

**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  
August 12, 2009*

6:00 p.m.

**CAC PRESENT:** Zack Pardo, Jim Peterson, Steven Ramseur, Kara Smith, Randy Hledik, John Oldham, Olivia Reynoso (arrived late), Tracy Rogan, Christine Kehoe, Brian McBeth, Daniel Hill, Erik Bishoff, Bill Seider.

**CAC ABSENT:** Susan Ban, Roxi Thoren, Eric Howard, Bill Woods, Stephen Roth, Ken Schmidt.

**PROJECT CORE TEAM /  
OVERSIGHT TEAM PRESENT:** Greg Mott, Linda Pauly, Molly Markarian, Gary Karp, Dave Reesor, Mike Engelmann, George Walker.

**PUBLIC PRESENT:** Bert Rekker (Glenwood resident), Ray Cavagnart (Glenwood resident).

- **CALL TO ORDER –**

Meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m.

- **PUBLIC COMMENT –**

There was no public comment.

- **APPROVAL OF MINUTES –**

Randy Hledik made a motion to approve the May 13, 2009 minutes, which were seconded by Brian McBeth. Minutes approved by consent.

- **EXISTING CONDITIONS –**

Molly stated that she would be presenting some of the key issues discussed in each section of the Existing Conditions Report. She asked that if anyone had any comments or feedback to feel free to interject during the presentation. She added that some of the items mentioned highlight policy discussions that the group will need to have during the policy development phase of the project. Molly also wanted to point out that the Existing Conditions Report is organized in terms of the topics that will be covered in the actual Refinement Plan.

Molly asked the CAC if they had any questions with the Existing Conditions Report in general. Randy Hledik thought that the Existing Conditions Report was very well written and very easy to understand with very good information.

***Urban Design*** – Urban design relates to nearly all of the topics in the Existing Conditions Report, so this topic was placed at the beginning of the document to help frame the thinking around Glenwood. Urban design is about the interaction of the built and the natural environment and making a livable community. Staff thinks that one way the vision of the group and the community can be achieved is through design and development standards in one form or another. Staff is not sure what form these will take, but something one of the break-out groups discussed at the last meeting was what kind of standards those might be and how they can influence how Glenwood looks and feels like in the future.

Another way to achieve the vision is to make sure the design of infrastructure is in line with the desired look and feel of Glenwood. One example of this is that the Springfield Utility Board would like to site an electric sub-station in Glenwood to address future demand. It is very possible that the Springfield Utility Board's preference for locating this sub-station in terms of cost and convenience will conflict with the community's desires in terms of aesthetics and livability, so the City really needs to collaborate with Springfield Utility Board on these kinds of decisions.

**Land Use** – It is important to note that one of the main motivators for doing the update of the Glenwood Refinement Plan is that the community has expressed the desire to revisit land uses. Given the history of Glenwood's development and the context within which the original refinement plan was developed, a lot of Glenwood is currently zoned and designated for industrial use. At that time, the thought of residential use was primarily low density residential and the current land use pattern in Glenwood reflects that planning. There are some commercial uses along Franklin Boulevard.

One issue of note from this section is that there are a number of plan/zone conflicts in Glenwood, meaning that the zoning on certain parcels is different than the Plan designation. According to State law, these types of conflicts must be resolved, so one of the things the group will have to do as part of the update to the Glenwood Refinement Plan is to resolve those conflicts. Some of the conflicts will be easy to fix while others may result in heated discussions. Two of the areas of particular interest are: 1) property at the southern tip of Glenwood where the land is zoned Public Land and Open Space, and the Plan designation is Industrial and Residential. As ideas are developed around what future land use should be in Glenwood, a decision needs to be made about what the most appropriate use is for this land and then zone and designate it for that use. 2) residentially-zoned areas outside of the core residential area in Glenwood that are designated as commercial or industrial. This conflict was created when the original refinement plan was developed. 20 years later, it is time to evaluate what is the most appropriate use for that land and then zone and designate it for those uses.

There are a number of overlay districts applicable in Glenwood that add additional layers of development regulations, some of which relate to health and safety, such as Floodplain, or Hillside. The Willamette River Greenway overlay is an added level of protection for natural resources. There is also an overlay for the area of Glenwood that is outside the City limits. Another overlay is for the 48-acre nodal Riverfront District.

