

# Downtown Urban Renewal Plan

## Part Two: REPORT



September 15, 2007  
DRAFT

Springfield Economic Development Agency  
September 2007

# **DOWNTOWN URBAN RENEWAL PLAN REPORT**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

This urban renewal plan was prepared with funding assistance from the City of Springfield. Springfield citizens participated in 2 townhalls leading to the preparation of the Downtown Urban Renewal Plan and Report.

### **Staff Assistance**

Gino Grimaldi, City Manager  
Jeff Towery, Assistant City Manager  
William Grile, Development Services Director  
John Tamulonis, Community Development Manager  
Mark Metzger, Planning Supervisor  
Courtney Griesel, Planner

### **Urban Renewal Consultant**

Charles Kupper, Spencer & Kupper

# REPORT ON THE DOWNTOWN URBAN RENEWAL PLAN

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PROJECT BACKGROUND.....	4
DEFINITION OF BLIGHTING CONDITIONS.....	6
100. DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS IN THE URBAN RENEWAL AREA	7
100A. PHYSICAL CONDITIONS.....	7
100B. SOCIAL CONDITIONS.....	12
200. EXPECTED FISCAL, SERVICE AND POPULATION IMPACTS OF PLAN.....	14
300. REASONS FOR SELECTING THE URBAN RENEWAL AREA.....	16
400. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EACH PROJECT ACTIVITY AND EXISTING CONDITIONS IN THE PROJECT AREA .....	16
500. FINANCIAL ANALYSIS OF PLAN.....	17
500A. ESTIMATED PROJECT COST AND REVENUE SOURCES.....	17
500B.ANTICIPATED START & FINISH DATES OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES.....	19
500C.ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES AND YEAR OF DEBT RETIREMENT.....	19
500D. IMPACT OF TAX INCREMENT FINANCING.....	24
500E. FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY OF PLAN.....	26
600. RELOCATION .....	26

# **REPORT ON THE DOWNTOWN URBAN RENEWAL PLAN**

## **PROJECT BACKGROUND**

The primary purpose of the Downtown Urban Renewal Plan is to revitalize the core historic downtown commercial and industrial areas of Springfield. The intent is to increase commercial activity, improve existing building facades, and promote pedestrian amenities and community activities.

The renewal plan builds upon other work and study efforts focused on downtown. They include the Downtown Refinement Plan (Adopted 1986, Updated 2005), the Booth-Kelly Mixed-Use District (1986), the TransPlan (2001), and the Willamalane Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan (2004).

The Land Use Element (p. 13) in the Downtown Refinement Plan forms a good general summary of the current state of conditions within the Downtown Urban Renewal area. It states:

“The Downtown area is where the original field with a spring in it was located (now an apartment complex) after which Springfield was named. It also contains the area that was in the original town plat of Springfield filed by Elias Briggs.

Since that time, the Downtown area has functioned as the City’s heart, and continues to do so even though the City has spread out, and other important nodes have developed on east Main Street, and in the Mohawk and Gateway areas. A significant retail base remains in the Downtown, and professional offices and services are increasing. The southeast portion of the Downtown is the location of several mill sites, which provide employment and a customer pool which Downtown businesses benefit from.

Beginning in the 1970’s, and worsening in the recession/depression of the early 1980’s, the Downtown community has been wrestling with an increasing vacancy rate. The situation seems to be improving somewhat as evidenced in recent reports of the Springfield Downtown Association. Although businesses are still leaving the area, new businesses and expansions of existing businesses are approximately matching the rate of exodus. Trends are not clearly identifiable in recent land use changes: a variety of types of uses have left, and a variety have located in Downtown.

The Booth-Kelly site has long fascinated visionaries in the Downtown community. The proximity of the site to Downtown, and the potential redevelopment of the site utilizing its amenities (millrace and pond, forested slopes, rail access, etc.) could prove to be very beneficial to the Downtown. Much of the site is currently vacant and inaccessible, and the existing development does not take advantage of the site amenities. Redevelopment of the site would be very expensive, but could be accomplished in a cohesive fashion over a long period with the development plan concept presented in the Booth-Kelly Development Area policies herein.

It is desired and anticipated that the eventual redevelopment of the Downtown area will feed upon itself: that is, new and expanded development will attract more news development. This will eventually make use and delivery of public services more cost-effective and increase demand for Downtown land and buildings resulting in a rise in property values to a point that development will be more economical than retaining a property's vacant status.

However, most of the problems are physical and need funds to be built or that vision will not be realized. The Downtown Urban Renewal Plan is intended to be the combination of projects and funding to overcome the problems and achieve the goals in the Downtown Refinement Plan (pp. 14-15):

“The following goals embody the spirit, optimism and commitment Downtown property owners, businesses and community organizations have ascribed to their vision of Downtown Springfield. These goals are deliberately achievable and intended to recognize the value of enduring public-private partnerships.

*Create a Pedestrian and Transit Friendly Downtown.* Develop a setting that is conducive to walking, bicycling and transit while providing accessibility to regional automobile and freight networks. Provide safe and walkable streets.

*Preserve the Past.* Enhance the downtown's future character by preserving the best of its past. Promote appropriate in-fill construction and historic preservation of the existing buildings.

*Reconnect to Key Natural Resource Features.* Connect the downtown with the Millrace and Island Park, and provide opportunities for appropriate downtown uses adjacent to these areas.

*Alive After Five.* Encourage evening activity in the downtown with dining, cultural and entertainment opportunities for all ages. Increase housing development in the downtown to generate the 18 to 24-hour city.

*Revitalize the Downtown with New Uses.* Create new opportunities for office, commercial, residential, civic, and mixed uses. Encourage high-density uses that are transit-oriented and located within a short walk from Springfield Station.

*Ensure Adequate Parking.* Provide parking that supports a vital downtown.

*Create Civic Gathering Places.* Create great public spaces, both large and small. Consider creation of a town square.

*Identify Catalyst Projects.* Identify projects that will spur growth in the downtown, including improvements that can be successfully accomplished in the short term.

*Create Downtown Partnerships.* Collaborate with Lane Transit District, the Springfield Renaissance Development Corporation, and other groups to coordinate efforts and build community support.

*Establish a Possible Identity for the Downtown.* Work with downtown business interests and the Springfield community to foster a positive identity and sense of pride for the downtown.

*Develop the Downtown as the Gateway to Springfield.* Work to achieve a visual impression in the Downtown that reflects well on the rest of the City.

