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Background
On July 20, 2016 the City Council directed staff to proceed with community outreach on the tier one, tier two and key corridors strategies to accommodate Eugene’s remaining multi-family housing needs over the next 20 years (Attachment 1). A draft framework of the outreach approach was provided to City Council at the same meeting. The following is a summary of the outreach efforts made and themes that emerged from the results. Detailed information on specific outreach efforts can be found in the attachments to this report.
Executive Summary

Outreach
A variety of outreach methods were used to get feedback from a broad range of Eugeneans (see Attachment 3, Community Outreach Detailed Reports and Materials). Staff produced videos, informational graphics or “infographics” and fact sheets that were distributed through weekly e-newsletters, in person events and the project website. Staff hosted or attended fifteen events and spoke to an estimated 500 residents. An online questionnaire was distributed, soliciting 185 complete responses. Where gaps were found in reaching subsets of the community, staff contacted existing networks to distribute the information and questionnaire. Staff also worked with Cogito, a local public involvement firm, to design focused outreach strategies to reach under-represented groups, including Latino residents, people with lower incomes, and younger people of Eugene. The most successful methods in reaching a broad range of people were the e-newsletters, the infographic sheets, and the videos.

While staff put significant effort into reaching a diversity of stakeholders and community members, we recognize that the number of people we were able to reach represents a relatively small sample. Given this limitation, the opinions and concerns summarized in this report do not reflect those of the whole community. This report instead reflects a sampling of the issues and concerns that may come up as Council works through its decision making process.

Summary of Overall Input

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Key Takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High density residential downtown redevelopment with existing programs and incentives</td>
<td>• There is general support for higher density housing downtown compared to other parts of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Part of the community doesn’t support the city’s analysis that significant housing development will not happen without some sort of action to make it more financially feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Latino input highlighted particular concern with safety and overcrowding associated with adding more housing downtown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium density residential- Option A: Amend the zoning code to preserve the R-2 medium density residential zone for attached housing</td>
<td>• About half support/somewhat support medium density residential Option A and B, with slightly more support for Option B. Comments indicate that B seems to be the more flexible of the two options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium density residential- Option B: Amend the zoning code to increase the minimum number of homes required in R-2 medium density residential zones from 10 to about 14 homes per net acre</td>
<td>• There is high support for exempting smaller infill lots from either of these new standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Corridors Strategy</td>
<td>Increase housing density along key transportation corridors and core commercial areas throughout the city (with incentives).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is support for adding housing to key corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There were few comments either way regarding delay in adoption of the UGB if the key corridor strategy were used to meet the housing deficit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The conversations around South Willamette impact discussions about this strategy and how key corridors would be implemented, specifically regarding the process for and timing of implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other multi-family housing strategies suggestions</th>
<th>Most common strategies suggested:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encourage SDUs (Secondary Dwelling Units), tiny houses and other forms of non-traditional housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More housing on C-2 zoned land or mixed-use developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• expand the Urban Growth Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples of other specific strategies suggested:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce Traffic Impact Analysis requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update average densities assumed, bring multi-family numbers up to date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other themes</th>
<th>Concerns about density in general, including building design and off-site impacts of denser housing (parking, etc.) and compatibility with neighborhoods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opposition/concerns about MUPTE (Multiple Unit Property Tax Exemption) program or incentives in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concerns about housing affordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• General concerns about city staff/planning processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Confusion about MDR Option A and B strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multi-family Housing Options Questionnaire results:
The following results reflect a sample size of 185 respondents. They cannot be read as representative of the community as a whole. Rather, these results raise issues and public concerns associated with planning for multi-family housing, and provide an indication of likely levels of support for the various policy options within the community.

Note: The table above does not reflect those that responded neutral or that they didn’t have enough information.
Conclusion
The results of our outreach indicate that there is general support for higher density housing downtown. There are parts of the community that are neutral or supportive of development incentives associated with this strategy, as well as a small but vocal cohort that are not supportive of development incentives. Other concerns, such as about safety downtown and overcrowding, were also stated.

The results also indicate that there is general support for the key corridors strategy. While the concept of higher density along corridors is widely supported, it should be noted that given current market conditions, subsidies or incentives would need to be introduced in these areas in order to address our housing needs. Development incentives face significant community opposition, and it would take time for the City to design and implement them in additional areas of the community. See Attachment 2 for more information about how this strategy could be implemented.

While there was no significant difference of support for Medium Density Residential Option A or Option B, Option B is more flexible and has slightly more support. There is a high degree of support for exempting smaller infill lots from either of these new standards.

Community input also resulted in a list of other strategies to consider to accommodate multi-family housing. Some of the most commonly suggested strategies are included on the tiered list of multi-family housing options previously provided to Council July 20, 2015. Comments on those that could impact the multi-family housing deficit are discussed in this report.

Some of the suggestions were directed at how housing develops (e.g. affordability and building design) without a clear relationship to solving our multi-family housing need. Community members indicated concern with potential impacts from infill development that would occur at increased densities under Option A or B. In either scenario there are concerns about adding more housing to established neighborhoods or rezoning single-family areas (despite the fact that Options A and B do not rezone single family areas). We also heard concerns about increased density (building design and off-site impacts), and concerns about the roles of city staff, neighborhood residents, and city-wide boards and commissions, in addition to concerns about equitable, fair planning processes.

From our work reaching out to underrepresented members of the community, we learned that people are interested in what the city is doing, and are happy to be asked for their opinions. Providing more information up front could increase the amount of input received and reduce uncertainty and misunderstanding. Focus groups with a broad range of people ahead of a questionnaire or input opportunity could be a good way to increase the input and provide learning opportunities about city projects. Finally, following-up with folks about why we do planning, what we are trying to achieve and how their input is being used is helpful even if people disagree with the outcome.
Community Input Opportunities & Input
A variety of outreach methods and opportunities were used to get input from the public. For a summary report, see Attachment 3, Community Outreach Detailed Reports and Materials. Below is a summary of the main input opportunities and the feedback we heard.

Summer Outreach Events
Over the course of the summer of 2016, City of Eugene Planning staff attended or hosted fifteen public events. These activities were designed to engage community members in a conversation around future growth, 20 minute neighborhoods, multi-family housing, and urban growth boundary and comprehensive plan adoption. These events can be broken down into two streams of engagement with two distinct purposes.

Community Events
Under the first stream, Planning staff hosted an Envision Eugene booth at 12 community events between July 14th and September 25th 2016, including Party in the Parks, Sunday Streets, Bethel Family Fun Night, neighborhood picnics, and First Friday Art Walks. Participating in these events was intended to boost project awareness and engage community members who have not traditionally participated in Envision Eugene public involvement activities. The tone of these events was fun and lighthearted focusing on 20 minute neighborhoods and what makes a great place to live.

Community Input
We had an estimated 500 interactions with the public at these events. Tracking all of the comments and interactions at events like these is challenging, and the main objective was to
boost Envision Eugene project awareness and make connections with a diverse community of residents. That said, we did collect relevant project information from the public, summarized and organized into themes below. The summary comments related to housing are specifically included here:

- **Importance of Parks and Community Centers**
- **Concern about Housing Affordability**
  - Residents consistently raised the issue of housing affordability. They wanted to know what the City was doing about housing affordability and how Envision Eugene could address this city-wide issue.
- **Frustration/Disillusionment with Planning Processes**
  - Residents who were aware of Envision Eugene expressed fatigue with the ongoing process. There was also a general awareness and frustration with neighborhood planning efforts (i.e. South Willamette) on both sides of the issue; some residents expressed mistrust in Planning-led initiatives while others were frustrated by the reluctance of some neighborhoods to add housing along key corridors and implement other aspects of the community vision.
- **Desire for more Neighborhood Commercial**
  - Residents expressed a desire for more restaurants and grocery stores in their neighborhoods. Residents want to be able to walk, bike or make a short drive to meet with friends, go out to eat and purchase necessary items.
- **Alternative Transportation Modes**
  - There was broad support for improving transit, cycling and walking infrastructure. People said that they want to live in walkable neighborhoods for a variety of reasons and that they want cyclists to have dedicated space, whether they are themselves cyclists or not.

**Community Drop-in Sessions & Open House**
The second stream of engagement was a series of more traditional engagement events. Planning staff hosted two drop-in sessions at the Atrium Building downtown and an Open House at Clear Lake Elementary School in Bethel. These events were coined as “deeper dive events” where residents could engage with some of the more technical Envision Eugene materials, review maps and policy directions, and ask questions directly of planners.

