

**Coburg Loop  
CAC and TAC Meeting Summary #4  
September 24, 2008**

**Introduction**

Jeff guided the group through the draft Technical Memo #3 and discussed the different elements including the preferred path alignments and routing options, street crossings, path standard, amenities and support facilities, and themes. There was consensus that the selected alignment met the needs of Coburg and provided good access to major attractions and community anchors, took advantage of potential future growth activities, and utilized existing infrastructure.

**Path Design Feedback**

The following represents the major elements discussed:

- *School Crossings, Perceived Danger.* The school crossing was not perceived as very dangerous by CAC members. Discussed pursuing technical assistance for the major crossings.
  
- *Additional Path Connections.* It was expressed that there is a need for an additional connection from the southwest side of town to the proposed path – perhaps at Christian Way or Dixon Street. This would require additional bridges over the Canterbury/Mill Slough.
  
- *Path Design Standard.* All agreed that it was a good design. No additional changes were suggested.
  
- *Lane County Adoption.* The group discussed whether or not Lane County would need to co-adopt the Implementation Plan. Normally, an Implementation Strategy does not require co-adoption by the County. However, because portions of the path alignment are currently outside the urban growth boundary, Lane County indicated that the co-adoption was a necessary step. The comment was made that if the Implementation Strategy required adoption, then it might be in the City's best interest to have Lane County co-adopt the Coburg Parks and Open Space Master Plan at the same time. The Master Plan was not co-adopted in 2005 when it was adopted by the City as a Refinement Plan to the Coburg Comprehensive Plan. Adopting the Master Plan and the Implementation Strategy would be the most thorough solution to co-adoption questions. TGM Manager, David Helton indicated that a TGM grant amendment was feasible to accomplish this.
  
- *Lighting.* It was agreed that path lighting was not necessary except at major crossings because lighting is expensive, can be vandalized, and there is concern that lighting the path 24 hours a day would encourage use at night which may not be supported by the community.

- *Emergency Boxes.* The question was raised whether the Plan should include provisions for emergency boxes and it was determined that these amenities have become utilized less with the prominence of cell phones and that they have a tendency to attract vandals.

### **Themes Index Map**

The next map that was shared was the *Coburg Loop Map Themes Index Map*. Here, Jeff described the various segment themes that could be associated with different segments of the path system. These include segment with the following potential themes:

- Agriculture
- Trees
- Waterways and Riparian Vegetation
- Coburg History
- Wetland Ecology/Public Works
- Industry

Public Works was added to the Riparian theme after discussion.

### **Property Owner Contacts**

Finally, Jeff described his initial contacts with property owners both in and outside the urban growth boundary. All successful contacts that were made resulted in positive feedback and willingness to continue to have discussions about the path connections in and around properties. There are additional first contacts that need to be made as Jeff had some difficulty initially connecting with a couple of the property owners.

### **Next Steps**

Next steps include completing Technical Memo #2; revising the Draft Path Alignment Concept Diagram; finalizing the draft path Design Standard; beginning Technical Memo #3; and completing a draft Themes Index Map.