## **DEFINITION OF BLIGHTING CONDITIONS**

The Oregon Legislature has established a system to finance urban renewal. Oregon Revised Statute Chapter 457 describes how the system works. This law gives cities and counties urban renewal powers. These powers provide a way to finance projects to remove "blight." Addressing blight is central to the purpose of urban renewal districts. The Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS 457.010) defines "blight" as follows (underlining is added for emphasis, and numeration is added for clarity):

"Blighted areas mean areas which, by reason of deterioration, faulty planning, inadequate or improper facilities, deleterious land use or the existence of unsafe structures, or any combination of these factors, are detrimental to the safety, health or welfare of the community. A blighted area is characterized by the existence of one or more of the following conditions:

1. The existence of buildings and structures, used or intended to be used for living, commercial, industrial or other purposes, or any combination of those uses, which are unfit or unsafe to occupy for those purposes because of any one or a combination of the following conditions:

- a) Defective design and quality of physical construction;
- b) Faulty interior arrangement and exterior spacing;
- c) Overcrowding and a high density of population;
- d) Inadequate provision for ventilation, light, sanitation, open spaces and recreation facilities;
- e) Obsolescence, deterioration, dilapidation, mixed character or shifting of uses;
- f) An economic dislocation, deterioration or disuse of property resulting from faulty planning;
- g) The division or subdivision and sale of property or lots of irregular form and shape and inadequate size or dimensions for property usefulness and development; and
- h) The laying out of property or lots in disregard of contours, drainage and other physical characteristics of the terrain and surrounding conditions;

2. The existence of inadequate streets and other rights-of-way, open spaces and utilities;

3. The existence of property or lots or other areas which are subject to inundation by water;

4. A prevalence of depreciated values, impaired investments and social and economic maladjustments to such an extent that the capacity to pay taxes is reduced and tax receipts are inadequate for the cost of public services rendered;

5. A growing or total lack of proper utilization of areas, resulting in a stagnant and unproductive condition of land potentially useful and valuable for contributing to the public health, safety, and welfare; or

6. A loss of population and reduction of proper utilization of the area, resulting in its further deterioration and added costs to the taxpayer for the creation of new public facilities and services elsewhere."

Note that it is not necessary for each of the cited conditions to be present in the renewal area, or that these conditions are prevalent in each and every sector of the urban renewal area.

## **100. DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS IN THE DOWNTOWN URBAN RENEWAL AREA**

### **100A. PHYSICAL CONDITIONS**

#### **1. Land Area**

The Downtown Renewal Area contains approximately 417 acres of land area. ORS 457.420 provides that the total land area of a proposed urban renewal district, when added to the land area of existing renewal areas may not exceed 15% of the City's land area. The City's current land area is approximately 9791 acres. The total of all acreage in renewal areas, including the Glenwood Urban Renewal District (618 acres), is 1035 acres. This represents 10.4% of the City's land area. Total renewal area acreage is within the 15% limitation prescribed by ORS 457.420.

#### **2. Existing Land Use and Development**

The Downtown Urban Renewal Area consists primarily of Heavy Industrial and Community and Mixed-Use Commercial. Included in this type of commercial is the Booth-Kelly District which provides for a mixed use employment center that complements Downtown Springfield. The next largest land use is for Low Density residential purposes. There are a very limited number of residential uses scattered throughout the project area. The majority of this residential is found in the Willamette Heights Neighborhood located in the South West corner of the Urban Renewal Area. Commercial development is concentrated along Main Street, running through the project area. This development is mostly strip commercial and serves the Downtown and surrounding communities with a range of services, convenience, and some comparison shopping opportunities. The Downtown Urban Renewal Area contains about 680 tax lots. Of these, 127 are tax exempt. The zoning of all tax lots are shown by acres in Table 1, below.

**Table 1. Zoning Within the Downtown Urban Renewal District**

<b>Zone Designation</b>	<b>Approximate Acres</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Low Density Residential	48.96	12.2%
Medium Density Residential	4.71	1.1%
High Density Residential	6.59	1.6%
Mixed-Use Residential	1.27	.3%
<b>Residential Total</b>	<b>61.53</b>	<b>15.3%</b>
Community Commercial	74.51	18.5%
Mixed-Use Commercial	41.8	10.4%
<b>Commercial Total</b>	<b>116.31</b>	<b>28.9%</b>
Heavy Industrial	109.25	23.3%
Light-Medium Industrial	28.32	7.04%
Booth Kelly Mixed-Use	76.16	18.9%
<b>Industrial Total</b>	<b>213.83</b>	<b>48.3%</b>
Public Land and Open Space	<b>25.53</b>	<b>6.5%</b>
<b>Total Acres</b>	<b>417.20</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Table 1 depicts the current zoning districts in the Downtown urban renewal area. Public land and open space encompass 6.5%; mixed-use and community commercial make up 28.9% of the uses planned for the Downtown area; while total residential uses are zoned for about 15.3% and total industrial are zoned for 48.3%. Currently, within the Urban Renewal Area almost 102 acres, or roughly 25%, stand vacant. The majority of this vacant land is in Commercial (12.7%), Residential (7.5%), and Industrial (4.2%) zones.

The renewal area boundary was drawn to create a project area that encompasses the core of Downtown commercial and mixed-use, while providing for public open space improvements along the Willamette River, Mill Pond and Mill Race, and within the Downtown urban core. Actions undertaken in the Downtown Urban Renewal Area will help make more productive use of land in Downtown.

### **3. Conditions—Buildings and Structures**

Recognition of blighted conditions within the urban renewal area go back to the early 1980's. The 1984 "Downtown Tomorrow" report of the Springfield Downtown Commission, opens with this observation of conditions in the Downtown: "*Downtown Springfield has needed revitalization for a long time. The jumbled mix of signs, vacant buildings, ragged patches of landscaping, crumbling sidewalks, and heavy vehicle through-traffic vividly portray a lack of care and a message of neglect.*" The report continues on to list goals and projects for the downtown, some of which are still recommended as part of this plan.

Based on the property class codes assigned to properties by the Lane County Department of Assessment and Taxation, there are just over 100 acres of vacant property within the Downtown Urban Renewal Area. About 72 vacant acres are taxable and would

contribute tax increment revenues to the urban renewal district if developed during the life of the urban renewal district. Table 2 summarizes the taxable vacant acreage within the urban renewal area by zoning district.

**Table 2. Vacant Taxable Property by Zoning District**

<b>Zone Designation</b>	<b>Acres</b>
Low Density Residential	19
Medium Density Residential	2
Community Commercial	28
Mixed-Use Commercial	8
Heavy Industrial	6
Light-Medium Industrial	8
Booth Kelly Mixed-Use	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>72</b>

There are nearly 550 buildings in the Downtown Urban Renewal area. A survey of downtown buildings in 2004 revealed that 59% of downtown structures fit the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) criteria for blight. This is significantly higher than the threshold required to qualify for HUD’s Community Development Block Grant program designation as a blighted area. The condition of some of these properties may make it economically infeasible to rehabilitate or repair them.