**Community Input**
An estimated 75 members of the public attended the three events. The input or questions we heard are organized by theme below, with the multi-family housing comments in more detail:

- Envision Eugene in general (timeline, process, state law)
- Concerns about growth and other miscellaneous related issues
• Expansion Areas (support and concern for industrial land, general support for Clear Lake overlay and wetlands protection, support for both park expansions)

• Multi-Family Housing:
  • There was general support for high density housing downtown. Residents who live downtown wanted to see more housing options closer to the core and residents who live in other parts of the city expressed that downtown seems like a logical place to encourage our highest densities. Residents articulated a desire to see more condominium options.
  • With regards to the options for changing the standards in the R-2 zone, residents seemed generally supportive or neutral of the proposed changes with no clear preference for Option A or B expressed during these events. There was also general support for exempting smaller lots.
  • Other suggestions heard were supporting more secondary dwelling units, making it easier to build duplexes, and increasing the minimum density in High Density Residential zones to meet some of the medium density need. On the other hand there were also residents who suggested expanding the UGB for housing, citing unaffordability and negative social consequences resulting from artificially restricting the land supply.

For more details, see Appendix 3.a, Summer Outreach Events Report

Questionnaires/Surveys
Two questionnaires or surveys were conducted that included questions about the multi-family housing options. Summaries of those results follows, details of the findings are in the attached reports.

Multi-family Housing Options Questionnaire
The Multi-family Housing Options Questionnaire was put together using SurveyMonkey. The questionnaire was open for almost seven weeks and was advertised through a variety of methods discussed below including e-newsletters and listservs, letters to property owners, and print/web/social media advertisements. In that time we heard from 277 questionnaire respondents, of which about 185 completed the questionnaire. About 60% answered the demographics questions. Of those that responded:
  • Most respondents were Caucasian, age 40 or older, had a Bachelor’s degree or more, and made $75,000 or more in household income. Over half of the residents lived in either south or northeast Eugene.
  • Underrepresentation of residents that were not Caucasian, 39 years old or younger, have some college or less, make 0-$74,999, and live in other parts of Eugene.

Community Input
A summary of the results of the questionnaire includes:
  • General support for high density housing downtown
- About half support/somewhat support medium density residential Option A or B, with slightly more support for B
- High support to exempt small lots from either Option A or B (if either are adopted)
- General support for the key corridor strategy

Additionally, several of the questions provided opportunity for respondents to include follow-up comments. About 185 respondents completed the questionnaire and of those (depending on the question) about 50-90 respondents chose to include additional comments with their answers for a total of 550 additional comments provided that were related to the strategies. Two questions (question 8 and 9) were specifically designed as open ended questions and generated the most additional comments (84 and 88 comments respectively). The most commonly mentioned themes are described below. The actual questionnaire responses should be consulted for details since many of the comments included several thoughts or ideas.

- Comments about general support for the strategies, MUPTE opposition/concerns expressed throughout, concerns about staff/planning process, concerns about infill (building design and off-site impacts) and compatibility with existing neighborhoods.
- A number of suggestions were provided regarding other strategies to consider.
  - Some of the most commonly suggested strategies are reflected in the tiered list of multi-family housing options previously provided to City Council on July 20, 2015. The tiered list included some analysis regarding the feasibility of the strategy, or why the feasibility of the strategy was not analyzed. Below are the most common strategies we heard and how they match-up with the tiered strategies previously presented to Council:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Strategy Suggestions from questionnaire</th>
<th>How Addressed in Tiered Strategy List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Encourage secondary dwelling units, tiny houses and other forms | Tier 2- Analyzed but determined to have low feasibility  
Tier 3- Not analyzed because it would take significant time with unclear capacity results and/or would require financial programs |
| More housing on C-2 zoned land or mixed use development | • Envision Eugene is already assuming 4 additional SDUs per year if we restructure systems development charges  
• Tier 3: Other financial or permitting incentives for certain densities, housing types, or in certain locations  
• The key corridor strategy focuses on commercially zoned land. Core commercial areas are also mostly C-2 zoned.  
• Tier 3: Require a minimum number of homes to be built when building residential in Commercial  
• Tier 3: Adjust permit fees for certain densities, housing types or in certain locations  
• Tier 3: Other financial or permitting incentives for certain densities, housing types, or in certain locations  
• Tier 3: Adopt MUPTE in more areas  
• Tier 3: Adopt tax increment financing in more districts |
Expand the urban growth boundary

Examples of other specific strategy suggestions:

- Tier 2: Expand the UGB to accommodate the unmet need

Update data (e.g. persons per households)

- Tier 2: Adjust a “baseline” multi-family assumption regarding housing demand or housing capacity

Adjust standards like parking, building setbacks

- Tier 3: Reduce development standards, e.g. parking minimums

Make it easier to do duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes

- Tier 3: Reduce the minimum lot size requirement for duplexes
- Tier 3: Reduce development standards, e.g. parking minimums

Reduce TIA Traffic Impact Analysis requirements

- Tier 3: Other financial or permitting incentives for certain densities, housing types, or in certain locations

Several other suggestions were directed at how housing develops (e.g. affordability, building design, refinement plan). The correlation between these suggestions and providing more housing capacity was clear.

For more details, see Appendix 3.b, Multi-family Housing Options Questionnaire – Report Results

Focused Outreach and Survey of Underrepresented Community Members

Subsequent outreach strategies were designed specifically to reach the underrepresented members of our community that we had not heard from. An unscientific survey was developed with the assistance of Cogito public involvement firm, with simplified versions of key questions regarding multi-family housing options and the proposed UGB expansion areas, including translation to Spanish. The survey was conducted over a two week period from September 26 to October 4, 2016. Over 100 individuals were introduced to the project and 51 completed the short survey. Survey respondents were:

- Approximately 80% female, 90% Latino, 5% African American, 1% Asian, and 4% White. Ages ranged from 22 to 56, and average age was approximately 30 years old. Income level ranged from about $15,000 to $50,000, and many of the women were single mothers.

It’s important to note that this outreach engaged people who had primarily not been involved in Envision Eugene, while the Multi-family Housing Options Questionnaire was sent to many that are already tracking or involved with Envision Eugene (as is reflected in that 2/3rds of the multi-family options questionnaire respondents had been involved beyond recently learning about the project). If survey respondents had participated in a focus group that began with background information about the topic, it is quite possible that the results of the surveys would be different.

Community Input

A summary of the results of the survey includes:
• About half supported high density housing downtown, with 30% not supporting it or unsure (20%)
• High support for new housing along main streets (key corridors)
• More support for medium density residential Option B than A

Additional comments were also provided either in the survey or verbally during administration of the survey. Some common themes related to multi-family housing options included:
• Concern about providing tax incentives
• Concern about adding more housing downtown due to safety and overcrowding
• Concern about housing affordability
• Concern about flexibility in what type of housing they would get to live in or build in the future

For more details, see Appendix 3.c, the report results for the focused outreach and survey of underrepresented community members.

R-2/Medium Density Residential Property Owner Letters

Two of the options being considered to address the medium density housing deficit would amend the R-2 zoning code:
  — Option A- allow only attached housing in the R-2 zone (prohibit single-family detached houses)
  — Option B- increase the minimum density in the R-2 zone from 10 to 14 homes per net acre

One group of stakeholders in these considerations are property owners that have R-2 zoned property, or property owners that have property designated for Medium Density Residential on the City’s long-range land use plan (The Metro Plan) and therefore could be eligible to rezone to R-2 in the future. Letters were sent on September 8, 2016 to 2,727 R-2 or MDR property owners¹ notifying this group of the two options being considered and providing a link to the Multi-family Housing Options Questionnaire.

Community Input

As of October 12, 2016, staff had spoken with or heard from about 45 people specifically as a result of the letter. Most conversations were on the phone, some were over email or in person. Some provided written comments or questions. The overall comments were as follows:
• The majority of those spoken to own property that is already developed (such as with a single-family house) and small in size, and where nearby property is already developed and/or similarly small in size. Generally, this group did not give an opinion since they did not feel they would be affected.

¹ Property owners with a medium density residential designation but with a special area zone were not sent the letter; these properties are presumably already appropriately zoned with a special area zone rather than R-2.
Several were confused by the letter. This could have affected the response rate. 
Comments heard expressing confusion included:
- Thought the letter meant the City was rezoning their property, requiring them to add more housing, or that the City was going to develop their property with more housing.
- Some in the South Willamette plan area who received the letter thought the letter was related to the South Willamette project and/or rezoning.

Of the few that did offer an opinion, they did not want more density in established single-family neighborhoods (regardless of if the neighborhood was primarily zoned R-2).

Very few owners of large R-2 or MDR properties contacted us; two that did respond both had projects already planned, their comments related less to the strategy options and are included in the emails in Attachment 4. One other stated concern that Option A or B would hamper development and marketability and suggested expanding the UGB.

Outreach to affordable housing providers specifically is in progress, comments we've received to date are in Other Input section below.

Overall, the feedback was supportive of exempting any infill housing from having to provide increased densities.

For more details, see Appendix 3d, Letter to property owners (R-2 zoned or MDR designated)
See also Attachment 4, e-mails received from July 25-October 12, 2016

Other Input
There were a variety of other times we received input on these strategies through in-person or phone conversations and emails (see Attachment 4 for written comments received from July 25-October 12, 2016). While difficult to document all conversations had by staff, a summary of those is included here. Responses to comments that could impact the multi-family housing deficit are also included.