Zack Pardo asked for clarification regarding the reference on page 15 of the Existing Conditions Report, third paragraph of the Policy Guidance section, which says, "these guidelines were developed prior to Opus Development Corp v. City of Eugene. As such, none of the guidelines, with the exception of the River Opportunity Area policies amended in 2005 and simultaneously codified in the SDC, are enforceable." Molly responded that in the current refinement plan, several design guidelines were included, such as Industrial Site Development guidelines that tried to mitigate the impact of industrial development on neighboring residential development. The result of the Opus case is that guidelines or requirements that will be imposed upon developers needs to be located in the Development Code to be enforceable. Those guidelines that were developed in the original refinement plan only appear in the refinement plan and were never included in the Development Code. All updates to the Glenwood Refinement Plan will be simultaneously adopted into the Springfield Development Code, where applicable. When the Riverfront Plan was developed in 2005, the Riverfront Plan District language is what was adopted into the Development Code.

Zack asked why the adoption of the refinement plan by Springfield did not resolve the Opus issues since the Plan had to conform to the Springfield Development Code. Gary Karp responded that Opus was a specific case that occurred in Eugene but that on one of the first

applications that he processed for Glenwood where he attempted to impose policy language from the refinement plan to justify street improvements, he found out that the Opus findings applied elsewhere, as well. The policies that are in the document itself have to be incorporated into the Springfield Development Code either as policies or standards.

**Housing** – as the report discusses, there is a mix of stick built homes, mobile homes, and a variety of other housing types in Glenwood, such as RV's and trailers. The housing stock is primarily located on residential lots in the core neighborhood and in the 8 mobile home parks in Glenwood. In the original Glenwood Refinement Plan, there is a statement that indicates that a lot of the housing stock at that time was deemed in need of major repair. Given the age and type of housing in Glenwood, that is likely still the case even though there has not been an official survey performed recently.

A couple of issues staff highlighted: 1) Potential mobile home park closures, which are very likely over the course of the plan period of the new updated plan. Property owners may wish to redevelop their properties for different uses and we will probably see the closure of some of the mobile home parks in Glenwood. The existing Glenwood Refinement Plan has a policy in it that states that "the City shall look into developing some sort of a local ordinance to address Mobile Home Park Closures." However, for a myriad of legal reasons, the City cannot do this at the local level. The State has statutes around notification of mobile home park closures and compensation, and the City cannot exceed these demands on developers. One of the questions the group can discuss is if the City cannot do anything in terms of financial support, what else could the City do to help the residents of mobile home parks in the event of a closure? What kinds of services can the City think about providing and what other kinds of support mechanisms are out there?

Olivia Reynoso asked if all of the owners or landlords of mobile homes want to redevelop their property. Molly responded that is not necessarily the case. Olivia then asked if some of the property owners retained their property and businesses, would the City tell them that they have to redevelop. Molly responded that the decision to redevelop is up to the property owner.

Jim Peterson asked about subdivision of mobile home parks so that mobile home owners can become land owners. Gary Karp responded that there is a new State regulation that allows conversion of a park to a subdivision. The City already has an example off of Marcola Road. He does not know if there is a restriction on the age of the park. Jim responded that the CAC could use this same language for those in Glenwood, if the group wanted this in certain areas. Molly replied that she thought one of the parks is already considered a subdivision park.

Daniel Hill stated that from the Housing section of the Existing Conditions report he gleaned that the existing housing stock helps to meet the need for low-income housing, and he wonders if in the process the group should think of ways that the City of Springfield could do some Land Banking. He also raised the question of the definition of affordable housing and the issue around subsidizing development to create affordable housing. He stated that part of the problem is the cost of land, and as the planning process for an area develops what usually happens is the land values go up dramatically. He would like to know if there is a way to start land banking to maintain affordable land prices for development. He also talked about small lot sizes and prefab homes, which could keep the cost down. Molly responded that Eugene has land banking program, in which they hold onto the land and then once in a while they release it through a RFP process to non-profit affordable housing developer. The City of Springfield has not supported a land banking program to date, but if that is something this group decides as a recommendation in terms of supporting affordable housing in Glenwood, that is certainly something staff will pass along.