A windshield survey of the urban renewal area in 2007 shows the urban renewal area contains buildings in various states of disrepair including residential properties (along South Mill and South 18<sup>th</sup>); commercial properties (along Main Street and South A); and industrial properties (along South Mill). These buildings show evidence of extensive deterioration of roofing, siding, foundations, steps, and exterior trim. Repairing and maintaining downtown buildings is essential for the recovery of any historic district.

High vacancy rates and tenant turn-over have characterized the urban renewal area. Commercial lease rates today remain low compared to the remainder of the Eugene-Springfield market. This has made it difficult for property owners to maintain existing buildings and has worked against privately financed rehabilitation and redevelopment. This has contributed to the continuing deterioration and blight conditions in the downtown area.

Lane Transit’s Springfield Station, completed in 2005, was the first new construction in downtown Springfield since 1987. New construction and restoration activities have followed. St. Vincent de Paul’s Royal Building, a new 5-story mixed-use development, is nearing completion. Additional projects include the restoration of the historic Gerlach building by the Emerald Arts Center and development of the Richard Wildish Community Theatre by the Springfield Renaissance Development Corporation. Each of these projects received significant subsidies in the form of public investment and private donations to cure blighted conditions in the structures. These projects would not have

been possible without public investment. These situations reinforce the need for the establishment of an urban renewal district to support redevelopment and revitalization downtown.

#### **4. Conditions – Streets, Intersections, Sidewalk, and Storm Drainage**

The general condition of the basic street and storm drainage infrastructure in the project area is typical with that of an older town. The following is a brief description of the construction type and current conditions assessment:

Most of the Downtown Urban Renewal Area was developed through donation land claims in the 1850's and constructed in the traditional block segment footprint over several decades. The streets are well-defined by curbs and gutters. Most of these streets are improved to city standards, with the exception of the Willamette Heights area where some unimproved streets still remain. Although many of the street components are older, the Maintenance Division continues to perform maintenance and repair activities to extend the useful life of the asset. Some of these preventive activities include crack and slurry sealing of streets, asphalt overlay and repair, curb, gutter and sidewalk repair, street sign and signal maintenance, etc.

In the urban renewal area, the majority of the streets are improved - curb and gutter with an asphalt surface. Most of these streets were constructed decades ago. Timely preventative maintenance and structural enhancements have maintained the integrity of these assets. Unimproved and substandard streets are found in the areas south of the Main and South A Streets corridor. Main and South A Streets (ODOT right of way) from the Willamette River bridges, east to 19<sup>th</sup> Street, are deteriorating fairly rapidly. Eventual reconstruction will be necessary for few other collector segments in the Boundary area due to age.

Typical improved street intersections consist of standard sidewalks with access ramps, curbs, gutters, signage, and traffic/pedestrian control in place. Continuous sidewalks populate most of the area, however many are old and deteriorating to the point of needing replacement. Varying types of access ramps provide a continuous corridor throughout most of the area. There are 12 intersection traffic signals within the urban renewal area. All of these control signals are owned by the State but maintained by the City. Signage at intersections and along street segments is uniform and consistent.

The urban renewal area has a total of 287 street lights. Street lights along Main and S. A Streets are being modernized with high voltage type lighting with some older low voltage yellow type lighting that will require updating.

A functioning storm water drainage system exists for most of the Boundary 3 area, with some roadside ditches residing south of Main Street. The age of the storm pipe system ranges from 1950s to 1990s and is comprised of mostly concrete pipe. Capacity of storm pipe ranges from 4 to 65 inches. There is a need to replace aging and undersized lines through rehabilitation projects. The sanitary system is predominately concrete pipe,

changing to PVC pipe whenever lines are rehabilitated. The older lines in this area date back to 1948. Pipeline sizes on sewer main lines run 8 to 24 inches with trunk lines up to 60 inches.

Bicycle opportunities are less than desirable as the Downtown currently has no designated, striped east-west routes. There is only one bike path along Pioneer Parkway within the urban renewal area. Shared sidewalks with pedestrians or streets with cars, does not engender this efficient travel alternative.

## **5. Conditions - Public Parking**

Off-street parking remains a real and perceived issue for downtown merchants. Although there almost a thousand spaces (both on and off-street) in the Downtown Mixed-Use area, many are occupied by employees, many are restricted by permit only, and the larger lots are not close to the businesses most in need. The lack of parking has had a negative affect on the level of economic investment in the area. The City enforces all on-street spaced or publicly owned spaces in this area, but the two hour time limit is not proving to be an effective deterrent to prolonged and non-business use. Notwithstanding all of the benefits that will accrue from an improved pedestrian environment, few downtown businesses can survive on a customer-based derived solely from foot-traffic.

## **6. Conditions - Visual Appearance**

The commercial core of the Downtown area is aligned along Main Street (ODOT Highway 126) and South A Street east of the Springfield bridges. Both are part of the State Highway system under the jurisdiction of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). Main Street and South A are characterized by a mix of older, “main street” style commercial properties with mostly on-street parking and strip commercial and industrial development of varying styles and quality, most fronted by parking lots. The “main street” area has several vacant storefronts and generally shows need of façade updating and repair. There are overhead power lines throughout the area, adding to the visual clutter. Attractive street furniture, signs, awnings, banners, trees, landscaping, and other visual amenities are inconsistent and scattered.

The Mill Race and Pond, located along South A, has been in a state of disrepair since its donation to the City in the mid-1980’s. Since that time, the City has refurbished portions of the water amenity and adjoining Booth-Kelly complex, but major repairs and improvement projects still remain to be completed. The current physical appearance and access restrictions to the site hinder future development. While physical appearance is not specifically listed as a condition of blight in ORS 457, the appearance of modern industrial sites including green space, plantings, improved business frontage and parking areas, low external impacts, etc. are important to economically productive industrial and commercial sites as well as the nearby properties. Economically underproductive sites are considered blighted. As development and redevelopment occurs in surrounding areas the Mill Race and Mill Pond should be evaluated to see if the facility may be redeveloped

and improved so that it may be more productive economically while enhancing the area's overall redevelopment.

## **7. Conditions – Land and Building Values**

It is anticipated that the 2007-08 tax roll will establish the initial base of assessed values for the Renewal Area. The figures are not yet available for the total assessed valuation for the Downtown Urban Renewal District for that year. The total assessed value of property within the urban renewal area for the 2006-07 tax year, subtracting non-taxable properties (\$54,567,634) is calculated at approximately \$122,500,000 in land and building values. The total assessed value of the Downtown Urban Renewal Area, excluding non-taxable properties, represents about 3.8% of the total property valuation within the City of Springfield. When added to the total frozen base value within the Glenwood Urban Renewal Area (\$106,986,910) the total assessed value for all Urban Renewal Areas in the City of Springfield equals about 7.3%. Total certified values within all renewal areas therefore are expected to be well within the maximum 15% of total valuation allowed by urban renewal law.

