like to see it go light industrial to some degree, but would like to put more emphasis on greenspace.
8. Joan Armstead, 1417 East 16<sup>th</sup> Ave. Ms. Armstead quoted page 87 of the Glenwood Refinement Plan (GRP) which referred to the environmental design element and the Willamette River. Glenwood has been through a lot of changes. Glenwood has evolved and she would like to see the commercial and industrial area reflect that. She wondered how many people have read the GRP. After reading the GRP, she feels the Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan should be the Glenwood Refinement Plan. She discussed areas from the GRP

that should be included in the Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan. As they go through this process, she hopes it is to everyone's benefit and leaves that touch of the pioneering feeling and the feeling of nature. She noted the importance of site review and referred to the GRP. She discussed the greenway setback lines in both the URD plan and the GRP. The greenway setback line is questionable and she wants to make sure it is interpreted correctly. Clean water is becoming a scarce commodity. She summed up saying that James Park does not serve Glenwood residents. She would like to see another park down in the flatland section between Franklin and 18<sup>th</sup> in the residential area. Ms. Armstead ended with a quote from the Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan, "The Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan is intended be the combination of projects and funding to overcome the problems and achieve the vision in the Refinement Plan". She wished council good luck, as it will not be easy. A lot of people want to see things done right.

9. Serahn Morton, 4095 East 17<sup>th</sup>, Eugene, OR. Ms. Morton is a renter in Glenwood and represents at least one renter in Glenwood. She would not want to see the property tax go up because it would cause rent to go up for all renters. She feels that would not be fair to renters or to the landlords.
10. Danielle Savoie, 3998 Franklin Boulevard, Eugene, OR. Ms. Savoie said she was disappointed when she voted on November 2 that she did not see the measure regarding the Urban Renewal District. She noticed that the Roaring Rapids Pizza Parlor was for Glenwood Urban Renewal. She wondered why this project would skip over the pizza parlor and take out the community of Ponderosa Mobile Village. She asked how one would stay and another taken away. She said she is reminded of the Boston Tea Party and taxation without representation. Those living in Glenwood have put time and money into their homes and to be taxed without being represented hits home. She would like to be represented by Glenwood residents on the Board. She asked who would be paying for this \$32M improvement plan. Many residents will be losing their homes and many are elderly people who would have difficulty finding optional housing.
11. Robert Cox, 1540 Brooklyn Ave. Eugene, OR Mr. Cox said he is a property owner. The only letter he received was about the council public hearing. He is a retired Vietnam Veteran. He bought his home in Glenwood, it is his home and he likes to be there. He would like to be able to vote on things that would or would not take care of him. He would like to see decent police protection around him. The other night he called 911 and got Eugene, but they told him they were not the ones he should call. He said he should have gotten the proper police department. He discussed crime. He likes living in Glenwood. He picked it out thirty years ago and would like to see council care about this area. There are a lot of good folks that live there.

Mayor Leiken closed the public hearing.

NO ACTION REQUESTED. FIRST READING ONLY.

Councilor Ballew said there seems to be confusion among the taxpayers of Glenwood about how the Urban Renewal District will or will not change their property taxes. From the perspective of the city it does not change their tax structure. They are still protected by the State Constitution. They may have a difference in rates from the Glenwood Water District. When someone comes in

and invests and puts new development in, those are the taxes that go towards paying off the debt for public improvements of the URD. The residents should not see a change in their taxes.

Mayor Leiken asked staff to do a presentation with Glenwood residents at a location in Glenwood to discuss how this would affect or not affect their taxes.

Councilor Fitch said her ward includes the property annexed in Glenwood. She would like to be able to attend this meeting if possible and suggested holding it at Lane Transit District or a local church.

Mr. Tamulonis said staff would work with the residents to find a suitable location. He said they could set up several meetings at different times to allow as many people as possible to attend.

Mr. Kelly said it may work best to have a drop-in with staff and elected officials available during a three or four hour period to allow people to drop in at their convenience. This would allow better one on one questions and answers in that type of setting. With council's permission, staff would like to set up the meeting as a drop-in setting.

Councilor Fitch said that would be great.

Members from the audience said they like to meet together.

#### BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE

1. Selene Jaramillo, Community Health Centers of Lane County, 1640 G Street, Springfield, OR. Ms. Jaramillo distributed some handouts and brochures to the Mayor and council regarding the Community Health Centers of Lane County. There is a new Community Health Center located in Springfield on G Street near McKenzie Willamette Hospital in Ward 3. They are a federally funded Community Health Center (CHC). She described the Federally Qualified Health Center (FQHC)/CHC which is a great model in terms of its sustainability. They offer services to a mix of patients, including about 50 percent which are uninsured. Those patients are offered services at a sliding scale based on the federal poverty line. The other half of their funding comes from being able to bill for insured patients, including those on the Oregon Health Plan (OHP) and federal grants. They have received a federal grant that is renewable in three years. Since March 1, 2004 when they opened the Riverstone Clinic, they have seen over 3500 people. Out of those, about 25 percent have been Latino/Hispanics and another 25 percent are also minorities. About 95 percent of their minority patients are Springfield residents. They have been working over the last six months building their practice and hiring staff. They have four providers at Riverstone, two nurse practitioners and two Medical Doctors (MD's). Three of those providers are fluent in Spanish. The clinic has services at satellite sites including the Safe and Sound Program in Eugene and the clinic at Springfield High School. Included in the materials distributed to the Mayor and council was an invitation to their Open House on Thursday, November 18 during the day. Tours will be given and staff will be available to meet and greet guests from the community that are interested in learning more about their services. As part of the community, they are interested in whatever ways they can collaborate to the mutual benefit and the benefit of the residents of Springfield.

Mayor Leiken thanked Ms. Jaramillo for her presentation and said he is pleased they have opened their clinic in Springfield.

Councilor Ralston asked how long they have been open.

Ms. Jaramillo said they were funded in November, 2003 and had ninety days to get everything ready to open the clinic. The two satellite projects opened January 5, 2004 and the main clinic, Riverstone, opened March 1, 2004.

2. Roscoe Divine, 35308 Camp Creek Road, Springfield, OR. Mr. Divine represents a group called Glenwood Options, Inc. Mr. Divine said the goal of the Glenwood Options group is to present to council information to provide a catalyst to ask PeaceHealth to consider Glenwood as a site for their hospital. This site was considered and rejected three years ago, but the Glenwood Options group conducted a study that they believe addresses many, if not all of the issues. They are a group of citizens who have an interest in this and do not want to be in any adversarial position, but would like to lay out suggestions to encourage the city and PeaceHealth to consider this site. Mr. Divine introduced Terry Moore from ECONorthwest who performed this study.

Mr. Moore said the Glenwood Option, Inc. presented the report from ECONorthwest to the city a couple of weeks ago and tonight he just wanted to give an overview of what they are doing. The assumption is that Glenwood will be developed and redeveloped. The purpose is to show that Glenwood is a possible site. Mr. Moore presented a power point presentation. Mr. Moore discussed why Glenwood was a good possibility, including interest in Glenwood, importance of Glenwood, location of Glenwood and the recently approved Glenwood Urban Renewal District. For Glenwood to develop quickly, it would need some help. There is some effort needed to get from here to there and Glenwood Options is looking to see if there is something they could do to move this along. They decided that the area needs a catalyst project to make things happen. Looking at the possibilities, they looked at PeaceHealth. Glenwood Options decided to look at PeaceHealth because it is a large project, there is a pending council decision on that project and it is the purpose of Glenwood Option to get the hospital in Springfield. Problems have emerged in Gateway and opportunities have emerged in Glenwood. They looked at sites in Glenwood and focused on two sites. Anything that would happen in Glenwood would have to be redevelopment, which is a disadvantage. He discussed the options. He discussed the two possible sites and the Refinement Plan.

Mr. Moore pointed to a map showing how the current plan for the RiverBend facility would fit as is on the first site in Glenwood (known as branding). He then showed a drawing of the RiverBend buildings placed at that site in a different configuration. In the second scenario, Franklin Boulevard would not be realigned and there would be a one hundred and fifty foot buffer for riparian setbacks. Otta Poticha and Jerry Diethelm built models of what that might look like. Mr. Moore showed pictures depicting the view from fourth or fifth floor of the hospital if located at that site. At this point, he is only stating that this is possible. The purpose is to say it could fit, it could make sense and could fit with the Riverfront Redevelopment Plan. He showed pictures of what it could look like if Franklin Boulevard could be realigned. If Franklin were realigned, there would be more property to the north. He referred to several images of the hospital and how it could be positioned. Mr. Moore discussed the second site and showed PeaceHealth branded onto the property and with the building rearranged slightly. He discussed how those configurations would work.