Molly suggested another idea staff has looked at in terms of incentivizing the development of affordable housing is a density bonus program. Affordable would have to be defined, but if we

talk in terms of subsidizing housing to support people at or below 80% of area median income, should the City of Springfield develop some sort of density bonus program were developers can exceed the maximum density as long a certain percentage of that housing is affordable. Another idea is to use urban renewal funds to subsidize the development of affordable housing. Olivia Reynoso and Jim Peterson asked what percentage of Glenwood residents live in mobile homes. Steve Ramseur commented that the report states that 60% of the housing stock is mobile homes.

Molly also spoke about the need to rehab the existing housing stock and providing support mechanisms to property owners because a lot of the housing stock is deteriorated and in need of repair. The existing refinement plan has several policies that talk about creating programs to help with repairs. Those programs have evolved and changed over the last 20 years, so as part of the update, these policies need to be updated. Within the City limits, Federal HUD housing and community development programs can assist people in repairing their homes. Outside of the City limits, the Urban Renewal District has already established a program called "GRIP", where property owners can apply for no interest loans until they sell their house to make certain upgrades. Also, the Urban Renewal District is looking at creating a program that could defray some of the cost, for example, hooking up to sewer.

In terms of housing, the main categories of policies staff would like to see developed are: 1) What to do about helping the residents of mobile home parks that will potentially close; 2) what programs already exist or could be developed to improve the existing housing stock; 3) what can we do to encourage the development of new housing in general and affordable housing. Something else that we need to think about is that in Glenwood, which is primarily developed with low density detached housing, is how can we provide for a greater variety of housing types to be built, such as designating land for high-density residential use.

Dan Hill asked what the percentage of owner-occupied houses is in Glenwood. Molly responded that 87% of dwelling units in Glenwood are occupied as of the census, and of that, 67% are owner occupied.

Zack wondered if the City foresees high density housing being integrated into lower density areas or would it be located in separate areas. Molly responded that it would be a separate area. Typically, the City tries to transition land uses when looking at re-designation or re-zoning, so there would not likely be a really high density area right next door to a low density area; there would be a gradual transition. Based on the input staff has received, it is likely that the high density areas will be predominantly along the riverfront or along Franklin Boulevard. Jim Peterson stated that the riverfront district is a high density concept already. Molly responded that the existing riverfront area stipulates minimum densities of 12 units per acre.

Zack asked if the mixed use designation allows for low, medium, and high density residential uses. Gary Karp responded that for residential uses in mixed use commercial districts, there is no threshold for residential development. However, within the riverfront area node housing must be built at a minimum of 12 dwelling units per acres, which is at the lower end of medium density. This update must determine how much medium or high density residential is needed in Glenwood and then adjust these minimums accordingly.

**Economic Development** - the beginning of the Economic Development section of the Existing Conditions Report talks about development complications in Glenwood, such as the difference between the perceived and actual market value of land. Other complications include lot ownership configurations and lack of infrastructure. In Glenwood, there are currently 125 businesses employing over 2,000 people in the sectors that are primarily manufacturing, transportation, waste management, construction, and some retail. One of the items discussed in this section that Molly touched on are the public investments that have been made in the last few years to help stimulate redevelopment in Glenwood, including the construction of the

wastewater main line in Franklin Boulevard in 2004, the ODOT pavement overlay on Franklin Boulevard, and the EmX bus rapid transit line. Two other public investments discussed in more detail in the Transportation section are: 1) in 2007 and 2008, the City engaged the public in a process to develop a concept for a re-design of Franklin Boulevard as a multi way boulevard; and 2) the construction of the new I-5 Willamette River Bridge.

The Economic Development section also talks a lot about the Glenwood Urban Renewal District, which was mentioned at the first CAC meeting. The district was created in 2004 by voter approval. The Springfield Economic Development Agency (SEDA) oversees that District. Over the life of the district (20 years), the property taxes above those calculated at the creation of the district are used to reinvest in Glenwood to help stimulate more development. SEDA is initially focusing on attracting more industrial development that will generate those tax increments so that they can reinvest more in the rest Glenwood. SEDA has also prioritized supporting existing residential neighborhoods, such as the GRIP program mentioned earlier.