## **8. Conditions – Investment and Utilization of Land**

Real property values within the Downtown Urban Renewal Area are largely concentrated in commercial and industrial property classifications. The overall value of land compared to the value of improvements on that land is extraordinarily low for an urban area, especially an area that represents a major concentration of industrial uses and is developed to nearly urban densities. The real market value of land in the urban renewal area is \$64.05 million and the real market value of improvements is \$163.2 million. The ratio of building value to land value is just over 2.5:1. Mature urban areas, especially those that include so much commercial, public, and industrial building, are expected to exhibit improvement to value ratios in the 4:1 or 5:1 range. The Downtown Renewal area falls just below this range which points to a lack of investment in the Downtown, under-utilization of land, depreciated values, and a loss of tax generating revenue for the project area.

### **100B. SOCIAL CONDITIONS**

The 2000 Census is the most recent source for comprehensive demographic data that is specific to the Downtown Urban Renewal Area. The Downtown Urban Renewal District boundaries do not coincide with local census tracts and block groups.. However, block groups within Census Tracts 3202, 3300, 3400, and 3500 fall within the portions of the urban renewal area. Table 3 below summarizes the estimated income and housing characteristics of residents within the urban renewal area. Table 4 shows the percentage of owner occupied dwelling units and renter occupied units. Table 5 shows the population within the urban renewal district by race.

It is not possible within the scope of this analysis to accurately estimate the exact number of residents and their demographics for the area within the urban renewal area without

including fragments of the census tracts and block groups that are outside of the urban renewal boundary. The information below is meant to provide only general information on income and housing characteristics of residents within the area.

**Table 3. Population and Income by Census Tract within the Urban Renewal District**

Census Tract	Total Population	Median Household Income	Percentage of Low-Moderate Income Households
32.02	4,066	34,273	28.7% (BG 1)* 55.0% (BG 2)*
33	6,775	30,163	59.4%
34	4,706	27,679	60.1% (BG 3)* 59.2% (BG 4)*
35	3406	44,053	25.0%

*(BG)\* is a division of a Census tract called a block group.*

The largest percentage of residents within the urban renewal district live in census tracts 33 and 34. Tract 34, Block Group 4 is almost wholly contained within the urban renewal area and the statistics for this subarea are perhaps the most representative of the area as a whole. Tract 35 is largely outside of the urban renewal area and is least representative of the area.

Table 3 shows that the majority of residents in the area have a median household income ranging between \$27,679 (Tract 34) and \$30,163 (Tract 33). Tract 35 has the highest household income at \$44,053. The median household income for Lane County is \$36,942.

The City of Springfield participates in HUD’s Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program which targets funding for low income neighborhoods. Eligibility for CDBG funding requires an assessment of the percentage of households living at or below the federally established “low-moderate income” level. In the Downtown Urban Renewal Area, the majority of households (roughly 55 to 60 percent) fall within the low-moderate income classification.

**Table 4. Housing Tenure by Census Tract within the Urban Renewal District.**

Census Tract	Percentage of Owner Occupied/ Renter Occupied Dwelling Units
32.02	50.5/ 49.5
33	52.3/ 47.7
34	49.1/ 50.9
35	83.4/ 16.6

Home ownership is sometimes an indicator of income and neighborhood stability. Table 4 shows that between 49 and 51 percent of all dwelling units are renter occupied. In Lane County 37.7 percent of dwelling units are renter occupied.

**Table 5. Racial Composition by Census Tract within the Urban Renewal District.**

	Lane County	Census Tract 32.02	Census Tract 33	Census Tract 34	Census Tract 35
White	90%	87%	89%	89%	92%
Hispanic	4%	11%	9%	8%	5%
Black	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%
American Indian and Alaska Native	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%
Asian	2%	2%	1%	0%	2%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Some other race	2%	5%	4%	3%	1%
Two or more races	4%	5%	4%	4%	4%

The racial composition (white to non-white) of the urban renewal area is similar to that of Lane County. The Hispanic population within the area is significantly higher than the county as a whole. Table 5 shows that in census tracts most representative of the urban renewal area Hispanics make up between 8 and 11 percent of the population, compared to just 4% for Lane County. The growing Hispanic presence and influence within the urban renewal area can be seen in the growing number of shops and services catering to Hispanic households that have been established in the area.

## **200. EXPECTED FISCAL, SERVICE, AND POPULATION IMPACTS OF PLAN**

Urban renewal plan activities are aimed at alleviating traffic, parking and pedestrian safety problems, at repairing and redeveloping property within the area, and at upgrading lighting, streets, sidewalks, open space conditions and providing new or upgraded infrastructure in the Renewal Area. The Urban Renewal Plan is expected to facilitate planned, orderly growth as anticipated in the Eugene-Springfield Metro Area General Plan and Downtown Refinement Plan. The Plan is not expected to result in a need for any additional police, fire, or other emergency services beyond those already contemplated by the City and other service providers.

The Renewal Area boundary includes some proposed housing development. Carrying out the Renewal Plan is expected to result in slight population growth in Downtown. But that growth is included in the overall population growth of the City of Springfield over the next 20 years and the fiscal impacts are not significant relative to growth in other parts of

the much larger Springfield city limits. And therefore, carrying out the Plan is expected to have no impacts on Springfield School District 19, given the Downtown Urban Renewal area's small size relative to the size of Springfield School District 19. Carrying out the Renewal Plan is not expected to have any additional impact on water and sewer service needs, since the utilities' planning include providing services to these and other utilities in the urban renewal area. Project activities are not expected to require the relocation or removal of any residential or commercial properties by the renewal agency.

Carrying out the renewal plan will require the use of tax increment revenues. The tax impacts of the renewal plan are discussed in detail in Section 500 D of this report.

The Downtown Urban Renewal Plan is expected to produce positive fiscal and service impacts for downtown. Among the public benefits of the renewal plan are:

- Street and circulation improvements will improve public safety and convenience.
- Infrastructure improvements will provide better utility service and decrease public maintenance costs
- New businesses will provide additional shopping convenience and reduce vehicular trips and time.
- New development will enhance the river experience.
- Rehabilitation programs will preserve and renew properties in, and around, downtown commercial areas along Main Street and South A.
- An increase in construction expenditures and purchases in the Urban Renewal area will create secondary jobs.
- The urban renewal plan will help the City of Springfield fund a number of projects listed in the City's Capital Improvements Program in the Downtown Refinement Plan for the urban renewal plan area.
- The urban renewal plan will develop the opportunity areas along the Mill Pond/Race, currently without suitable streets, public access or infrastructure for tourism, mixed commercial-residential, or other major development by providing urban standard roads, supportive urban services and utilities, area-wide storm drainage systems, and allowing public access and protection of the waterfront areas.