- Developers of R-2 subdivisions. Prior to the Council July 20, 2016 work session, staff discussed the Medium Density Residential options with several builders or developers previously involved in developing single-family subdivisions in R-2 zones. A summary of the comments follows. Subsequently, staff also followed-up with links to the multi-family housing options questionnaire.
  - Between Option A and B, Option B was found to be more flexible.
  - Concern about adding more restrictions to housing. Suggestion to expand the UGB for MDR land instead so that single-family housing would have more available land.
  - Comments on difficulty of building single-family detached in R-2 zones because of the density requirement and the market preference for detached homes.
  - Comments that any attached housing type can be costly/risky due to legal complications associated with attached housing types and condominiums.
  - Comments that attached housing is best located closer in, near commercial and other amenities, rather than where some of our MDR land is located.
• **Plan-Zone Conflict.** Staff checked-in with several members of the Envision Eugene Technical Resource Group regarding questions or feedback on the strategies. Since the land supply is based on the number of acres in the *MDR Metro Plan designation*, not the number of acres in the R-2 zone, one member suggested that staff do some analysis to make sure the strategies, which would make changes to the R-2 zone, would affect enough of the land supply in the MDR designation to account for the 600 needed homes. This suggestion is based on the fact that there is not a precise overlap between land zoned R-2 and land with the MDR Metro Plan designation. Staff’s recent review shows that the majority of the land supply in the MDR designation is also zoned R-2, so the R-2 strategies’ effect would be immediate on most MDR land. Some of the land supply within the MDR designation is not yet zoned R-2, but is likely to be rezoned to the R-2 as owners of such land choose to develop during the 20-year planning period; the Metro Plan’s MDR designation will serve as the guide for purposes of the intended zoning / development of land as such applications are considered. (This is especially true of MDR land that has the AG zone because it has not yet annexed to the City.) Considering these factors, it is reasonable to conclude that the R-2 strategies would result in the needed increase in the number of homes built on the MDR land supply over the 20-year planning period.

• **Home Builders Association of Lane County.** Discussions with the Lane County HBA representative indicated a preference for UGB expansion, and if no expansion, a preference for Option B over Option A because Option B is more flexible by still allowing all housing types and does not further restrict the land available for single-family housing. Caution that the results of either code amendment would need to be monitored to see if any of these become a barrier to housing construction.

• **TIA Requirements.** One MDR property owner suggested reducing Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) requirements to either be consistent with the goal of trying to get more housing on land (e.g. the medium density residential code amendments) or, as an incentive to get more housing than we would otherwise see. Matching TIA requirements with density expectations seems more relevant to the transportation system plan work and would not alter our housing strategy options for UGB adoption; we are coordinating with transportation staff on this suggestion.
  — That said, reducing the TIA requirements as an incentive to get more housing would be a development incentive that would fall under the Tier 3 strategy: Reduce development standards.

• **League of Women Voters.** Comments submitted by the LOWV expressed a slight preference for Option B as more flexible than Option A, and expressed support for the high density downtown strategy. Group supports moving the UGB adoption forward.

• **Affordable Housing Providers.** We also reached out to affordable housing providers regarding what the impact would be of these strategies on affordable housing developments. A few responded with the following comments:
  o The strategies would not impact the development they would propose.
  o Question whether MDR Option A or B would result in MDR land becoming more expensive.
- Ensure that any strategies consider the impact on affordability of housing and the flexibility to build affordable housing (questionnaire comment).

- **Emails submitted by individuals** included some common themes:
  - Some expressed confusion around how the MDR options were related to the South Willamette Area planning project.
  - Some were seeking clarity on the R-2 options.
  - Some expressed frustration with a variety of city staff/planning processes.

- **Moving UGB forward.** We have heard some express support for moving UGB adoption forward by choosing multi-family strategies, including the higher density downtown strategy and either Option A or B for medium density housing.

- **Increased densities & multi-family units.** Analysis was submitted that asserts that Eugene’s 20-year multi-family housing need has been met already and asserts that multi-family housing has been developing denser than the assumptions Envision Eugene is using. The comments suggest updating our assumptions with new data would eliminate the multi-family deficit. This issue is currently under examination for technical and legal implications, but appears to be more relevant to our forthcoming growth monitoring program rather than adopting our 2032 UGB.
  - Utilizing updated information would fall under the Tier 2 strategy: Adjust a “baseline” multi-family assumption regarding demand or housing capacity.

- **Off-site impacts & planning process.** We heard concerns throughout all forms of input and community engagement about increased density (building design and off-site impacts), and concerns about the roles of city staff, neighborhood residents, and city-wide boards and commissions, and concerns about equitable, fair planning processes.
### Multi-family Housing Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Multi-family Housing Strategies per City Council Direction on July 20, 2016</th>
<th>Impact on deficit</th>
<th>Technical Feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 1 - more in-depth analysis:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>High Density Residential (HDR) Downtown Redevelopment Strategy</strong> (financial development incentives, project coordination, permit facilitation, EWEB code/park/infrastructure)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>OPTION A for Medium Density Housing:</strong> Amend the zoning code to preserve Medium Density Residential (MDR) land for attached housing types only</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>OPTION B for Medium Density Housing:</strong> Amend the zoning code to require single-family detached developments on MDR land to achieve a higher density</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy added by City Council</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Increase density along key transportation corridors</strong> and in core commercial areas (for example, with financial development incentives such as the Multiple Unit Property Tax Exemption)**</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tier 2 - analyzed but low technical feasibility:</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Re-designate</strong> land from one category to another a multi-family or commercial category that can accommodate the unmet need**</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Increase the minimum density</strong> required in the zoning code**</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Expand the UGB</strong> to accommodate the unmet need**</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Adjust a “baseline” multi-family assumption that impacts how much housing demand or housing capacity we are assuming for the future:  
  o Number of persons per household in each new home  
  o The mix of new housing types (i.e. single-family vs. multi-family)  
  o The amount of each housing type that is allocated to each type of land use designation  
  o Density of new housing (number of homes per acre of land) | High              | Low                   |
**Key Corridors Strategy Discussion**

In order to adopt Eugene’s urban growth boundary (UGB), City Council must demonstrate how our unmet housing needs (about 600 medium density homes and 1,000 high density homes) will be accommodated. The strategies to do this must be adopted prior to or at the same time as the UGB. At the City Council work session on July 20th 2016, staff presented a list of potential strategies that could be used to address this need. Accompanying this list was analysis that helped staff prioritize the strategies in terms of feasibility and impact on the deficit. Three strategies rose to the top:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Alternative Strategies</th>
<th>Impact on deficit</th>
<th>Technical Feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 1</strong> - These strategies were analyzed more in-depth than others because of their potential for a high impact on the unmet multi-family need:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HDR Downtown redevelopment strategy (financial incentives, project coordination, permit facilitation, EWEB code/park/infrastructure)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Amend the zoning code to preserve MDR for attached housing</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Amend the zoning code to require single-family detached developments in MDR to achieve a higher density</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the Council work session, accommodating more housing along key corridors emerged as an important strategy that Council wanted staff to further analyze and focus public engagement on. Council directed staff to include the key corridor strategy as part of the ongoing Envision Eugene outreach. In response, the key corridor strategy was specifically identified as one of the strategy options in the outreach materials.

Key corridor planning and intensification remains a core component of Envision Eugene with significant support from the community. Results from the summer public involvement activities show that compact development along our key corridors remains a popular strategy; in the Multi-family Housing Options questionnaire 62.5% support/somewhat support key corridors strategy, in the survey to underrepresented community members 82% supported housing along main streets. Experience with area planning also shows that conversations about densifying any area of town also require significant time and staff resources. The question is whether adding housing along corridors is a strategy Council wants to pursue for meeting our housing need now, in order to adopt our urban growth boundary.

**Scenario A: Use key corridor strategy to accommodate housing as part of UGB adoption**

Council may decide to focus on increasing density along our key corridors to meet our 20 year unmet need. In order for this strategy to be recognized as an “efficiency measure” by the state, allowing Eugene to adopt our urban growth boundary, Council would also need to adopt measures to incentivize development in these areas before, or at the same time as, adopting our
UGB. Previous analysis shows that redevelopment of already developed commercial land with 1,600 more housing units is unlikely to occur without development incentives (see the memo to City Council, Attachment A, Investment Tools Scenarios, November 2013 available at [http://or-eugene.civicplus.com/DocumentCenter/View/29773](http://or-eugene.civicplus.com/DocumentCenter/View/29773)). Doing the required technical analysis and public engagement to develop and adopt these incentive programs would take time and would significantly delay adoption of our UGB and comprehensive plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy: Incentivize development along key corridors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis:</strong> In 2013, the Technical Resource Group reviewed the proposed target for multi-family housing that would need to be built through redevelopment to meet the community's needs over the next 20 years. The multi-family redevelopment target was identified to be about 1,600. To better understand the scope of investments needed to achieve this target, several scenarios were examined. The re-development estimating tool used by the TRG in 2012 was designed to allow “what if” adjustments that could mimic a variety of economic conditions and interventions. Using this estimating tool, analysis results show that some combination of investment tools, for example MUPTE, tax-funded SDCs, below-market-rate sales and leases of government-owned property, and reductions in parking requirements, will be needed to achieve the community’s redevelopment target. The results also indicated that, given the above-listed interventions, virtually all of the estimated redevelopment would occur in the downtown and Franklin Boulevard areas with a small amount occurring in the South Willamette area. For more information, see the November 15, 2013 memo to City Council, including the attached memos Technical Summary- Updated Redevelopment Target for Multifamily Housing, and Investment Tool Scenarios which are available at <a href="http://or-eugene.civicplus.com/DocumentCenter/View/29773">http://or-eugene.civicplus.com/DocumentCenter/View/29773</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on deficit:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Feasibility:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Eliminates deficit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timing is critical to success with this strategy. With good process and enough time, community support could be achieved in specific corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consistency with MUPTE ordinance requirements is needed if adopting MUPTE in more areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scenario B: Utilize key corridor strategy in future long-term planning efforts

