

**THE GLENWOOD REFINEMENT PLAN UPDATE PROJECT
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)**

SPRINGFIELD CITY HALL * LIBRARY MEETING ROOM * 225 FIFTH STREET * 541-726-3753

Wednesday

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES
May 13, 2009

5:30 p.m.

STAFF PRESENT:

Greg Mott Planning Manager, Brenda Jones Administrative Specialist,
Lind Pauly Planning Supervisor, Molly Markarian Planner II

CAC COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Zack Pardo, Jim Peterson, Steven Ramseur, Kara Smith, Randy Hledik,
John Oldham, Steven Ramseur, Kara Smith, John Oldham, Steve Roth,
Olivia Reynoso, Eric Howard, Bill Woods, Tracy Ran, Christine Kehoe,
Brian McBeth, Daniel Hill, Ken Schmidt, Roxi Thoren, Erik Bishoff, Bill
Seider, Susan Ban.

• CALL TO ORDER –

Meeting was called to order at 5:39 p.m.

Staff Markarian welcomed the group and announced that one of the members, Lori Adams, had resigned from the Glenwood CAC due to family constraints. The position will not be filled until at least two CAC vacancies occur.

• PUBLIC COMMENT –

There was no public comment.

• ELECTION OF CO-CHAIRS –

Staff Markarian reminded the CAC that at Meeting #1, the group indicated that they would like to wait until the next meeting to elect Co-Chairs.

No one volunteered to serve as a co-chair. Jim Peterson requested that staff continue to lead the group.

Staff Mott explained why a chair is needed for this type of group.

Roxie Thoren and Steven Ramseur volunteered to serve as co-chairs. Ms. Thoren and Mr. Ramseur were elected to serve as co-chairs by consent.

• APPROVAL OF MINUTES –

The Minutes for the March 13, 2009 meeting were approved by consent.

• LEGAL ISSUES – Joe Leahy, City Attorney, City of Springfield.

- Mr. Leahy welcomed the Glenwood CAC and thanked them for their service to the project and distributed a handout (attached).

- Mr. Leahy informed the group regarding the following:
 - Meetings are always public meetings.
 - All materials are public information.
 - All meetings will be held in a public domain.
 - When writing emails or other materials, remember you are writing for the Register Guard. Be careful what information you include in your emails and other materials.
 - Assume everything you write will be made available as Public Record Request.
 - You cannot meet as a group without it being a public meeting.
 - If you have a Quorum of the group then the meeting needs to be open to the public and noticed as such.
 - Defamation of character. Do not label anyone in an email or in person. You can disagree but be considerate of others.
 - It is a personal decision if you decide to talk to the media or citizens. Remember you are talking as yourself and not as a Glenwood CAC member.
 - Mr. Peterson asked what amount of time constitutes a meeting. Mr. Leahy said that this has not been established by the courts but he would say that one hour would constitute a meeting.

- VISIONING PRINCIPLES –

Staff Markarian informed the group that staff had categorized the visioning comments from the first CAC meeting and that the categorized lists were included with the meeting packet. She also said that staff had drafted ten visioning principles based on those categories and requested feedback from the CAC. The CAC provided the following suggestions for the wording of the principles:

- Mention pavement reduction
- Define the market for open space – neighborhood v. regional
- Make the natural resources visioning principle less generic
- Blend 4, 8, & 9
- Create a separate principle that embodies the importance of employment generators
- Define sustainable
- Create a principle that addresses sustainability in general

Jim Peterson suggested that the visioning principles be considered a ‘work in progress.’ The CAC decided to move onto the next agenda item and will give more consideration to the visioning principles at the next meeting.

- VISIONING EXERCISE –

Staff introduced the visioning exercise. Building upon several of the concepts discussed at the first CAC meeting, staff presented a series of questions for small group discussion. CAC members counted off by ‘threes’ and broke up into small groups to focus on the discussion questions. The three groups discussed the following general topics: Glenwood’s character; Glenwood’s entryways; and the Willamette River. CAC members re-convened as a large group

towards the end of the meeting so that each small group could present its ideas. The discussion questions and responses were as follows:

TOPIC #1

CAC members stated that we should preserve the independent feel and unique identity of Glenwood and also that we should preserve the integrity, character, and cohesiveness of the residential neighborhoods.

1. What makes Glenwood unique, and what features that contribute to Glenwood's uniqueness should be preserved?
 - Not Eugene, not Springfield -- independent
 - Transportation hub
 - Since the time of the Briggs ferry
 - Railroad
 - Highways
 - River
 - Bridges
 - Transit – EmX
 - Forgotten, outlaw character
 - River
 - Riparian zones
 - River views – and of Island Park / Kelly Butte
 - Access to river – fly fishing
 - Dining on the river
 - Riverfront that is accessible and doesn't have the railroad along it
 - Unusual amount of vegetation for an urban area
 - Urban forest
 - Lots of wildlife in residential neighborhoods
 - Larger, old canopy in close proximity – shade; better air quality & temperatures
 - Ratio between roadway & canopy
 - Mix between industrial and residential
 - Housing
 - Partial redevelopment
 - Found objects
 - Sensitivity to ecology; organic; eccentric
 - Quiet, hidden, secluded
 - Residential 'farms' – gardens & fruit trees