The public and private investments made in the urban renewal area are likely to encourage new investment in adjacent areas. The value thus created can not be quantified, but observation of renewal programs around the state indicates that there are spillover investment effects from a successful renewal program. There are other positive effects of a renewal program that do not lend themselves easily to quantification, for they are quality of life issues. Maintaining Main Street and South A as the primary arteries of the area, improving housing, expanding cultural, and shopping opportunities within the area, and improving the appearance of downtown, all have value to this area's sense of community. In fact, these qualities have been expressed as important community values and directly influenced creation of this renewal plan and its projects.

The expenditure of tax increment funds is expected to produce new property values for

the City of Springfield. The renewal project is estimated to be completed by the year 2027. During that period, property values in the renewal area are expected to increase by approximately \$322 million. At current property tax rates, the new property values anticipated in the renewal area will contribute over \$4.3 million in property tax revenues in the first year after the project is ended. Of that revenue, approximately \$1.5 million will return to the City of Springfield. That property tax revenue will continue to grow thereafter as a result of increases in annual assessments.

### **300. REASONS FOR SELECTING THE URBAN RENEWAL AREA**

The Urban Renewal Plan Area was selected based on Downtown Refinement Plan and the Eugene Springfield Metro Area General Plan goals, objectives, and policies and on the existence of blighting conditions within the area. The project area evidences the following characteristics of blight:

- A lack of proper utilization of land planned for tax producing purposes.
- Deficiencies in streets, curb, sidewalk, water and sewer services in the project area.
- Deficiencies in public recreation and open space opportunities.
- Poor visual and aesthetic conditions, contributing to a low level of investment in the project area.
- Poor building conditions in the project area.
- A prevalence of low values and lack of investment in the project area, and reduced tax receipts resulting there from.

Conditions within the Renewal Area exist and satisfy the definitions of blight in ORS 457.010. Treating and curing these conditions are reasons for selecting this renewal area.

### **400. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND EXISTING CONDITIONS IN THE DOWNTOWN URBAN RENEWAL AREA**

1. Streets will be improved throughout the renewal area.
2. Infrastructure and utilities will be improved in the renewal area.
3. Improvements to parks, public buildings, and open spaces will treat deficiencies in those areas.
4. Parking improvements will make it easier for tourists and visitors to shop, or take advantage of recreational opportunities, thereby encouraging expenditures and new investments in the area.
5. Streetscape activities will improve the visual appearance of the area, and provide a better climate for new investment in the project area.
6. Assistance for rehabilitation and new development will attract new investment to the area, and improve the building conditions and blighted appearance of the area.

7. Administration and planning activities will assure the plan is carried out effectively and in conformance with applicable managerial and fiscal requirements.

## **500. FINANCIAL ANALYSIS OF PLAN**

### **500A. ESTIMATED PROJECT COST AND REVENUE SOURCES**

Table 6 shows the estimated total costs of the Downtown Urban Renewal Project. These costs are the total anticipated costs, allowing for 5% inflation during the life of the project.

The principal method of funding the project share of costs will be through use of tax increment financing as authorized by ORS 457. Revenues are obtained from anticipated urban renewal bond proceeds and the proceeds of short term urban renewal notes.

Table 6 shows that the total costs of project activities to the Urban Renewal Agency are estimated at \$25,020,000 in 2007 dollars. A 5% annual inflation is assumed for the project costs. The Maximum Indebtedness authorized under this plan is \$43,010,000. This amount is the principle of such indebtedness and does not include interest or indebtedness incurred to refund or refinance such indebtedness.

The capacity for urban renewal bonds is based on projections of urban renewal revenues. Anticipated annual revenues are shown in Table 7 of this Report. Table 7 anticipates there will be 6 long-term bond issues during the life of the plan. Bonds will be issued as revenues, project requirements, and overall bond market conditions dictate. In addition, the Renewal Agency will apply for, and make use of funding from other federal, state, local, or private sources as such funds become available.

**Table 6. Proposed Downtown Urban Renewal Projects**

August 31, 2007: Estimated Costs and Completion Dates

<b>Project</b>	<b>Expected Completion</b>	<b>SEDA Share</b>
<b><u>A. Street Construction and Circulation Improvements</u></b>		
	<b>2021</b>	<b>\$5,000,000</b>
South A & Main Street Couplet Redesign and Construction		\$2,200,000
North A "Civic Street" Curb and Streetscape Improvements		\$1,000,000
Downtown District Pedestrian Level Street Lighting		\$1,300,000
Pedestrian Corridor Improvements		\$500,000
<b><u>B. Infrastructure and Utilities Improvements</u></b>		
	<b>2022</b>	<b>\$1,470,000</b>
Utility Undergrounding and/or Relocation Projects		\$970,000
Stormwater System Improvements		\$500,000
<b><u>C. Public Facilities</u></b>		
	<b>2025</b>	<b>\$6,100,000</b>
Springfield Library Building		\$1,000,000
Downtown Parking Structure		\$3,000,000
Downtown Off-Street Surface Parking Construction and Rehabilitation		\$25,000
Downtown Public Art		\$500,000
Island Park Facilities Upgrades and Expansions (Including Parking)		\$1,000,000
Federally Qualified Health Center		\$150,000
Springfield Museum		\$100,000
Main Street Dual Use Parking/Civic Plaza (Between Museum and Arts Center)		\$75,000
Public Performance Space Improvements		\$250,000
<b><u>D. Parks, Recreation, Pedestrian and Bike Corridors and Other Amenities</u></b>		
	<b>2021</b>	<b>\$2,050,000</b>
Downtown Millrace Access, Restoration, and Improvements		\$800,000
Downtown Parks Development and Improvements		\$600,000
Downtown "Entrance/Gateway" Improvements		\$500,000
Downtown Public/Private Signage Improvements		\$50,000
Street/Open Space Tree Program		\$100,000
<b><u>E. Upgrades to Fire Protection and Emergency Response System</u></b>		
	<b>2025</b>	<b>\$3,500,000</b>
Fire Station Relocation		\$3,500,000
<b><u>F. Redevelopment of Commercial, Residential, Industrial, etc. Through New Construction</u></b>		
		<b>\$1,900,000</b>
Downtown Redevelopment Assistance Program (New Construction)	<b>2022</b>	\$1,900,000
<b><u>G. Preservation, Rehabilitation, and Conservation</u></b>		
	<b>2018</b>	<b>\$2,650,000</b>
Downtown Building Façade Improvement Program		\$250,000
Downtown Restoration and Rehabilitation Fund		\$2,000,000
Historic Preservation		\$400,000
<b><u>H. Property Acquisition and Disposition</u></b>		
	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b><u>I. Technical, Financial and Design Plan(s)</u></b>		
	<b>2011</b>	<b>\$600,000</b>
		\$600,000
<b><u>J. Plan Administration</u></b>		
	<b>2028</b>	<b>\$1,700,000</b>
Staffing and Support Services		\$1,700,000
<b><u>K. Project Ideas Requiring Expansion of Current Boundaries</u></b>		
		<b>\$50,000</b>
South Mill Pond/Race Annexations (Improvements may be made without annexation or boundary expansion if outlined in Plan and approved by Lane County)		\$50,000
<b>TOTAL ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS</b>		<b>\$25,020,000</b>
<b>Note: Cost estimates are in 2007 dollars.</b>		<b>SEDA Share</b>