Mr. Moore said the Glenwood Options group is working under the assumption that the city wants to do something in Glenwood and would like a hospital in Springfield. A central location would be good for the city in general. This proposal is not without problems, such as land assembly and the scale of development and citizen approval. He said many, if not all, of those issues could be resolved. There are important decisions to be made and it is important to take a long run view of this for development.

Discussion was held regarding using this property for the McKenzie Willamette Hospital as well.

Councilor Ballew said she appreciated their interest. It is up to the hospital to determine where they choose to locate.

Mayor Leiken said the hospitals would have to make the decision.

3. Fred Simmons, 312 S. 52<sup>nd</sup> Place, Springfield, OR. Mr. Simmons said he wanted to bring up the issue of the process for tonight's public meeting. He does not feel the meeting was noticed adequately for the Springfield Economic Development Agency (SEDA) public hearing. He would like to know if the city was in conformance.

Mayor Leiken asked staff to check into this and submit a report.

City Manager Mike Kelly said he would have staff check into this and provide a response to Mr. Simmons.

4. Joan Armstead, 4017 East 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene, OR. Ms. Armstead referred to Terry Moore's reference in his testimony to the Glenwood Refinement Plan. Ms. Armstead wanted it in the record that Mr. Moore was actually referring to the Glenwood Riverfront Plan, not the Glenwood Refinement Plan.
5. Anna Hayes, 3903 East 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene, OR 97403. Ms. Hayes said the proposal to site the hospital in Glenwood was absurd. She noted the terminology of branding used by Mr. Moore when he discussed placement of the proposed buildings in Glenwood and the negative connotation that involves. Ms. Hayes said the hospital locating in Glenwood would be ludicrous.

#### COUNCIL RESPONSE

#### CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS

1. Correspondence from Bob Kramer, Little Red Farm Nursery, 1020 S. 42<sup>nd</sup> Street, Springfield, OR Regarding the S. 42<sup>nd</sup> Street Reconstruction.
2. Flyer from Steve Manela of the Community Health Centers of Lane County, Riverstone Clinic, 1640 G Street, Springfield, OR Regarding Their Services. (Mr. Manela requested and was approved to speak for 10 minutes under Business from the Audience.)
3. Correspondence from Roscoe Divine, The Glenwood Option, Inc. 555 Lincoln Street, Eugene, OR to Mike Kelly Regarding Time for a Presentation During Business from the Audience. (Mr. Divine was approved to speak for 10 minutes under Business from the Audience.)

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR FITCH WITH A SECOND BY COUNCILOR BALLEW TO ACCEPT THE CORRESPONDENCE FOR FILING. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6 FOR AND 0 AGAINST.

BIDS

ORDINANCES

BUSINESS FROM THE CITY COUNCIL

1. Business from Council

a. Committee Reports

1. Councilor Ballew discussed the MPC meetings.
2. Councilor Ralston said he had been attending the D.A.R.E. Graduations at the various elementary schools. Due to a conflict, he may not be able to attend the graduation on Wednesday, November 17 at 6:30pm at Mt. Vernon. He encouraged other councilors to attend these graduations. There is a lot of enthusiasm from the students, teachers and D.A.R.E. officers alike. The students really appreciate seeing elected officials and other community leaders attend the graduations.
3. Councilor Fitch said the Springfield Chamber of Commerce will hold its annual Chamber/University of Oregon Tailgate Auction on Friday, November 19 to help raise money to fund scholarships.

b. Other Business

BUSINESS FROM THE CITY MANAGER

Mr. Kelly reminded council of their Joint Meeting with the Planning Commission on Tuesday, November 16. They will have a Work Session at 6:00pm and a Regular Meeting/Public Hearing at 7:00pm.

Councilor Fitch noted that she would be out of town.

BUSINESS FROM THE CITY ATTORNEY

Mr. Leahy said the City Attorney's office is drafting an ordinance regarding Ballot Measure 37. Springfield staff and the City Attorney's office have been meeting and will continue to work on the language. Discussion on Ballot Measure 37 and the proposed ordinance will be held with the council during a work session on November 22. The draft ordinance will then be brought to the council during a Regular Meeting on November 29 for consideration of adoption under an emergency clause. Mr. Leahy will provide council with information from the League of Oregon Cities regarding this measure. Council can contact Mr. Leahy with any thoughts or concerns on this issue.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

Minutes Recorder Amy Sowa

---

Sidney W. Leiken  
Mayor

Attest:

---

City Recorder