- Mobile home parks
 - Development Potential
 - Gateways at both ends – clear start and end
2. What about Glenwood is independent, and what specifically would contribute to preserving the independent feel of Glenwood?
- Rural atmosphere
 - Zoning would allow cottage industries, farming, etc.
 - Unique characteristics – design standards (i.e. pavement color, house size)
 - Street width – narrow w/out sidewalks – pervious roads – slow traffic
 - No through traffic in residential core
3. In 20 years, what will the character of the various neighborhoods or districts in Glenwood be like?
- a. What do they look like?
 - b. How do they feel?
 - c. What will contribute to preserving / establishing the character of these areas?
 - d. What types of uses / amenities will we see in each area?
 - i. If residential, what types of residential uses?
 - ii. If employment, what types of commercial / industrial uses?
 - iii. What other uses or amenities are there?
- River District – along north and east riverfront w/public access
 - San Antonio Riverwalk; John’s Landing; Corvallis
 - Eat along river
 - Retail stores & residential – mixed-use housing and tetail
 - Parkland – river sports, band platform, picknicking
 - Higher density residential
 - Public access for bikes and pedestrians
 - Urban greenway that is ‘urban’, not just wild – value in interaction along river of housing, commercial, restaurants, etc.
 - Guidelines for riverfront development (Jim: 250’???)
 - Accommodate HUB activities – convention center, hotel, playing fields, etc.
 - Affordable housing – may need incentives
 - Housing staggered along river with green areas to break up density
 - Neighborhood park development and/or direct access to Day Island
 - Plug in parks??
 - Arterial District – along the transportation corridors

- Area that looks good and works for through-put
 - Multi-way boulevards
 - Pedestrian overhead walkways
 - Raised platform transit
 - Residential District
 - Move residential away from railroad corridor
 - Preserve unique qualities of residential neighborhood – skinny streets, tree canopy
 - Get rid of unsightly overhead wires
 - Install new lights, signage, street furniture
 - Affordable housing
4. Where does / will one neighborhood transition to another? What are these transition areas like?
- Mitigate transition edges between industrial, commercial, residential
5. How can the cohesiveness and integrity of the existing core residential neighborhood be preserved?

TOPIC #2

CAC members stated that Glenwood is a bridge and should provide a strong connection between downtown Springfield and Eugene.

1. What should it look like and feel like upon entering Glenwood?
 - a. At the western entrance by the Willamette River Bridge?
 - Roundabout at Glenwood Boulevard will be the signature entrance on the west
 - b. At the eastern entrance by the Springfield Bridge?
 - Roundabout at McVay Highway will be the signature entrance on the east
 - Locate a park under the Springfield bridges?
 - Construct a separate bike/ped bridge under the Springfield bridges?
 - c. Along Glenwood Boulevard?
 - Entrance is a well-developed industrial area – need for maintenance / clean-up, but no major entryway changes other than I-5 interchange modifications.
 - d. At the southern tip of McVay?
 - McVay south of railroad trestle is of secondary importance; don't spend a lot of energy on it as the area will be developed later
2. What will help make a Glenwood riverfront district that is distinct from other areas of Springfield, such as downtown?
 - Glenwood already is a distinct district
 - Access into Glenwood is via bridges; Glenwood is a bridge – symbolize this in entryways at roundabouts

- Entertainment w/ public open space; movie theatre??
 - Preserve natural beauty
 - Model green district
 - Melting pot because of location between Eugene & Springfield
 - Proximity to UO/LCC creates a different potential
3. What can be done to connect Glenwood to the adjacent districts of downtown Springfield and Walnut Station in Eugene?

TOPIC #3

CAC members stated that Glenwood is a gem and we should preserve the magic of the river.

1. What will the relationship between the built and natural environment along the river's edge be like?
- Thin greenway with bike-ped path
 - Barriers along multi-use path as needed – may need to provide it for existing non-river oriented development due to safety issues; would require new development to embrace connection to river and provide access / visibility to path; eventually no barriers
 - Can't squeeze already narrow properties too much further
 - ? of need for elevated path over river on narrow western edge
 - Facilitate connections to the river
 - Small local-serving park / open space in northeast corner as in Riverfront Plan
 - No need for a major regional park or a major (wide) greenway as that exists on the opposite side of the river
 - Limited access to the water
 - Maybe a boardwalk for fishing / river views
 - Maybe a boat ramp for ORS-type business, but boat access is nearby, so not necessary. Also, this is a somewhat dangerous section of the river
 - View corridors at selected points, such as at Glenwood Boulevard
2. What will the riverfront feel like and look like?
- Inviting to businesses / housing / students
 - Accessible in a variety of ways
 - Performance standards v. design guidelines
 - Is height an issue? No view corridors now; well-designed development would be a big improvement. Quality more important than height. Market demand may dictate height. North bank well positioned for high density, especially given EmX corridor.
 - South Waterfront uses performance standards to regulate light/air/view shed/ecological functions while leaving design up to the creativity of the designers.

- Who decides what is aesthetically pleasing?
 - Would need a design review committee to implement design standards effectively.
 - Concern: North bank is well positioned to attract student housing; quality of student housing design an issue.
 - Don't make developers jump through so many hoops, they are unwilling to develop – don't make the standards too prescriptive
 - Developed & undeveloped (i.e. urban – natural – urban)
3. How will the riverfront be used?
- North Bank
 - Riprap keeps floodplain narrow; EmX provides service; Franklin is Eugene-Springfield connector – makes area appropriate for:
 - Dense, mixed-use residential, business/commercial, recreation, services (i.e. health clinic?)
 - Bike/ped path
 - Need development to be able to, at the same time, relate to river and to Franklin due to land being so narrow, especially at west end
 - East Bank
 - More floodplain (may change with LOMR); no EmX; no great views; deeper land mass land; industrial to the west – makes area appropriate for:
 - Mixed-use commercial and light industrial, such as agribusiness (i.e. nurseries)
 - Bike/ped path
 - New bridge to Dorris Ranch
4. How will the riverfront be accessed?
- Bike/ped path along river
 - Auto / road loop
 - North/south from Franklin
 - Where auto traffic ends at auto loop, ped/bike access should continue to connect to bike/ped path
 - Access from EmX stations

- ADJORN –

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.