## **500B. ANTICIPATED START & FINISH DATES OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES**

The project activities shown in Table 6 will begin in 2008. The sequencing and prioritization of individual project activities shown in Table 6 will be done by SEDA and any citizen advisory bodies that SEDA calls upon to assist in this process. The priority of projects and annual funding will be as established in the annual budget process. Completion dates for individual activities may be affected by changes to local economic and market conditions, changes in the availability of tax increment funds, and changes in priorities for carrying out project activities, especially with public partners like Willamalane Parks District, School District 19, Lane County, the Oregon Department of Transportation and others.

It is estimated that all activities proposed in this plan will be completed and project indebtedness paid off by 2027. At that time, the tax increment provisions of this plan can be ended.

## **500C. ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES AND YEAR OF DEBT RETIREMENT**

It is estimated that the Downtown urban renewal district will collect tax increment revenue between the years 2008 and 2027. It is estimated that the district will produce \$46.19 million in tax increment receipts in that period. These funds will be utilized to finance project activities and pay debt service costs, including interest, associated with undertaking these project activities.

It is anticipated that available project revenues and funds accumulated in a special fund for debt redemption will be sufficient to retire outstanding bonded indebtedness in the year 2028 and terminate the tax increment financing provisions of the project. After all project debt is retired and the project closed out, it is estimated that there will be surplus tax increment funds. These funds will be distributed to taxing bodies affected by this plan, as provided in ORS 457.

Table 7 of this Report shows the anticipated tax increment receipts for each year of the project and the use of those receipts. Table 7 follows on the next pages.

**Table 7. Cash Flow Table Relating to \$25.02 Million in Project Expenditures – 2008 to 2013**

<b>Resources and Requirements</b>					
<b>a. Resources</b>	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
<b>Beginning Balance</b>	0	\$2,435	\$29,305	\$56,863	\$186,363
<b>Resources</b>					
<b>A. Tax increment Revenue</b>	37,064	272,008	522,334	573,762	889,086
<b>B. Bond Proceeds</b>					
<b>long term</b>	\$0	\$1,635,784	\$0	\$0	\$3,635,076
<b>C. Interest</b>	\$371	\$19,078	\$5,223	\$5,738	\$45,242
<b>Total Resources</b>	<u>\$37,435</u>	<u>\$1,929,305</u>	<u>\$556,863</u>	<u>\$636,363</u>	<u>\$4,755,766</u>
<b>b. Project Requirements</b>					
To Long term Debt Service	\$0	\$225,000	\$225,000	\$225,000	\$725,000
Projects funded long and short debt	\$35,000	\$1,675,000	\$275,000	\$225,000	\$3,800,000
Total, projects and Debt Service	\$35,000	\$1,900,000	\$500,000	\$450,000	\$4,525,000
<b>Ending Balance</b>	\$2,435	\$29,305	\$56,863	\$186,363	\$230,766

**Table 7 Cont. Cash Flow Table Relating to \$25.02 Million in Project Expenditures – 2013 to 2018**

<b>Resources and Requirements</b>					
<b>a. Resources</b>	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
<b>Beginning Balance</b>	\$230,766	\$272,541	\$289,337	\$322,526	\$356,731
<b>Resources</b>					
<b>A. Tax increment Revenue</b>	1,353,242	1,427,521	2,235,830	2,596,861	2,911,120
<b>B. Bond Proceeds</b>					
<b>long term</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,299,381	\$0
<b>C. Interest</b>	\$13,532	\$14,275	\$22,358	\$128,962	\$29,111
<b>Total Resources</b>	\$1,597,541	\$1,714,337	\$2,547,526	\$13,347,731	\$3,296,962
<b>b. Project Requirements</b>					
To Long term Debt Service	\$725,000	\$725,000	\$725,000	\$2,141,000	\$2,141,000
Projects funded long and short debt	\$600,000	\$700,000	\$1,500,000	\$10,850,000	\$750,000
Total, projects and Debt Service	\$1,325,000	\$1,425,000	\$2,225,000	\$12,991,000	\$2,891,000
<b>Ending Balance</b>	\$272,541	\$289,337	\$322,526	\$356,731	\$405,962

**Table 7 Cont. Cash Flow Table Relating to \$25.02 Million in Project Expenditures – 2018 to 2023**

<b>Resources and Requirements</b>					
<b>a. Resources</b>	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
<b>Beginning Balance</b>	\$405,962	\$448,484	\$512,551	\$547,011	\$585,250
<b>Resources</b>					
<b>A. Tax increment Revenue</b>	3,028,240	3,148,581	3,469,092	3,601,556	3,737,663
<b>B. Bond Proceeds</b>					
<b>long term</b>	\$0	\$0	\$3,346,545	\$0	\$0
<b>C. Interest</b>	\$30,282	\$31,486	\$68,156	\$36,016	\$37,377
<b>Total Resources</b>	\$3,464,484	\$3,628,551	\$7,396,344	\$4,184,583	\$4,360,289
<b>b. Project Requirements</b>					
To Long term Debt Service	\$1,916,000	\$1,916,000	\$2,749,333	\$2,249,333	\$2,249,333
Projects funded long and short debt	\$1,100,000	\$1,200,000	\$4,100,000	\$1,350,000	\$1,450,000
Total, projects and Debt Service	\$3,016,000	\$3,116,000	\$6,849,333	\$3,599,333	\$3,699,333
<b>Ending Balance</b>	\$448,484	\$512,551	\$547,011	\$585,250	\$660,956