Zack Pardo asked if there is any plan in the near future to upgrade the stormwater system on Franklin Boulevard, because every time it rains hard all of the streets in Glenwood have standing water. George Walker with PW responded that there are a couple of things in the works for stormwater in Glenwood. Public Works has just finished and adopted the Stormwater Facility Master Plan, and the number one priority project is the collective Glenwood area. The plan identifies conceptual level projects and only addresses the fact that we need to do stormwater projects in an area. It does not define pipe size, what the project looks like, or how it is laid out. There is also a push to implement the Franklin Boulevard multi-way boulevard concept, and when that happens, stormwater management on Franklin Boulevard will be addressed. Zack wanted to know if there is any stormwater piping underneath Franklin towards the river from the south side of the street. George answered that the City did not develop any new pipe projects in Glenwood. Existing systems are mostly private and mostly not inventoried in the public system.

**Natural Resources** – The natural resources discussed in the Existing Conditions Report are state-designated Goal 5 Natural Resources, such as riparian corridors, wetlands, and wildlife habitat. The report discusses the resources that the City knows exist in Glenwood. The City already has a lot of city-wide protections for those types of resources. The City is also working with a consultant to determine all current wetlands and riparian areas in Glenwood. One question that needs to be answered in Glenwood is “what kinds of protection beyond what the City already requires for natural resources may be needed in Glenwood?” One thing to consider is groundwater protection even though there are no SUB wellheads in Glenwood because there are a lot of private wells. Another issue is what other than the existing tree felling permits is desired relating to the urban forest in Glenwood.

In terms of natural open space, the only areas in Glenwood other than parks or planned parks are the Laurel Hill Cemetery and that steep sloped in the southern part of Glenwood. Should these continue to be natural open space areas? Are there other areas that are desired for open space?

Another natural resource worth talking about is the Willamette River Greenway. There are certain regulations in place that are mandated by the State within 150’ of ordinary low waterline of the river. As part of the update of the refinement plan, the City needs to establish what is called the “Greenway Setback Line”, which is a line that’s in between the 150’ and the water in which only water-dependent and water-related uses may go. There has been some talk about making the Greenway Setback up to 75’ because there is already riparian protection at 75’, but there are complications with this. For instance, note that within that riparian setback, no development can occur.

Zack asked if this project will inventory existing tree stock and native vegetation. Molly answered that the wetland and riparian areas are being identified currently, but in terms of the trees there is no plan to inventory the tree stock.

**Hazards** - There is not much to say about hazards because the Springfield Development Code and the Building Code generally have protection measures in place for development that occurs in high risk areas where it floods, landslides, and earthquakes are possible. Molly pointed out is that FEMA recently approved new floodway and floodplain boundaries in the southern portion of Glenwood. The City is now in the process of analyzing data prior to possibly submitting information to FEMA for the rest of Glenwood along the river. It is important to note that the land available for development will change as the FEMA floodway and floodplain boundaries change.

Another hazard mentioned in the Existing Conditions Report is potentially contaminated sites. Molly referred to "Brownfields", which is land where contamination is known to exist or is perceived to exist and dissuades developers from investing, so the map shows where these potential contamination sites are.

**Historic & Cultural Resources** – Molly asked the committee if they think it is important for the City to do more in terms of Historic Resources than they have already done. The City hired a consultant in 2001 as part of another project to do a cursory survey of Glenwood to identify where potential historic resources are. If more needs to be done, the next step would be to do more detailed research and more detailed inventory of potential historic resources, and based on that information, decide whether or not protection measures should be put in place for those resources. Molly asked the committee to keep this in mind as they move forward with possible and historic policies.

In terms of cultural resources, the State Archeologist has said that there are no known resources in Glenwood but that the potential exists. As we see development and re-development, it is possible that archeological sites and human remains will be unearthed. Staff would like the Glenwood Refinement Plan to remind developers about taking precautionary measures that the State mandates around these types of discoveries.

**Transportation System** – This complex section begins with a discussion of the fact that Glenwood is really well located in terms of proximity to I-5, Franklin Boulevard, and the rail system. Glenwood is really well served by transit since almost all of Glenwood is within ½ mile of a transit stop. Some of that transit service is along McVay Highway serving LCC, and the rest is the EmX service along Franklin Boulevard. The rail does support the industrial uses in Glenwood, although it creates connectivity issues, especially in the residential area. Something the group will need to think about is whether there a desire for more at-grade crossings. In general, there are many gaps in the transportation system, for cars, pedestrians, and bicyclists, and the Existing Conditions Report points out where those gaps are and talks about what the plans are to address those issues in the future.

