City of Springfield
Work Session Meeting

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION MEETING OF
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL HELD
MONDAY, JULY 9, 2007

The City of Springfield Council met in a work session in the Jesse Maine Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday, July 9, 2007 at 5:30 p.m., with Mayor Leiken presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Mayor Leiken and Councilors Lundberg, Ballew, Ralston, Woodrow and Pishioneri. Also present were City Manager Gino Grimaldi, Assistant City Manager Jeff Towery, City Attorney Joe Leahy, City Attorney Matt Cox, City Recorder Amy Sowa and members of the staff.

Councilor Wylie was absent (excused).

1. Planning Options for Glenwood.

Community Development Manager John Tamulonis presented the staff report on this item. Land development in Glenwood is guided by the policies of the Glenwood Refinement Plan (GRP). As with the Metro Plan, the GRP has not undergone a significant update since the late 1980's except for the 48 acre riverfront subarea. The issue at hand is whether additional updating of the GRP should be undertaken, and if so, to what extent? This memorandum provides the Council with 5 options addressing this issue.

Planning and Public Works staff have assembled a list of 5 options for future development in Glenwood.

These options include:

1. Status Quo Development
2. Expanding Riverfront Mixed-Use Along Both Sides of Full-Length Franklin
3. Franklin/McVay Corridor Planning
4. Entire Transportation Corridor Planning
5. Update Glenwood Refinement Plan

Each option broadly identifies development activities, necessary department tasks, timelines, staffing needs, costs and the associated pros and cons. Option #1 does not include the comprehensive visioning that occurs with Option #5. It does allow a portion of the Glenwood riverfront to be developed to contemporary expectations but defers any development decisions about the remainder of the riverfront, or the interior of Glenwood, to a later time. Options 2-5 represent a logical extension of the contemporary vision outlined in the Glenwood Riverfront Plan. Staff supports the broader approach suggested by Option #5 because it incorporates the wishes of the community, the energy of the Council and the trends of the 21st century market place.

Staff requests specific direction from Council regarding the future of Glenwood outside of the 48 acre riverfront site. The set of options presented in Attachment 1 cover these concerns by allowing the Council to consider, accept modify or reject specific courses of action for Glenwood. These options are accompanied by broad estimates of project timelines and costs, and the more obvious advantages and disadvantages that may result from implementation.

At the direction of Council, staff will begin to assemble project lists and plans to implement the planning option(s) preferred. This will be presented to Council as a follow up Work Session item.

Mr. Tamulonis referred to the Glenwood Refinement Plan, Glenwood RiverFront Plan, the Franklin/McKay Boulevard Study, the Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan, the American Institute of Architect (AIA) 150th Anniversary Initiative, the I-5/Glenwood Area Planning Study, and the Walnut Station Mixed-use Area (which was located in Eugene). When considering changes in land use, infrastructure must accommodate those changes.

Planning Manager Greg Mott discussed the various interests and participants that shaped the activity in Glenwood. Staff felt it was appropriate to check in with Council to get a sense of their direction. He reviewed the options listed above. The focused policy initiative had been on the 48 acres identified in the urban renewal district and through Council direction. Consideration of extending that area farther west and south had been discussed. He explained each option and how the planning department and public works department would have different roles in each option. Glenwood represented something completely unique from any other area. Option 5 would be an update of the Glenwood Refinement Plan and would not do away with the original plan. Each option had an estimated cost associated with it.

Councilor Ralston asked if the full time employee (FTE) costs were separate from the contract costs. Yes. He asked if SEDA would pay those costs or the City.

Mr. Grimaldi said SEDA could pay if they chose.

Councilor Ballew said it appeared that Option 4 cost more than Option 5 and took longer.

Mr. Mott explained the differences in the costs for both options and said that they each had a range of time. Staff was being conservative when estimating that Option 4 would take thirty to forty-eight months. It was doubtful that Option 4 would take longer than Option 5. There was no difference in the costs to public works for either option. He discussed the trip points and how that affected the area. The public works piece would be about as extensive for both options as would citizen involvement.

Councilor Ballew asked who should pay for infrastructure in the urban renewal area, the City or the urban renewal agency.

Mr. Grimaldi said it would depend on the outcome of the infrastructure.

Councilor Ballew said there was specialized financing for the urban renewal agency. She said it would be beneficial to have a policy to sort that out.