**Table 7 Cont. Cash Flow Table Relating to \$25.02 Million in Project Expenditures – 2023 to 2027**

<b>Resources and Requirements</b>				
<b>a. Resources</b>	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
<b>Beginning Balance</b>	\$660,956	\$227,911	\$343,623	\$354,167
<b>Resources</b>				
<b>A. Tax increment Revenue</b>	3,877,513	4,021,209	4,168,856	4,320,564
<b>B. Bond Proceeds</b>				
<b>long term</b>	\$0	\$5,020,090	\$0	\$0
<b>C. Interest</b>	\$38,775	\$90,413	\$41,689	\$43,206
<b>Total Resources</b>	\$4,577,244	\$9,359,623	\$4,554,167	\$4,717,936
<b>b. Project Requirements</b>				
To Long term Debt Service	\$2,249,333	\$3,416,000	\$2,000,000	\$0
Projects funded long and short debt	\$2,100,000	\$5,600,000	\$2,200,000	\$3,500,000
Total, projects and Debt Service	\$4,349,333	\$9,016,000	\$4,200,000	\$3,500,000
<b>Ending Balance</b>	\$227,911	\$343,623	\$354,167	\$1,217,936

## **500D. IMPACT OF TAX INCREMENT FINANCING**

The passage of Ballot Measure 50 (BM50) has changed Oregon's property tax system, and the impacts of urban renewal on taxpayers, and other taxing bodies. Prior to BM50, collection of tax increment revenues for a renewal agency resulted in an increase in the taxpayer's property tax rate. Taxing bodies suffered no revenue losses, unless there was overall compression of property tax revenues.

### **Revenues Foregone by Affected Taxing Bodies**

Table 8 shows the anticipated cumulative incremental values in the Renewal Area over the life of the Plan and the anticipated property tax revenues foregone as a result of taxing bodies not being able to apply their permanent BM50 tax rates to those values.

### **Present Value of Revenues Foregone**

Table 8, the revenues foregone, provides a Present Value calculation of the revenue foregone over a twenty year period. In this calculation, the annual revenues foregone by the taxing bodies are discounted by 3.5%. That produces a lower, realistic picture of the present day revenues that might be foregone by the taxing bodies over the life of the plan.

Two additional notes should be made about revenues foregone by affected taxing bodies. One, Tables 8 and 9 both assume that all the new values in the Downtown Renewal Area would occur, even without the investment of urban renewal funds. It is more realistic to assume that the public expenditures on renewal activities will have some effect on the growth of values within the urban renewal area. If one makes that assumption, some of the values which are used to calculate revenue foregone would not materialize at all. This assumption is not made, here, but if it were used, it would further reduce the revenues foregone by the affected taxing bodies.

Two, some will look at the total revenues foregone, and assume that the total shown is lost immediately. As the revenue foregone tables show, these revenues are foregone annually, over an extended period of time, not all at once. Given the size of the total budgets of the taxing bodies, the annual revenues foregone usually represent only a minor percentage of their total budgets.

### **Impact on Schools**

School and ESD revenue foregone is replaced dollar-for-dollar by State funds, and does not affect per student funding

**Financial Impact of Plan after Indebtedness is Repaid.**

When all the projects contained in the Urban Renewal Plan are completed, an estimated \$321.7 million in assessed values will be placed back on the tax roll. In the following year, property tax revenues generated by those values are estimated to be approximately \$4.32 million.

The tax impact on each of the overlapping taxing bodies is shown in Tables on the following pages.

**Table 8. Taxes Foregone by Affected Taxing Bodies**

**Draft Plan - \$25.02 Million in 2007 cost  
Estimated Revenue foregone 19 Year Period**

		<u>Lane County</u> <u>Tax rate</u>	<u>Spfld</u> <u>Tax Rate</u>	<u>Will Park &amp;</u> <u>Rec</u> <u>Tax Rate</u>	<u>SD19</u> <u>Tax Rate</u>	<u>ESD</u> <u>Tax Rate</u>	<u>LCC</u> <u>Tax Rate</u>
		<b>1.2726</b>	<b>4.7203</b>	<b>1.9647</b>	<b>4.6412</b>	<b>0.2233</b>	<b>0.6165</b>
Year	Cumulative New Incremental Values in area	Foregone On New Values	Foregone On New Values	Foregone On New Values	Foregone On New Values	Foregone On New Values	Foregone On New Values
2008	\$2,759,801	\$3,512	\$13,027	\$5,422	\$12,809	\$616	\$1,701
2009	\$20,253,797	\$25,775	\$95,604	\$39,793	\$94,002	\$4,523	\$12,486
2010	\$38,893,078	\$49,495	\$183,587	\$76,413	\$180,511	\$8,685	\$23,978
2011	\$42,722,439	\$54,369	\$201,663	\$83,937	\$198,283	\$9,540	\$26,338
2012	\$66,201,507	\$84,248	\$312,491	\$130,066	\$307,254	\$14,783	\$40,813
2013	\$100,762,650	\$128,231	\$475,630	\$197,968	\$467,660	\$22,500	\$62,120
2014	\$106,293,424	\$135,269	\$501,737	\$208,835	\$493,329	\$23,735	\$65,530
2015	\$166,480,294	\$211,863	\$785,837	\$327,084	\$772,668	\$37,175	\$102,635
2016	\$193,362,704	\$246,073	\$912,730	\$379,900	\$897,435	\$43,178	\$119,208
2017	\$216,762,479	\$275,852	\$1,023,184	\$425,873	\$1,006,038	\$48,403	\$133,634
2018	\$225,483,249	\$286,950	\$1,064,349	\$443,007	\$1,046,513	\$50,350	\$139,010
2019	\$234,443,839	\$298,353	\$1,106,645	\$460,612	\$1,088,101	\$52,351	\$144,535
2020	\$258,309,146	\$328,724	\$1,219,297	\$507,500	\$1,198,864	\$57,680	\$159,248
2021	\$268,172,449	\$341,276	\$1,265,854	\$526,878	\$1,244,642	\$59,883	\$165,328
2022	\$278,306,993	\$354,173	\$1,313,692	\$546,790	\$1,291,678	\$62,146	\$171,576
2023	\$288,720,236	\$367,425	\$1,362,846	\$567,249	\$1,340,008	\$64,471	\$177,996
2024	\$299,419,844	\$381,042	\$1,413,351	\$588,270	\$1,389,667	\$66,860	\$184,592
2025	\$310,413,691	\$395,032	\$1,465,246	\$609,870	\$1,440,692	\$69,315	\$191,370
2026	\$321,709,869	\$409,408	\$1,518,567	\$632,063	\$1,493,120	\$71,838	\$198,334
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$3,967,663</b>	<b>\$14,716,770</b>	<b>\$6,125,466</b>	<b>\$14,470,155</b>	<b>\$696,196</b>	<b>\$1,922,100</b>
<b>PV @3.5%</b>		<b>\$2,388,675</b>	<b>\$10,438,743</b>	<b>\$4,344,850</b>	<b>\$10,263,816</b>	<b>\$493,818</b>	<b>\$1,363,364</b>

Note: School and ESD revenue foregone is replaced dollar-for-dollar by State funds, and does not affect per student funding.