Concurrent transportation projects will influence the future of Glenwood. One is that the City is in the process of updating its Transportation System Plan citywide. Another project is the I-5 Willamette River Bridge. The State is taking down both of the older bridges and then building a new bridge, and as part of that project there will be a lot of environmental remediation done underneath the bridge on both the Springfield and Eugene side. Something that Springfield is excited about for Glenwood is that a spin-off of this project is that the City and the State are going to be building a connection in the multi-use path on the south bank, from the Knickerbocker Bridge to connect to Franklin Boulevard in Glenwood. One other project that is in the works is the I-5 Glenwood Area Planning Study. There is a group of people looking at what to do for the Glenwood Interchange. Currently, the group is projecting the potential future land

use scenarios, what the demand on that interchange is going to be, should it be redesigned, should it be moved, etc.

An influential transportation project the group needs to be aware of is the Franklin Boulevard Corridor Study. The group talked about this at the first meeting. In 2008, the Springfield City Council adopted a concept for Franklin Boulevard that is a hybrid multi-way boulevard. Certain sections of it function like the classic multi-way boulevard and other sections are going to function more like an arterial street. The City is currently applying for funding to implement this concept. In the event the Federal government decides to fund this project, a more detailed design will need to be done. The thing the committee needs to keep in mind is that this concept is moving forward and changes can be made to the actual design. However, the concept and major components are here to stay.

Jim Peterson asked if Franklin Boulevard is a major arterial. Molly stated that it is. Jim Peterson commented that it does not look like a major arterial. Dave Reesor, Transportation Planner, interjected and commented that Franklin Boulevard is a major arterial, and that the concept for Franklin Boulevard is a hybrid multi-way boulevard. It is designed so that there is a thoroughfare through the middle for traffic going from point A to point B without stopping, so for this reason it functions as an arterial. In the center where the EmX route will be relocated, there is a separated lane just like the one by the University of Oregon. The slip lanes on the sides are designed for very slow traffic, which is more like a local route with speeds in the range of 15 to 20 miles per hour, which would also have angled parking on the left for local access to businesses.

Jim Peterson asked if there would be lights for pedestrians. Dave Reesor responded that this design would be very pedestrian-friendly. It will have wide sidewalks with pedestrian-scale lights along the sidewalks. Mr. Peterson asked if it made more sense to get the pedestrians off the streets and get them over or under Franklin. Steve Ramseur commented that access to businesses is at street level. David responded that a key component of the Franklin project is pedestrian safety. Currently, there are many sections of Franklin Boulevard that do not have sidewalks, and this concept would provide continuous sidewalks along Franklin Boulevard with landscape buffers. Molly commented that the idea is to channel pedestrians into certain crossings that can activate pedestrian signals. The cost to bring pedestrians over or under Franklin would significantly add to the already high cost. David commented that currently, it is estimated that the Franklin project would cost \$50 million.

Kara Smith asked if there had been any studies performed regarding climate change initiatives, reducing emissions, and improving traffic flow. David responded that there has not been any study per say, but right now the City is applying for competitive Federal money to implement the project that would include environmental impact analysis. One of the criteria for the grant is reduction in greenhouse emissions, so the staff has conducted some analysis on possible CO2 emission reduction with the new design.

### ***Public Facilities & Services –***

*Wastewater* - Major wastewater service extensions are planned and are funding dependent. One is for extension of wastewater service down Mississippi and the other down McVay Highway with a potential alternative route along S. Brooklyn.

*Stormwater* – The Stormwater Facilities Master Plan outlines future stormwater facilities in Glenwood. As part of this project, the City is working to identify wetland and riparian areas and developing concepts around water quality and stormwater management using the resources that are identified.

*Electric* – The transfer from Eugene Water and Electric Board (EWEB) to Springfield Utility Board (SUB) is complete. As mentioned at the beginning of the meeting, there is the question of where the future substation would be located in Glenwood.

*Water* - SUB is the primary water service provider. The Glenwood Water District is still in existence but the water is actually provided by SUB.

*Solid Waste* - The big questions is what is the future of the Lane County Central Receiving Station?

*Police* - Law enforcement depends on whether property is inside the City limits (Springfield Police Department) or outside the City limits (Lane County Sherriff's office).

*Fire and Emergency Medical Services* - Springfield Fire and Life Safety provides these services. Fire Service outside of the City limits is through a contract with the Glenwood Water District.

*Schools* – Children in Glenwood attend Eugene 4J School District schools. Any boundary changes are outside the scope of this project. But, if it is an issue that the group feels is important exploring, a policy could be developed that encourages exploration of options.