Alternatively, City Council may decide to pursue the key corridor strategy as part of neighborhood planning processes that are slated to follow UGB adoption. The key corridor strategy can still serve as a cornerstone of the Envision Eugene plan, providing opportunities for better building design, more complete and walkable neighborhoods, and more housing
opportunities as we continue to grow. This scenario would also have the benefit of taking the time needed to develop neighborhood-specific plans without delaying adoption of the UGB. If Council selects this scenario, Council would need to select one of the other zoning related strategies, such as increasing the minimum density in the R-2 zone (Option B), or prohibiting single-family housing in the R-2 zone (Option A) as the efficiency measure required to adopt our UGB. This scenario would advance UGB adoption, while allowing us to pursue the important community goal of key corridor development with the time and process desired by the community.
A variety of outreach methods were utilized to reach a broad range of people across the community. Some were targeted at getting specific feedback, such as the questionnaires and property owner letters discussed above. Others were higher-level outreach aimed at gaining general project awareness, such as having a project booth at the Party in the Park events, Sunday Streets, and neighborhood picnics. These general outreach opportunities not only broaden awareness of the project but also provide an opportunity to increase the number of people that receive Envision Eugene email updates, which include notification of opportunities for more specific input.

While a variety of outreach methods were utilized, a decision was made in the beginning to focus most outreach efforts in two main areas: on-line and through existing networks and events. This approach was aimed at providing the most flexibility for the community to give us their feedback by making materials and questionnaires available on-line. Similarly going to events where folks are already congregating and contacting existing networks maximizes community and staff time and makes the overall experience easier and more comfortable.

The main feedback opportunities included:

- Envision Eugene booth at summer events – 12 (from July 14 through September 25, 2016)
- Multi-family Housing Options Questionnaires - 2
- R-2 or Medium Density Residential property owner letters – 2,727
- Community Drop-in Sessions and Open House (Clear Lake Area) - 3
Additional outreach included:

- envisioneugene.org – revamped or added about 19 pages
- Envision Eugene e-Newsletter – 13 issues (July through September)
- Videos – 4 (including Adopting Our UGB, Multi-family Housing Options), the Multi-family Housing Options video was also featured on the City homepage
- Facebook posts – 24 posts (July 20-Sept. 30, 2016, multi-family housing options post reached 1,458 viewers)
- Infographic sheets - 8
- Fact sheets - 7
- Press releases – 2
- Print ads – 4
- Distribution of posters – 21 community centers and grocery stores
- Articles in other newsletters – at least 4
- Specific outreach with key stakeholders such as – League of Women Voters, Home Builders Association of Lane County, R-2 zone subdivision developers, Association of Realtors, affordable housing providers, Neighborhood Leaders Council, Housing Policy Board, Sustainability Commission, Human Rights Commission

Opportunities for Input
There were several opportunities for input. The main opportunities, and the summary reports on these efforts, include:

- Summer Events & Drop-in Sessions (see Appendix 3.a report)
- Multi-family Housing Options Questionnaire (see Appendix 3.b results report)
- Focused Outreach and Survey of Underrepresented Community Members (see Appendix 3.c, results report)
- Letter to Property Owners/Discussions (R-2/MDR) (see Appendix 3.d, letter)
- Other Input (see Attachment 4, written comments and questions received from July 25-October 12, 2016)

Envision Eugene Website
The Envision Eugene website provided the home base for all of the UGB adoption and multi-family housing options information. Knowing that there would be a massive outreach effort this summer, the website was revamped to better fit the focus on the UGB adoption package and multi-family housing options, consolidate outdated or historical materials, and provide clear navigation for getting involved. Examples include the newly created What's New and Get Involved! pages with links to the multi-family housing questionnaire and overview video, the Adopting Our Urban Growth Boundary page, and the Multi-family Housing Options page with more details such as the multi-family housing options fact sheet, maps, and the July 20 City Council multi-family materials. There are also topic specific webpages such as one on planning for housing. Links to the questionnaires and outreach events were also available on the front page of
and some Envision Eugene videos were featured on the City’s home page.

| Relevant Multi-family Webpage Hits (July 12, 2016 to September 28, 2016) |
|-----------------------------|------------------|
| 1,181                       | Envision Eugene  |
| 499                         | Multi-family Housing Options |
| 192                         | Get Involved with Envision Eugene! |
| 151                         | Adopting Our UGB |
| 89                          | Housing          |
| 56                          | What’s New?      |

Data has been filtered to eliminate City employee visits.

**Envision Eugene Newsletter**

One of the regular outreach tools utilized this summer has been publishing the Envision Eugene newsletter to the Envision Eugene email list. The Envision Eugene email list started out in July 2016 with about 550 contacts (people signed up over time since 2010) and now has increased (17%) to about 650 contacts. The main strategy was to increase the frequency of emails and increase the amount of content by reviving the Envision Eugene e-newsletter format. For each newsletter, we broke up the urban growth boundary adoption package into discrete and more digestible topics, from one of the first newsletters focusing on the multi-family housing options, and then moving on to each Envision Eugene pillar and related parts of the UGB adoption package. Many of the topics included a specific infographic sheet, fact sheet, and in some cases a video, to help break down the information, which was linked to within the newsletter. For example, the multi-family housing options topic includes an infographic sheet explaining the remaining multi-family housing deficit, a video providing an overview of the issue, and a fact sheet explaining the multi-family housing options.

Multi-family housing options was the focus of the August 9, 2016 newsletter. After that, subsequent newsletters also highlighted the multi-family housing options questionnaire and other community outreach opportunities. To review the summer issues of the newsletter, visit [http://www.eugene-or.gov/3335/Envision-Eugene-Newsletters](http://www.eugene-or.gov/3335/Envision-Eugene-Newsletters). As shown in the table below, our strategy led to significantly higher open rates and click rates than industry standard for government emails.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Open Rates</th>
<th>Click Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Envision Eugene Newsletter- Multi-family Housing Options (August 9, 2016)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envision Eugene Newsletter- July through September 2016 average</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant Contact benchmarks for Government emails</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advertising
A variety of avenues were utilized to get the word out about input opportunities and community events we were attending.

Facebook and Other Networks
The Envision Eugene Facebook page currently (September) has 474 likes (followers). We posted on Facebook each Envision Eugene newsletter, after most community events that we attended, and reminders about questionnaires. Two particularly relevant posts related to the multi-family housing options were the post of the Adopting Our UGB video and the post of the Envision Eugene newsletter focusing on multi-family housing options and the associated questionnaire. We paid for additional Facebook advertising of these posts as well. The results as of Sept. 28, 2016 include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adopting Our UGB video</th>
<th>Multi-family housing options newsletter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People reached</td>
<td>2,363</td>
<td>1,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactions</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post clicks</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also broadcasted the community events we’d be attending, the questionnaires and the opportunities for input through newsletters and listervs from other organizations and networks such as:

- Representatives of Eugene’s boards and commissions
- American Institute of Architects-Southwestern Oregon
- Eugene Association of Realtors
- University of Oregon groups (Live Move, College Democrats, College Republicans)
- City of Eugene weekly newsletter to neighborhood associations
- Chamber of Commerce Local Government Affairs Committee
- Young Professionals Network
- Connected Livability Professionals
- InMotion newsletter
- PDD Pulse (Planning and Development Department newsletter)
- City Council newsletter
We also advertised through printed materials:

- 4 Register Guard or Eugene Weekly advertisements
- 2 press releases
- 21 locations of poster distribution (see poster above)

Outreach Materials
A variety of materials were developed to try to engage folks in different ways according to the level of detail they were interested in.

Overview Materials:
Envision Eugene newsletters (covered above) and topic-specific videos provided an overview of specific UGB topics. Two videos that included the multi-family housing options topic are Adopting Our UGB and Multi-Family Housing Options. The Multi-family Housing Options video has been viewed 224 times (as of Sept. 28, 2016) and Adopting Our UGB had been viewed 518 times (Oct. 6, 2016).

Medium Level Materials:
Additional materials were developed that provided more detail about adopting our UGB and the multi-family housing options. Those included infographic sheets (example at right) and fact sheets.