Mr. Tamulonis said the Plan noted that SEDA would use infrastructure to make changes in Glenwood. The first year strategy was to focus on industrial development to gain the most benefit for tax growth. He discussed infrastructure that could be funded by SEDA to encourage additional growth. Investment along the riverfront may require more funding. A case could be made based on the priorities of the agency. The Plan did not spell that out specifically.

Councilor Ballew said citizens voted for urban renewal with the understanding that it wouldn't cost them anything. She wanted to be clear that there was good rationale for spending funds.

Mr. Tamulonis said Glenwood development and the taxes paid in Glenwood, would be paying for the infrastructure in Glenwood.

Mayor Leiken said in looking at Options 4 and 5, Option 4 seemed more of a cookie cutter approach. He could see why Option 4 could take a little longer than Option 5. The area in Options 1, 2 and 3 was contiguous, but Option 4 had noncontiguous property. Option 5 overall would be less expensive over time with a better advantage. It was more expensive to redevelop properties than to raze them and rebuild. He understood the timeline for Options 4 and 5.

Mr. Mott said that was correct. There was the edge treatment that was expanded through Option 4. It would include an attempt to modernize the land use activities along those corridors with a coordinated vision between Council and the Glenwood residents.

Councilor Ralston he didn't like the patchwork approach and felt Option 5 made more sense. It was better to get it done comprehensively and all at once. He was concerned about how the neighbors would feel about this.

Assistance Public Works Director Len Goodwin recalled that his first presentation before Council was regarding Glenwood. At that time, Springfield did not yet have jurisdiction over Glenwood. Mr. Goodwin said public works would be involved in the infrastructure. It made a lot of sense from an infrastructure standpoint to go with Option 5. He discussed some of the infrastructure issues. He gave an example of a major sewer that was put into Glenwood to try to get in ahead of the Franklin Boulevard overlay. It was designed with excess capacity to serve all the needs of the Glenwood land uses that were around it. A developer came in and talked about levels of intensity of development that were many times what the current Glenwood Refinement Plan was talking about. If it were to develop at that intensity, the new sewer with excess capacity would end up being inadequate. Further development would require finding ways to serve the eastern shore of Glenwood. Those types of unintended consequences needed to be considered when trying to integrate how the land was used and how the structure would be provided to serve it.

Mr. Goodwin said from an infrastructure view, staff was already starting to update the Refinement Plan. Staff would be bringing Council draft facilities plans for storm and sanitary sewer. Those were designed, at this point, to accommodate Glenwood as it currently existed. They were designed based on current information. That was good information to apply to new land uses and the infrastructure to support that. Transportation Manager Tom Boyatt was looking at the Franklin Boulevard Corridor, which would be essential when looking at the Glenwood Refinement Plan in total. Staff was in the process of working with the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) on a study of a potential new interchange in the Glenwood area. Once

that interchange was designed, it would be designed to fit whatever land uses were in place at that time. If there were changed land uses in Glenwood, they would probably be more intense and bring about more transportation needs. Public works could accommodate any of the options, but Option 4 presented a unique challenge for public works. He explained how they would be impacted. There were land uses currently in those areas, but those would most likely be changed to meet Council goals. That may mean that public works overbuilds the infrastructure to accommodate future needs. From a public works and infrastructure perspective, it would be best to look at the entire area of Glenwood, not just a portion of it.

Councilor Ballew said logically it made sense to do Option 5, but that was a lot of money and she asked where they would get the funds.

Mr. Grimaldi said if Council directed staff to move forward with Option 5, staff would prepare funding options and specifics for consideration. They didn't want to make a mistake. There was some apprehension from citizens and the Refinement Plan process in the end could give them long-term certainty.

Councilor Lundberg said updating the Metro Plan took a lot of time and energy. She would like to have more flexibility in the plan and layer the time frames because things did change. She asked if there was potential to do it in a segmented way. She had seen the Refinement Plan used to hinder progress and also to move things along. Gateway was a good example in how things changed. She said they would be in year five of the urban renewal district by the time the Plan was updated. She asked if there was a possibility in updating the plan differently or if we were bound by laws or rules. She wanted to use the Plan to our benefit, rather than a binding tool that was restrictive.

Mr. Mott said there was a balance between the certainty that Mr. Grimaldi referred to and being responsive. This Refinement Plan was adopted in 1989 and with the exception of the 48 acres, everything had been consistent with that Plan. Things had changed a lot since 1989 and would continue to change in the next seventeen years. There could be a better way to anticipate and accommodate that change and still provide people with some measure of certainty. It would take some smart thinking.