*Parks* – Willamalane's Comprehensive Plan proposes three park changes in Glenwood: 1) Redevelop or expand the existing James Park; 2) Acquire land and develop a new urban park in a residential core; and 3) Develop some kind of special use park along the riverfront. Something for this group to think about is what would be some potential sites that the group feels should be explored for possible acquisition and development of parkland.

***Urban Transition & Annexation*** – When the jurisdiction in Glenwood was transferred from Eugene to Springfield, Lane County and Springfield entered into an agreement whereby the City has regulatory oversight over Glenwood in terms of planning and building because Springfield will eventually provide all urban services in Glenwood. Lane County has taken issue with this agreement recently, so the politics surrounding this action could affect the implementation of this plan.

Greg Mott added that the elected officials of Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County directed staff to prepare a work program this past July that will address five issues of mutual concern that. The elected officials may re-visit these agreements, but whether or not any real significant changes are made to them remains to be seen. It would be 100% speculation to say how this will resolve itself.

Kara Smith asked if there is potential that the plan could turn out like Santa Clara/River Road or as far as voluntary annexation. Greg responded that annexation is controlled by statute and property is either eligible for annexation or not. It is up to the community to decide how annexations are approved. City of Springfield considered an annexation plan in the late 80's or early 90's and promptly abandoned the idea due to citizen feedback. Greg has been with the City for 35 years and every single annexation that has occurred under City of Springfield's recommendation to the Boundary Commission has been because the property owner wanted to annex. In most cases, it is because the property owner wants services that cannot be provided outside the City limits. Some people see this as a forced annexation as in "I'm being forced to annex in order to develop my property", but the City is not telling a person you must annex, the City is saying, if you want City services, you must annex.

Dan Hill referenced the wastewater map that shows the possible extension of a sewer line down Mississippi Street which is a classic example where residences would have the opportunity to tap into the sewer line if they annexed their property. Molly mentioned that SEDA has contemplated assisting with loans for property owners who wish to connect to sewer. Dan

asked about the annexation application process and whether it is a burden for property owners. Molly responded that one of the topics staff has been grappling with is that currently, annexation agreements between the City and property owners are not really standardized in general. Creating a more streamlined process would have to be citywide. However, it is something that is making redevelopment in Glenwood a bit more challenging, so is this something the City should take a look at.

Jim Peterson asked if sewer is part of annexation. Molly responded that if a property owner wants to connect to the wastewater system or if a property owner has a failed septic system and cannot replace that system due to State and County regulations, the property owner must annex.

Gary Karp commented that just because the City is building a wastewater line down Mississippi does not mean the owners have to connect to the sewer. Greg Mott also said that to be technically correct, the law does not require annexation to provide sewer. However, the City's policy is that you must annex to get sewer or the property is within a certain distance of the sewer line and the septic system has failed. Then the law is clear that the property owner has to follow that procedure. The law may not allow you to replace the septic system so you may have to connect to the sewer. It is the City's policy to only provide wastewater service through annexation. If there is property right now that is 800' or 1,000' from the sewer line and the County Sanitarian will allow a replacement system that would be the obvious choice. However, if the City extends sewer to a property that has requested it, thus bringing the line much closer to a property with a failed septic system, hooking up to that system will be required by State law of the property owner with the failed system.

Jim Peterson asked if the City was going to give the citizens of Glenwood an incentive. Greg responded that he thinks what Molly was talking about is having a coherent plan in order to match the public investments with perspective redevelopment potential that exists in Glenwood that currently cannot occur because the services are not there. Also, taking into consideration the very real cost that are involved in that – annexation cost, connection to sewer cost, the fact that there are many households that cannot afford that type of thing. Jim said that for property owners who own homes worth \$60,000, spending another \$60,000 to hook-up to sewer is challenging. Greg continued by saying that for households that qualify for assistance, in the past, the City has used Federal block grant funds to offset some of the infrastructure improvements. He added that the City has helped mitigate the cost of street improvements, the cost of sewer, and he would not be surprised in some cases if the City has not footed the entire bill, not just reduced it, but paid for the whole thing. These types of discussions relate to the strategies being explored for the redevelopment and urbanization of Glenwood.