For more information, see:
Appendix 3.e. Housing Affordability Infographic sheet
Appendix 3.f. Housing Need Infographic sheet
Appendix 3.g. Multi-family Housing Options Fact Sheet

Deeper Dive Materials:
Finally, for a deeper dive into the multi-family housing issues, the Envision Eugene website includes information on:

- Medium density housing types,
- Multi-family housing options slides
- Multi-family housing options draft code language for Options A and B
- Maps of vacant and partially vacant medium density residential land
— City Council July 20, 2016 materials
— July 7, 2016 memo to City Council
— Technical Resource Group preliminary technical analysis of strategies

For more information, visit http://www.eugene-or.gov/3315/Multi-Family-Housing-Options

Attachments
1. Multi-family Housing Options - Tiered list as directed by City Council on July 20, 2016
2. Key Corridors Options
3. Community Outreach Detailed Reports and Materials
   a. Summer Outreach Events Report
   b. Multi-family Housing Options Questionnaire – Report Results
      i. Envision Eugene Multi-family Housing Options Questionnaire – Full Results
   c. Focused Outreach and Survey of Underrepresented Community Members- Results Report
   d. Letter to property owners (R-2 zoned or MDR designated)
   e. Housing Affordability Infographic sheet
   f. Housing Need Infographic sheet
   g. Multi-family Housing Options Fact Sheet
4. Other Input: Written Comments/Questions received from July 25-October 12, 2016
Appendix 3.a

Envision Eugene Summer Engagement
20 Minute Neighborhoods, Multi-Family Housing, and Urban Growth Boundary and Comprehensive Plan Adoption

Summer Events Summary Report
October 12, 2016

Background

Over the course of the summer of 2016, City of Eugene Planning staff attended or hosted fifteen public events. These activities were designed to engage community members in a conversation around future growth, 20 minute neighborhoods, multi-family housing, and urban growth boundary and comprehensive plan adoption. These events can be broken down into two streams of engagement with two distinct purposes.

Under the first stream, Planning staff hosted a booth at 12 community events, including Party in the Parks, Sunday Streets, neighborhood picnics, and First Friday Art Walks. These events were intended to boost project awareness and engage community members who have not traditionally participated in Envision Eugene public involvement activities. The tone of these events was fun and lighthearted focusing on 20 minute neighborhoods and what makes a great place to live. A full list of events and a summary of the engagement activities is included below under Community Events.

The second stream of engagement was a series of more traditional engagement events. Planning staff hosted two drop-in sessions at the Atrium Building downtown and an Open House at Clear Lake Elementary School in Bethel. These events were coined as “deeper dive events” where residents could engage with some of the more technical Envision Eugene materials, review maps and policy directions, and ask questions directly of planners. Details about these events and the feedback received are addressed below under Drop-in Sessions and Open House.

These two streams of engagement, along with other public involvement activities, provided a robust approach to public engagement coupling opportunities for direct input to the planning process from citizens with opportunities for improved public relations with the community.

Community Events

Planning staff hosted an Envision Eugene booth at twelve community events between July 14th and September 25th 2016. These events were organized by agencies and organizations external to the Planning Division. These community events drew a broad cross section of the community for whom interacting with the Envision Eugene booth was incidental to their attendance at the
event and not necessarily their main reason for attending. This approach represents community outreach in the purest sense – going to where the community is already and engaging with them in a way that is accessible.

The booth was staffed by 2-3 members of the planning team with occasional assistance from a Planning Commissioner. The booth included a 20 minute neighborhood game that engaged the public in mapping their own twenty minute ‘hood and an activity where the public could say what amenities they loved and what amenities they wished for in their twenty minute neighborhood.

The booth also had Envision Eugene coloring sheets, post-cards, bumper stickers and lots of informational materials on Envision Eugene and the UGB and Comprehensive Plan adoption process. A list of materials is included in Appendix 3.a.i.

Below is a list of the twelve events where Envision Eugene had a presence, including the location, and the estimated number of interactions staff had with the public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Interactions (Estimates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Party in the Parks</strong></td>
<td>Willakenzie Park</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, July 14, 5:30 – 7:30pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Party in the Parks</strong></td>
<td>Churchill Park</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday July 19, 5:30-7:30pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sunday Streets</strong></td>
<td>Park Blocks</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, July 31, 2016 Noon-4pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friendly Area Neighbors Picnic</strong></td>
<td>Washington Park</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, July 31, 5:00 – 8:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Friday Art Walk</td>
<td>Friday, Aug 5</td>
<td>4:30 – 6:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party in the Park</td>
<td>Tuesday, Aug 9</td>
<td>5:30 – 7:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel Family Fun Night</td>
<td>Thursday, Aug 11</td>
<td>5 – 7:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party in the Park</td>
<td>Tuesday, Aug 16</td>
<td>5:30 – 7:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Road Picnic</td>
<td>Sunday, Aug 21</td>
<td>noon – 4 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiesta Cultural</td>
<td>Friday, September 2</td>
<td>4:30 – 6:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Neighbors Picnic</td>
<td>Saturday, September 10</td>
<td>11:00 am – 2:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Streets</td>
<td>Sunday, September 25</td>
<td>noon – 4 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Input Gathered**

The focus of these events was on connecting with the community in a fun, non-confrontational atmosphere. Tracking all of the comments and interactions at events like these is difficult to do and the objective was to boost project awareness and connections with a diverse community of residents. That said we did collect relevant project information from the public, summarized and organized into themes below:

**Importance of Parks**
Residents spoke about and indicated through the activities that parks were highly valued and contributed to resident quality of life.

**Concern about Housing Affordability**
Residents consistently raised the issue of housing affordability. They wanted to know what the City was doing about housing affordability and how Envision Eugene could address this city-wide issue.

**Frustration/Disillusionment with Planning Processes**
Residents who were aware of Envision Eugene expressed fatigue with the ongoing process. There was also a general awareness and frustration with neighborhood planning efforts (i.e. South Willamette) on both side of the issue; some residents expressed mistrust in Planning-led
initiatives while others were frustrated by the reluctance to add housing along key corridors and implement other aspects of the community vision.

**Desire for more Neighborhood Commercial**
Residents expressed a desire for more restaurants and grocery stores in their neighborhoods. Residents want to be able to walk, bike or make a short drive to meet with friends, go out to eat and purchase necessary items.

**Importance of Community centers**
Residents described the important role that community centers play in their quality of life.

**Alternative Transportation Modes**
There was broad support for improving transit, cycling and walking infrastructure. People said that they want to live in walkable neighborhoods for a variety of reasons and that they want cyclists to have dedicated space, whether they are themselves cyclists or not.

**Drop-In Sessions and Open House**
Planning staff hosted three events in September designed to provide an opportunity for the public to delve into the decisions Council would make around multi-family housing and the urban growth boundary and comprehensive plan. A broad set of materials were made available at these events, including factsheets, infographics, the Draft Comprehensive Plan, and maps of the expansion areas (a list of materials is in Appendix 3.a.i).

The two drop-in sessions were hosted at the Atrium Building lobby at 99 W 10th in downtown Eugene. This central location is accessible by transit, bike, foot and private vehicle. These events were held straddling the end of the work day (4-6pm). They were advertised broadly through our email list/newsletter, four newspaper ads (two in the Register Guard and two in the Eugene Weekly), and posters that were distributed to libraries, community centers and private businesses throughout the community.

The open house was held in Bethel at Clear Lake Elementary, where Planners were available to talk about all aspects of Envision Eugene but materials were focused on the Clear Lake Expansion Area. It was advertised as having this focus. The open house ran from 4:30 – 6:30pm and was advertised using the same channels as with the drop-in sessions – print ads, the Envision Eugene email list and posters in public locations.

The following table summarizes the times, dates, and locations of the three events with estimates of attendance:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendance (Estimates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drop-In Session</td>
<td>Sept 13th 2016 4-6pm</td>
<td>Atrium Building 99 W 10th Ave, Eugene</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House</td>
<td>Sept 15th 2016 4:30-6:30pm</td>
<td>Clear Lake Elementary 4646 Barger Dr, Eugene</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-In Session</td>
<td>Sept 13th 2016 4-6pm</td>
<td>Atrium Building 99 W 10th Ave, Eugene</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The format of all three events allowed members of the public to browse the materials at their leisure. Planners were available to interpret the materials and answer questions as needed. There were no structured activities, however computers were available to members of the public who wanted to complete a questionnaire or look up the size of their property to better ascertain how the proposed code amendments to R-2 zone would impact them.

Public Input

The following section provides an overview of what staff heard from members of the public at the drop-in sessions and open house held in September. Organized by topic, these summaries
have been distilled from staff notes of conversations each staff person had which are attached as Appendix 3.a.ii for reference.

**Envision Eugene (general)**

Many residents attending the drop-ins and open house had general questions about Envision Eugene, the process and the timeline. Among some residents who have been following the process, there is frustration with the amount of time it has taken to move from the community process in 2010-2012 to adoption of our own UGB and comprehensive plan.

**Concerns about Growth**

Residents are concerned about growth and how it will impact our public systems and quality of life. There are residents in the community who feel that we should be restricting growth rather than managing and facilitating it. Others are concerned that existing infrastructure and public systems will not be able to handle the added burden of the new residents forecasted in the community. Of particular concern are police services and transportation.