PV = Present value of the revenue foregone. This adjusts future dollars to 2007 dollar totals.

## **500E. FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY OF PLAN**

Table 8 in Section 500 of this Report to the Plan shows the estimated costs of project activities at \$25.02 million. Table 9 provides additional details pertaining to how costs were estimated. The principal source of revenue to carry out project activities will be annual tax increment revenues of the Renewal Agency. Anticipated tax increment revenues are shown in Table 8. The tax increment revenues shown in Table 8 are based on the following assumptions:

The revenues shown in Table 8 are expected to be sufficient to carry out all project activities currently shown on the Urban Renewal Plan, and to retire project indebtedness within a 21-year period. It is financially feasible to carry out the Urban Renewal Plan for the Downtown Urban Renewal Area.

## **600. RELOCATION**

### **600A. PROPERTIES REQUIRING RELOCATION**

No relocation is anticipated at the adoption of this plan.

### **600B. RELOCATION METHODS**

If in the implementation of this Plan, persons or businesses should be displaced by action of the SEDA, the Agency shall, as required by law, provide assistance to such persons or businesses to be displaced. Such people and businesses displaced will be contacted to determine their individual relocation needs. As required, they will be provided information on available space and will be given assistance in moving. All relocation activities will be undertaken and payments made in accordance with the requirements of ORS 281.045 - 281.105 and any other applicable laws or regulations. Relocation payments will be made as provided in ORS 281.060.

### **600C. HOUSING COST ENUMERATION**

The Downtown Urban Renewal Plan does not anticipate removing existing housing units. New housing is expected to be developed in the mixed use zones of the Urban Renewal Plan Area. A portion of units are expected to be rental housing units for low- to moderate-income residents. In addition, private development may build upwards (allowed under existing plan designations and zoning and at an average density of 15 units per acre). These would likely be priced for sale or rent to upper middle and upper income households as described in recent housing market analyses.

**Table 9. Project Estimating Detail (Reflects Detail From Table 6)**

	A	B	C	D	E
1	<b>Table 2a: Proposed Downtown Urban Renewal Projects</b>				
2	September 5, 2007: Estimated Costs and Completion Dates				
3		Expected	SEDA	OTHER	TOTAL PROJECT
4	PROJECT	Completion	SHARE	SHARE	CATEGORY COST
5					
6	<b>A. Street Construction and Circulation Improvements</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>\$5,000,000</b>	<b>\$11,990,000</b>	<b>\$16,990,000</b>
7	South A & Main Street Couplet Redesign and Construction		\$2,200,000	\$6,990,000	
8	North A "Civic Street" Curb and Streetscape Improvements		\$1,000,000	\$2,000,000	
9	Downtown District Pedestrian Level Street Lighting		\$1,300,000	\$2,100,000	
10	Pedestrian Corridor Improvements		\$500,000	\$900,000	
11					
12	<b>B. Infrastructure and Utilities Improvements</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>\$1,470,000</b>	<b>\$4,350,000</b>	<b>\$5,820,000</b>
13	Utility Undergrounding and/or Relocation Projects		\$970,000	\$2,250,000	
14	Stormwater System Improvements		\$500,000	\$2,100,000	
15					
16	<b>C. Public Facilities</b>	<b>2025</b>	<b>\$6,100,000</b>	<b>\$12,175,000</b>	<b>\$18,275,000</b>
17	Springfield Library Building		\$1,000,000	\$2,000,000	
18	Downtown Parking Structure		\$3,000,000	\$5,000,000	
19	Downtown Off-Street Surface Parking Construction and Rehabilitation		\$25,000	\$100,000	
20	Downtown Public Art		\$500,000	\$500,000	
21	Island Park Facilities Upgrades and Expansions (Including Parking)		\$1,000,000	\$3,000,000	
22	Federally Qualified Health Center		\$150,000	\$1,350,000	
23	Springfield Museum		\$100,000		
24	Main Street Dual Use Parking/Civic Plaza (Between Museum and Arts Center)		\$75,000	\$75,000	
25	Public Performance Space Improvements		\$250,000	\$150,000	
26					
27	<b>D. Parks, Recreation, Pedestrian and Bike Corridors and Other Amenities</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>\$2,050,000</b>	<b>\$2,075,000</b>	<b>\$4,125,000</b>
28	Downtown Millrace Access, Restoration, and Improvements		\$800,000	\$1,050,000	
29	Downtown Parks Development and Improvements		\$600,000	\$200,000	
30	Downtown "Entrance/Gateway" Improvements		\$500,000	\$750,000	
31	Downtown Public/Private Signage Improvements		\$50,000	\$150,000	
32	Street/Open Space Tree Program		\$100,000	\$50,000	
33					
34	<b>E. Upgrades to Fire Protection and Emergency Response System</b>		<b>\$3,500,000</b>	<b>\$2,000,000</b>	<b>\$5,500,000</b>
35	Fire Station Relocation		\$3,500,000	\$2,000,000	
36					
37	<b>G. Redevelopment of Commercial, Residential, Industrial, etc. Through New Construction</b>		<b>\$1,900,000</b>	<b>\$6,400,000</b>	<b>\$8,300,000</b>
38	Downtown Redevelopment Assistance Program (New Construction)	2022	\$1,900,000	\$6,400,000	
39					
40	<b>H. Preservation, Rehabilitation, and Conservation</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>\$2,650,000</b>	<b>\$7,450,000</b>	<b>\$10,100,000</b>
41	Downtown Building Façade Improvement Program		\$250,000	\$750,000	
42	Downtown Restoration and Rehabilitation Fund		\$2,000,000	\$5,800,000	
43	Historic Preservation		\$400,000	\$900,000	
44					
45	<b>I. Property Acquisition and Disposition</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
46					
47					
48	<b>J. Technical, Financial and Design Plan(s)</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>\$600,000</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>	<b>\$800,000</b>
49			\$600,000	\$200,000	
50					
51	<b>K. Plan Administration</b>	<b>2028</b>	<b>\$1,700,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,700,000</b>
52	Staffing and Support Services		\$1,700,000		
53					
54	<b>L. Projects Extending Outside of Current Boundaries</b>		<b>\$50,000</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>	<b>\$250,000</b>
55	South Mill Pond/Race Annexations (Improvements may be made without annexation or boundary expansion if outlined in Plan and approved by Lane County)		\$100,000	\$200,000	
56					
57	<b>TOTAL ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS</b>				
58			<b>\$25,020,000</b>	<b>\$46,840,000</b>	<b>\$71,860,000</b>
59			SEDA	Developer/Owner	Total Project
60	Note: Cost estimates are in 2007 dollars.		Share	Other Share	Category Cost