Another issue in Glenwood is that all of the addresses in Glenwood are Eugene addresses. Shortly after the jurisdictional transfer from Eugene to Springfield, the possibility of changing Glenwood addresses to Springfield addresses was explored. The City sought approval of the US Postal Service, and then conducted a vote of the people, but it was voted down. Staff has heard that the postal service would not support a re-vote. What people cited as the reason for not supporting the change in addresses were all the hassles that businesses and property owners have to go through. As redevelopment occurs in Glenwood, those hassles increase as people establish themselves. If addressing is an issue, it would seem that before a lot of new development and redevelopment occurs, this would be the time to deal with it.

- **SEPTEMBER 2, 2009 MEETING –**

Linda Pauly informed the group that the City has hired Crandall Arambula, a Portland-based consulting firm that is currently working with City staff on a Downtown District Plan, to look at land use and circulation possibilities along the Glenwood riverfront to ensure that both districts complement each other. Contracts were signed last week.

The consultants will hold a meeting with the Glenwood CAC and TAC on September 2, 2009, in addition to the downtown CAC and TAC. By scheduling as many meetings as possible on one day saves the City a substantial amount of money. This is why the meeting for this committee has been changed to a daytime meeting from 2:00pm to 4:00pm. Jim Peterson asked if the meeting can be 3-5 or something different for those members who work. Molly responded that only one or two members of the CAC had indicated that a daytime meeting would not work for them on their application forms. Linda Pauly explained that this meeting time will be needed a total of three times, after which evening meetings will resume. Kara Smith asked if these three meetings will occur during a one-month period. Linda responded that it will be for the next three meetings, which are spread out.

Some of the committee members were concerned that if they were unable to attend a daytime meeting because of work that they would fall behind. Molly assured the members that all information that is presented at the meeting will be posted on the Glenwood webpage, including the audio recordings of the meetings.

- **GOAL STATEMENTS –**

At the last meeting, it was the consensus of the committee that they wanted to re-visit the Goal Statements after they reviewed the Existing Conditions Report. At this time, staff would like to bring some closure to the topic of the Goal Statements because staff is starting to formulate policy ideas and design concepts which warrant solidifying these statements.

Molly suggested that they go through the ten statements one by one, and if anyone has any suggestions, now is the time to communicate their wishes. Some things to think about are that these are really overarching statements that should express the values the CAC feels are most important for the future of Glenwood, and they should generally cover the main topics of the Refinement Plan. In terms of detail, it is important that they reflect the uniqueness of Glenwood but they cannot be so detailed that they move into the realm of policy language.

Randy Hledik mentioned that he noticed that two topics in the Existing Conditions Report do not have related goals, Hazards and Public Facilities and Services. It seems to him that it might be worthwhile to have some sort of a Goal Statement with regards to both of these topics. Molly asked if there was anything in particular around these two goals that he would like to see in these goals. Randy commented it seems to him that any kind of future development or redevelopment in Glenwood is very much tied to improvement of public facilities and so there needs to be a goal related to upgrading all the public facilities in Glenwood.

Jim Peterson asked if we need 10 goals or whether some of the similar goals can be combined. Molly responded that some of them can be combined. Molly then asked the group if they wanted to talk in general about the goals or go through each one by one.

After much discussion by the CAC and Staff, wording of the Goal Statements that the group agreed to for the time being are:

1. Improve connections to the Willamette River.
2. Establish inviting public spaces, including parks, plazas, and multi use paths.
3. Encourage aesthetically pleasing, sustainable buildings and sites that are context sensitive and oriented to human activity.
4. Provide opportunities for the installation, display, and creation of public art.

5. Allow for a mix uses suitable to the unique development opportunities in Glenwood.
6. Make a variety of housing types available to meet the needs of a range of households.
7. Facilitate opportunities for businesses to provide goods and services to local, regional, statewide, national, and international markets.
8. Restore, enhance, protect, and increase awareness of the ecological function of natural resources.
9. Protect the public from potential natural and manmade hazards.
10. Celebrate Glenwood's contributions to the region's historic development.
11. Enhance the multi-model transportation system to improve the safety, convenience, and movement of vehicular traffic, trains, public transit, bicyclists, and pedestrians.
12. Fill existing gaps in a full range of urban public facilities and services.
13. Facilitate redevelopment while addressing the consequences of change to existing residents and businesses.

Molly assured the group that there would be opportunities for the group to revise these statements over the course of the project.

- **ADJOURN**

Meeting adjourned at 8:07 p.m.