**Multi-Family Housing**

There was general support for high density housing downtown. Residents who live downtown wanted to see more housing options closer to the core and residents who live in other parts of the city expressed that downtown seems like a logical place to encourage our highest densities. Residents articulated a desire to see more condominium options.

With regards to the options for changing the standards in the R-2 zone, residents seemed generally supportive or neutral to the proposed changes with no clear preference for Option A or B expressed during these events.

Other suggestions heard were supporting more secondary dwelling units, making it easier to build duplexes, and increasing the minimum density in High Density Residential zones to meet some of the medium density need. On the other hand there were also residents who suggested expanding the UGB for housing, citing unaffordability and negative social consequences resulting from artificially restricting the land supply.

**Expansion Areas**

Planning staff spoke with a number of residents about the proposed expansions in Santa Clara and Clear Lake. Residents were generally supportive of the expansions for parks and schools, although some explanation was required as to why UGB expansion is required for a park (community parks require urban services). Moreover, there was a desire for community consultation when the parks are eventually developed to avoid negative neighborhood impacts.

Residents were more divided on the Clear Lake expansion for jobs, where some questioned the need for it (in particular the need for large lots) and some raised concerns about wetlands protection in the area. Generally, people thought its location close to the airport and other
industrial properties was logical. Attendees appreciated the City’s two pronged approach to wetland impacts mitigation (1) develop a wetlands mitigation bank to serve Clear Lake and (2) the potential for green infrastructure that will keep much of the water in the location where it lands. There was general interest in and support for the Clear Lake Overlay Zone and the tiered approach to land use that provides transition between uses.

Conclusion

The fifteen events Envision Eugene hosted and attended over the course of July – September 2016, resulted in over 550 in-person interactions between planning staff and members of the public. These encounters serve three purposes; to inform and educate the public, to solicit their input on Envision Eugene and Council decisions; and to improve the City’s relationship with the community. As part of a broader outreach strategy in support of adopting our UGB and Comprehensive Plan, these summer outreach events helped planning staff ascertain the direction in which the community wants us to move.
Appendix 3.a.i

Envision Eugene List of Materials

Community Events
- Large Vision Map
- Large 20 Minute Neighborhood “Heat” Map
- Large neighborhood-specific map (depending on location of event)
- Large 20 minute neighborhood amenities chart
- Factsheets:
  - Urban Growth Boundary Adoption
  - Santa Clara Expansion Area
  - Clear Lake Expansion Area
  - Population and Demographics
  - Multi-family Housing Options
  - Comprehensive Plan
- Multi-family memo to Council (April 13)
- Multi-family questionnaire (hard copies)
- 20 minute neighborhood posters
- EE Timeline
- Envision Eugene seven pillars coloring sheets
- 2012 Envision Eugene Recommendation
- Draft Community Design Handbook
- Draft Comprehensive Plan
- Envision Eugene postcard

Drop-in Sessions
Comprehensive plan:
- EE Timeline
- Metro Plan
- draft Comprehensive Plan
- Comprehensive Plan Fact Sheet
- vision map
- binder of adoption package materials from website
- 3 infographics; Neighborhood Livability, Compact Development, Climate, Flexible Implementation

Housing:
- 2 infographics; Housing Affordability and Housing Need
- medium and high density housing types
- MDR land supply and MDR land supply less than .5 ac large maps,
- Multi-family Housing Options Fact Sheet
- binder of multi-family materials from the website
Clear Lake Expansion Areas:
- proposed expansion area map
- plan designation/zoning/overlay maps
- natural resources map
- Draft Clear Lake overlay zone
- Clear Lake Expansion Area and Overlay Zone fact sheets

Santa Clara Expansion Areas:
- proposed expansion area map
- plan designation/zoning/overlay maps
- Santa Clara Expansion Area fact sheet

Other materials:
- 2012 Recommendation
- Community Design Handbook
- Housing Mix and Area Planning fact sheets
- Questionnaire links bookmarks
- Envision Eugene postcard
Appendix 3.a.ii
Envision Eugene Drop-In Session Summary Notes
By Topic
(Excerpts of only Envision Eugene general/process and housing comments)

EE Drop-In Session Summary Notes – 9/13/16

Envision Eugene (general) / Process
- **New UGB**: Resident asked for the history behind Eugene and Springfield separating their UGBs. Concern expressed that we still need to do regional planning.
- **Process**: Spoke with a resident who just wanted to know about process, why it was taking so long, what pieces of the comprehensive plan were moving forward now and which would move forward later, next steps, etc.
- **Envision Eugene Overall**: Discussed history and progress of Envision Eugene with several community members.
- **State Planning Goals/Laws**: Discussed the legal requirements around urban growth boundaries and comprehensive plan. There was particular concern about the expectation that we would accommodate growth instead of actively trying to limit population growth in Eugene.
- **Process**: Several expressed concerns with the length of time to reach a conclusion on UGB expansion.

Housing
- **Multi-family options**: Resident expressed concern that the buildable land inventory maps show lots under .5 acre if we are proposing to exempt them from the new R-2 code changes. Clarified that they are the full BLI maps, that the .5 acre or larger issue would be a subset of this map and what the actual cutoff would be is currently under consideration. Asked city to check on a specific property that she said was on the BLI map but had over $10,000 of improvement value.
- **Multi-family options**: Discussed why we don’t see more condos in Eugene due to high insurance and legal risks from condo developments across the country. Supports more housing downtown, even with MUPTE, commented that there were condos all over Boston and that are a great housing types. Knows people that have sold their houses and looked for smaller condos in Eugene only to end up buying a housing that is too far to walk from downtown.
- **Housing**: Discussed with Planning Commissioner his understanding that condos have previously been too expensive to pursue because of insurance costs but he’s heard that is changing.
• **UGB for Housing** - Discussed expanding the UGB for housing. It was the resident’s opinion that trying to cram more housing within the UGB was driving up the cost of housing and not leaving enough space for vehicle storage.

• **Downtown Housing** - Spoke with a resident who loved living downtown and wanted to see more people have that option.

• **Housing** - Spoke to one woman who felt that property tax increases were going to force her out of her home, and that the City should have a program to freeze property tax increases on homeowners to avoid the disruption to community.

• **General Interest/Housing** – Spoke with one resident from Good Pasture concerned with Eugene’s growth, ability to maintain existing infrastructure, public safety and other obligations. We walked through the Comprehensive Plan, UGB expansion, and multi-family strategies. Corrected misunderstandings about the extent of growth (not residential, and limited growth for other needs), and focused on making Eugene more livable. Thought the R-2 change was reasonable and low-impact, and advocated for SDUs.

• **General Interest/Housing** – Spoke with South Willamette resident and frequent participant about South Willamette SAZ. Conversation focused primarily on multi-family strategies. She the R-2 change would work, but wanted to see the exemption for small lots maintained.

Other

• **Annexation** - After reviewing the expansion areas, resident asked if we were going to annex River Road Santa Clara, would like to see the city get the taxes for the services they are providing.

• **Buildable Lands Inventory** - Resident asked why the Oakleigh co-housing site is not showing up on the BLI maps since it is believed to be R-2? [Confirmed that it is R-1/LDR so it doesn’t show up on the MDR supply maps and that’s why they had to do a PUD- to be able to do multi-family]

• **Property Rights** – Several community members wanted to talk about the limits to what the City could force property owners to do, including sell their property or develop/redevelop at a given time or in a given way.

• **River Road/ Santa Clara annexation** – Questions and concerns veered toward the odd City/ County patchwork of annexation in these two neighborhoods. Attendee felt unincorporated residents were getting a free ride and should be brought into the City.

**EE Drop-In Session Summary Notes – 9/21/16**

Envision Eugene (general) / Process

• **Envision Eugene Overall** – Discussed history and progress of Envision Eugene with several community members.
- **State Planning Goals/Laws** – Discussed the legal requirements around urban growth boundaries and comprehensive plan.

- **Timeline** – Several community members wanted to talk about what the anticipated timeline is for adoption, and what upcoming decisions could shift that timeline.

### Housing

- **Multi-family options** - Explained to resident the difference between a Metro Plan designation of Medium Density Residential and zoning of R-2 and that because of the eligibility of MDR properties to rezone to R-2, the R-2 letter was sent to both R-2 zoned and MDR designated property owners. Reviewed BLI maps confirming that a lot that has more than $1,000 of improvement value was not on it and reviewed new map showing MDR lots over .5 acre regarding the potential exemption for lots less than .5 acre.

- **Multi-family options** - Resident who owns R-2/MDR land expressed support for Option B; increased minimum density because it provides more flexibility than Option A. Had already taken the questionnaire. Discussed whether resident’s lot could be split designated or if a mixture of housing in R-2 zoning. Discussed resident’s other lot downtown regarding parking.