Mr. Grimaldi asked Councilor Lundberg for clarification regarding segments in the Plan.

Councilor Lundberg said she said it would either be each area at a time or a certain piece of the infrastructure. She said the riverfront area had the most potential for development in the near term. She said it was so expensive and she wanted to break it into pieces.

Mr. Mott said Council would hear another aspect of this which included work being performed on the residential land supply demand analysis. Part of it was projecting the types of housing needed, the types of densities and where it would happen from people with a lot of experience. He discussed the expansion of the City's urban growth boundary and the need to provide commercial, industrial and residential areas in the City, including Glenwood. Glenwood needed to be considered in that equation. The residential information should be ready this year.

Mr. Goodwin discussed Option 3 and the stormdrainage that would affect the southwestern edge. Sanitary Sewer could be an issue if the whole area was not done at the same time. The City may be scrambling for solutions in some areas if not done right at first.

Councilor Woodrow said he appreciated Councilor Lundberg's concern about the time frame. He discussed the different options. Springfield was responsible for all of Glenwood and needed to plan for it as a whole. The whole intent was that Glenwood would be changing and needed to be prepared. He agreed that it needed to be done as expeditiously as possible. He was strongly in favor of Option 5 and planning ahead.

Councilor Ballew said a Refinement Plan was done and a developer had said it was not a good plan because of the economics of the area. She could support Option 5, but would like to see something on a higher level than Option 5, including things such as drainage tracking. It may be too soon to determine what should be single family residential as opposed to what should continue to be industrial. She would like to see more of an overall look, rather than the specifics.

Councilor Lundberg said flexibility was the operative word. There was a risk when things had to be changed. She would like to see this outlined in layers.

Councilor Ralston said from a practical standpoint, this would create certainty for a developer. The reality was that there was already a Refinement Plan which made sense and there wasn't a lot that needed to be changed. The cost could be on the lower end of what was expected. He said to do it right, we needed to do it all.

Councilor Pishioneri said he supported updating the entire Refinement Plan and look at the whole picture. It allowed for greater involvement with the public and businesses. It added a lot of good checks and balances. He understood that it would cost more than the other options, but would need to be done at some point anyway.

Councilor Woodrow said SEDA would be looking at all of Glenwood. SEDA and the City needed to be in concert regarding this. He agreed that it would be beneficial to look at it in a layered format so public works and planning could look at what needed to be added. Option 5 was the best way to go with a layered look, as long as that didn't impact or hamper public works or the developer.

Mayor Leiken asked staff to put together an Option 5 hybrid, in a phased or layered outlook.

Mr. Grimaldi said staff would bring that option back to Council.

2. Review Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) Membership for Franklin Boulevard Study Project.

Transportation Manager Tom Boyatt presented the staff report on this item. The purpose of the Franklin Study is to assess the design, alignment, and traffic operations of Franklin Boulevard and the Franklin/McVay intersection and to investigate opportunities to improve the condition of this important corridor, both for through traffic and Glenwood Riverfront re-development. The project goal is to reach a preferred alternative for Franklin Boulevard improvements through an open public process, and to adopt the selected alternative as a refinement to TransPlan and the

Glenwood Refinement Plan. The Study is scheduled to take approximately 18 months. The project team will host a public design charette in early August. Outcomes of this intense design activity will be presented to Council in work session on September 10, to focus on a discreet set of alternative for subsequent analysis.

Oregon Land Use Goal 1 – Citizen Involvement, as well as the City's adopted Citizen Involvement process, calls for fair, balanced, and transparent public involvement. To meet these goals, and more specifically to guide a successful project, the Transportation Division seeks to establish a project Stakeholder Advisory Committee for the Franklin Boulevard Study. The attached list represents input from focused interviews with project stakeholders as well as internal staff discussions. Representation from the Springfield Chamber of Commerce is still being finalized. SAC membership may also evolve over the course of the project as individuals or organizations select different members to represent their interests. Public involvement costs are assumed in the approved project budget and consultant contract.

Mr. Boyatt referred to the proposed roster. Staff would meet with the Planning Commission Tuesday, July 17 for formal approval of the members.

Councilor Ballew asked if another development person should be included that was involved in construction.

It was noted that one of the listed members was involved in construction.

Mr. Boyatt asked if the group agreed with the proposed list.

Council consensus was to go forward with the list as noted.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:29 pm.

Minutes Recorder – Amy Sowa

Sidney W. Leiken
Mayor

Attest:

Amy Sowa
City Recorder