- **Multi-family options** - Discussed 20 minute neighborhood game from the Party in the Parks and how some areas don’t have enough housing to support a grocery store. Resident expressed concern that she felt the previous SWSAZ was planning to put more housing in an area that is already denser than other areas and about the housing types and street width proposed along one of the SWSAZ streets (W 23rd Ave) that would have removed large trees, concerned that no one actually visited the street when they developed the proposal for that area. Resident suggested that some smaller housing infill might have been okay on the street and suggested that other areas could use more planning than South Willamette. Thought we could move forward with a plan that focused on the commercial area. Noted that the restriping of Willamette seemed safer for pedestrians. Discussed housing affordability and concerns about displacement.

- **Multi-family options** - Resident’s relative received R-2 letter, is zoned R-1 but MDR designated. Explained the difference between zoning and designation and why we sent it to both potential stakeholders, and that the letter is not about rezoning anyone’s land. Discussed the SWSAZ and the recent forum. Resident indicated that all the issues with the project add up to looking like the city was interested in developing South Willamette like the Pearl district in Portland. Would like to see more, small cluster cottages like those on Portland Street and appreciated the maximum square footage proposed for cluster cottages in the SWSAZ. Discussed housing affordability and concerns about displacement.

- **Multi-family options** - Other suggestions heard were make it easier to do duplexes and increase the minimum density in HDR to accommodate the portion of MDR housing that overlaps with HDR’s allowable densities.
• **Multi-family Housing** – Resident was doubtful of the City’s commitment to multi-family housing (citing process around Oakleigh PUD). Why subsidies for developers downtown and not in other areas? Wanted to know more about Multi-family options, density, etc. Also wondered if other towns faced the same nimby/resistance to density.

• **Multi-family housing** – Wanted to know how the city could support and/or incentivize multi-family development through the city, not just downtown.

---

**EE/ Clear Lake Open House Notes – 9/15/2016**

Envision Eugene (general) / Process

• **Timeline** – Every community member spoke to wanted to know what the timeline for the expansion is, and how changeable it is.

• **Overall Envision Eugene** – Spoke about the larger project of Envision Eugene and how the expansion fit into that. One resident referred to it as an “omnibus package.”

• **Timing** – Several property owners wanted to know when this was going to happen.

• **Process/Timeline** – Two attendees were most concerned about timing, and when the process would officially conclude. The public involvement timeline and Formal Adoption process was shared. Other questions were about State DLCD involvement and time to reach “acknowledgement.”

Housing

• **R-2 letter** - Property owner received both the R-2 letter and the Clear lake open house letter. The R-2 property they own is developed with a house and not planning on redeveloping. Also clarified where the proposed UGB expansion would be in relation to resident’s property (resident’s property is included within it) and clarified the proposed Metro Plan designation and zoning had not changed from earlier drafts.
Appendix 3.b
Envision Eugene
Multi-family Housing Options – Questionnaire Results Report
Sept. 30, 2016

Background
The City’s analysis shows that we do not have enough room inside our urban growth boundary for about 1,600 medium and high density homes. The City needed to get community feedback on several potential options to accommodate these homes over the next 20 years before the City Council decides which strategies should move forward for adoption. A variety of outreach tools were utilized to get feedback including the Envision Eugene Multi-family Housing Options Questionnaire. This questionnaire was developed as a way to reach people on-line, at their convenience and formed part of a comprehensive approach to soliciting feedback.

Executive Summary
The multi-family questionnaire was open from August 9 through September 25, 2016 and was broadcast through a variety of channels, including newsletters, posters, and print advertisements. There were 17 questions, of which eight were about multi-family housing options and 8 were about demographics and one was for administration. The questions included links to materials relevant to each question, as well as links to additional materials that “dove deeper” into analysis and details. There were 277 respondents, of which about 60% answered the questions. A total of 185 respondents completed the questionnaire; 92 respondents did not respond to the majority of the questions.

Who did we hear from and who did we not?
Most Respondents had either recently learned about Envision Eugene (31%) or had been following in some way (38-39%). A smaller portion had also participated in committees, boards or commissions working on Envision Eugene (15%).

About 60% of respondents answered the demographics questions. As detailed further on page 6, the demographics of those who responded to the questions differed from the demographics of Eugene as a whole; particularly with regard to age, income, rent/own, and education.

- Most respondents were Caucasian, 40 years or older, had a Bachelor’s degree or more, and made $75,000 or more in income. Over half of the residents lived in either south or northeast Eugene.
- There was an underrepresentation of residents of non-Caucasian races, people 0-39 years old, people with some college or less, residents with incomes of 0-$74,999, and residents of parts of the community other than South and North East Eugene.

2 The last question was administrative and not analyzed here.
### Key Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Topic</th>
<th>Key Takeaways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **High density residential (HDR) downtown redevelopment** with existing programs and incentives | • 68% (127 people) support/somewhat support this strategy  
• 24 of the additional comments said they don’t support MUPTE |
| **Medium density residential (MDR)- Option A:** Amend the zoning code to preserve the R-2 medium density residential zone for attached housing | • 48% (87 people) support/somewhat support, 38% (69 people) don’t/somewhat don’t support  
• 17 Respondents said that this option would be too restrictive |
| **Medium density residential (MDR)- OPTION B:** Amend the zoning code to increase the minimum number of homes required in R-2 medium density residential zones from 10 to about 14 homes per net acre | • 55% (102 people) support/somewhat support, 24% (64 people) don’t/somewhat don’t support  
• 15 stated concerns about design of medium density and compatibility with neighborhoods |
| **Key Corridors Strategy**- Increase housing density along key transportation corridors and core commercial areas throughout the city (with incentives). | • 64% (115 people) support/somewhat support, 26% (48 people) said they do not support / somewhat do not support  
• 13 expressed general support, 23 stated opposition to MUPTE |
| **Reasons for no/ somewhat no support** for above strategies | • Most comments were not easily correlated back to the specific strategies. Common themes of those that responded were dissatisfaction with MUPTE and city staff/planning processes |
| **Exempting smaller lots** from Medium Density Residential Option A or Option B standards | • 70% support/somewhat support.  
• High support even if respondent didn’t support Option A or B |
| **Other multi-family housing strategies suggestions** | • About 50% said no and about 50% yes there are other multi-family housing strategies we should consider  
• Most common strategies suggested:  
  • encourage SDUs, tiny houses and other forms of non-traditional housing  
  • more housing on C-2 zoned land or mixed-use developments  
  • expand the UGB |
| **Important considerations suggestions** | • Most common considerations suggested:  
  • General concerns about density, including building design and off-site impacts of denser housing (parking, etc.)  
  • General concerns about city staff/planning process  
  • Concerns about MUPTE (Multiple Unit Property Tax Exemption) program  
  • Confusion about MDR Option A and B strategies |
This table does not reflect those that responded neutral or that they didn’t have enough information.

There were some overall themes apparent as well. Based on the open ended comments, *some questions were unclear or misinterpreted* by some of the respondents. Additionally, there were several comments throughout about *dissatisfaction with city staff or planning processes*.

**Conclusions from the Questionnaire**

The results of the questionnaire include:

- General support for high density housing downtown
Almost half – 48% - of respondents support/somewhat support medium density residential Option A, with slightly more support – 55% - for Option B

High support to exempt small lots from either Option A or B (if either are adopted)

General support for the key corridor strategy

Comments about respondents’ general support for the strategies, opposition and concerns about MUPTE, concerns about staff/planning process, concerns about infill/design/compatibility with existing neighborhoods

Who did we hear from and who not?
Questions 1 and 10-15 were about who took the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was broadcast through a variety of measures including a 650-person Envision Eugene e-newsletter, four print advertisements and a poster distributed to 21 locations.

To help us know if the questionnaire was reaching a broad range of Eugeneans, we asked when respondents learned about Envision Eugene and asked for demographic information including what zip code and neighborhood association they live in, as well as their age, ethnicity, income, whether they rent or own their home, and educational attainment.

Question 1. When did you learn about Envision Eugene?
Respondents were allowed to check all that applied.

- About 1/3 had recently learned about Envision Eugene.
- Over 1/3 had followed it in the news, received Envision Eugene email updates or attended public events.
- A smaller portion (15%), had participated in committees, boards or commissions working on Envision Eugene.
- This is a balanced representation of people who recently learned about the process and those that have been following or participating in Envision Eugene.
- Of those that also responded “other”; the most common answers were through receiving the R-2 zoning options letter from the City (21%) and participation in planning projects (19%), Facebook or other organizations/groups (14%), neighborhood association news (12%), or other ways (14%).
Questions 10-15. As we mentioned, we’re hoping to reach a broad range of folks. To help us know who we are reaching, please provide the following general information about yourself. These questions are optional and are intended to give a general sense of who we are reaching.

Question 10. What zip code do you live in?
Question 11. What neighborhood do you live in?
Question 12. What is your race?
Question 13. Please estimate your total household income for 2015 before taxes.
Question 14. Do you rent or own where you live?
Question 15. What is your educational attainment?

About 60% of respondents took the demographic questions. Of those who responded, the following table shows the breakdown compared to the U.S. Census data for all of Eugene:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>Questionnaire Data</th>
<th>Community Data¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where people live</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(top locations from questionnaire shown)…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 97405 (south Eugene)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>Not readily available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 97408 (north Eugene north of Beltline)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>There are 6 Eugene zip codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Northeast neighbors</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Southeast Neighbors</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Friendly Area Neighbors</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• over 40 years old</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 18-39 years old</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• identified as white Caucasian</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• identified as any other race</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• made $75,000 or more (2015)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>27% (Households)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• made less than $25,000</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32% (Households)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• own where they live</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• rent where they live</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>51% (Households)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• have a Bachelor’s degree or higher</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• have less than a high school degree to some college</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹For consistency, the majority of the community data is from 2010-2014 the American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, giving an approximation of the community today. The ACS reports on residents within the Eugene city limits. The questionnaire respondents could be outside of the city limits.
2 The census does not provide population by neighborhood association boundary. The last effort to do this was the City of Eugene Neighborhood Assessment 2011. These estimates include people within City of Eugene neighborhoods, which sometimes extend beyond the urban growth boundary.

In addition to the channels noted above, the questionnaire was broadcasted to the following organizations and networks:

- Representatives of Eugene’s boards and commissions, American Institute of Architects-Southwestern Oregon, Eugene Association of Realtors, University of Oregon groups (Live Move, College Democrats, College Republicans), City of Eugene weekly newsletter to neighborhood associations, Young Professionals Network, Connected Livability Professionals, InMotion, PDD Pulse (Planning and Development Department newsletter), City Council newsletter
- An additional survey was developed for Latino and underrepresented outreach. For more details, see Appendix 3.c Focused Outreach and Survey of Underrepresented Community Members- Results Report.

Analysis of Strategy Questions Results

Questions 2 through 7 were focused on the main strategies identified in City Council’s July 20th motion (Tier one and key corridors).

**Question 2.** Do you think the High Density Residential Downtown strategy balances or supports the City of Eugene’s goals and values regarding housing affordability, compact development and neighborhood livability from the Envision Eugene pillars?

*High Density Residential HDR Downtown Redevelopment Strategy: Accommodate our remaining high density housing need downtown through existing programs (dedicated City staff support) and development financial incentives (such as the Multiple Unit Property Tax Exemption (MUPTE) program).*

- 68% (127 people) said they support or somewhat support this strategy
- 22% (41 people) said they do not support or they somewhat do not support this strategy
- There were 64 additional comments provided. Themes within the comments included:
  - 24 opposed MUPTE (11 of these supported the strategy)
  - 10 provided general support
  - 11 called for improved design or implementation

**Question 3.** Do you think the Medium Density Residential Option A strategy balances or supports the City of Eugene’s goals and values regarding housing affordability, compact development and neighborhood livability from the Envision Eugene pillars?
**Medium Density Residential: OPTION A:** Amend the zoning code to preserve medium-density residential zones for attached housing (this would result in detached single-family housing being prohibited in these zones). ("Detached" was added here for clarity on 8/10/16)

- 48% (87 people) said they support or somewhat support this strategy
- 38% (69 people) said they do not support or they somewhat do not support this strategy
- There were 60 additional comments provided. Themes within the comments included:
  - 17 said that this option would be too restrictive
  - 10 were generally opposed
  - 8 were confused over the proposal

**Question 4.** Do you think the **Medium Density Residential Option B** strategy balances or supports the City of Eugene’s goals and values regarding housing affordability, compact development and neighborhood livability from the Envision Eugene pillars?

**Medium Density Residential: OPTION B:** Amend the zoning code to increase the minimum number of homes required in medium density residential zones from 10 to about 14 homes per net acre.

- 55% (102 people) said they support or somewhat support this strategy
- 35% (64 people) said they do not support or they somewhat do not support this strategy
- There were 54 additional comments provided. Common themes in the comments included:
  - 15 had concerns about the design of medium density and compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods (7 of them were not supportive of the strategy, 6 were supportive, 2 were neutral)
  - 11 were opposed to increased density
  - 10 were generally supportive

**Question 5.** Do you think the **Key Corridors strategy** balances or supports the City of Eugene’s goals and values regarding housing affordability, compact development and neighborhood livability from the Envision Eugene pillars?

**Key Corridors Strategy:** Increase housing density along key transportation corridors and core commercial areas throughout the city. Most of the land in these areas is already zoned to allow higher density housing and is already developed. In order to see more housing occur in these places to fit the 1,600 high and medium density homes, analysis indicates that financial incentives would need to be applied to these areas. An existing financial tool which could be expanded along one or more corridors is the
Multiple Unit Property Tax Exemption (MUPTE) program which can enable redevelopment of an already developed site to add housing.

- 63% (115 people) said they support or somewhat support this strategy
- 26% (48 people) said they do not support or they somewhat do not support this strategy
- There were 61 additional comments provided. Common themes in the comments included:
  - 13 expressed general support
  - 23 stated opposition to MUPTE (3 said somewhat yes to the strategy but no MUPTE, 15 said no to the strategy and no MUPTE)

**Question 6.** If you answered "somewhat no" or "no" to any of the strategies above, please tell us why.

- The comments present a wide range of perspectives on general issues and could not be easily correlated back to the specific housing strategies.
- There were 91 additional comments provided. Most common themes included:
  - 17 were opposed to MUPTE
  - 22 addressed a variety of other concerns, mostly without referring to specific strategies (such as distrust of City/Planning Staff)
  - 11 opposed/disagreed with more density
  - 8 were about the need for policies that support housing affordability

**Question 7:** For Medium Density Residential Options A or B above, there could be limitations on how each Option is applied. For example, smaller lots (such as less than 0.5 an acre) could be exempt from the new standards, which would allow owners of smaller lots within established neighborhoods to develop at existing levels of density, and still build single-family housing.

Would you support exempting smaller lots from the new Medium Density Residential Option A or Option B standards?

- 73% (128 people) said yes.
- 27% (48 people) said no.
- There were 48 additional comments provided. Common themes within the comments included:
  - 10 were generally supportive of this idea
  - 6 indicated we should be encouraging innovative design of small appropriate housing
  - 5 stated we should decrease the exemption (making it applicable to fewer lots)
46 stated we should increase the exemption (making it applicable to more lots)
4 were generally opposed to this idea

Questions 8 through 9 were opportunities for people to identify other multi-family housing strategies (such as Tier two or Tier three strategies) or other considerations.

**Question 8. Are there any other strategies that you think we should consider to meet our multi-family housing needs?**

- 49% (81 people) said no.
- 51% (84 people) said yes; there were 84 additional comments provided. This was an open-ended question so there were a variety of suggestions (see the attachment for the full comments). However, the most common themes in these suggestions included:
  - 21 had ideas about encouraging SDUs, tiny houses and other forms of non-traditional housing
  - 9 supported more housing on C-2 zoned land or mixed-use developments
  - 8 called for expanding the UGB
  - There were several other strategies suggested by one or a few individuals such as adjusting development standards, refinement plans, multi-family density bonus in R-1 zones, and don’t grow.
  - There were also several suggestions that related to planning for housing such as making sure housing is affordable, building design standards, housing for the aging and families.

**Question 9. Is there anything else you feel is important to consider?**

- 47% (78 people) said no.
- 53% (88 people) said yes; there were 88 additional comments provided;
- Due to the open ended nature of this question, it presented an opportunity for residents to raise ideas and concerns related to a great variety of issues, not all of which related to accommodating medium or high density housing directly. In order to focus this report on issues related to accommodating our multi-family need, we have highlighted only those common themes that will inform Council action on multi-family housing, however all individual responses are included for Council’s reference in Appendix 3.b.i of this summary report.
- Many of the themes that emerge from the answers to this question emerged from the answers to other questions as well. Respondents were concerned about the design of buildings and the impacts of design on surrounding neighborhoods and single-family homes. Respondents were also concerned about the impact of traffic and parking in neighborhoods with higher density. The theme of focusing on downtown and transportation corridors before other parts of community also...
was repeated as well as facilitating more small housing types and mixed use. There were some residents who called for expansion of the UGB and some who called to preserve it. Opposition to incentives like MUPTE was repeated as well.

- Issues of housing affordability, walkability and alternative transportation, economic development and confidence in city staff and planning process were reoccurring.

Other Common Themes
There were other common themes that were apparent throughout the questionnaire as well.

- Some respondents stated that they did not understand a strategy or it was unclear, particularly the medium density housing options. Some other respondents’ comments made it clear that they did not understand a strategy. It is possible that other respondents who completed the questionnaire also misunderstood the strategies and didn’t comment.

- It also seemed that some respondents were not aware, or did not believe, the City’s analysis that no significant housing redevelopment would occur on commercial land without development incentives to make redevelopment financially feasible.

Conclusion
The questionnaire is one piece of community input to consider when weighing the multi-family housing options. Although 277 is a higher number of responses than previous planning project surveys have generated, the rate of completion is low compared to the population of Eugene and, based on the demographic information collected, we know that the sample does not reflect the population of Eugene. However, although the results of the questionnaire cannot be used as statistically valid, they do provide an important snapshot of community input. The results of the questionnaire found:

- General support for high density housing downtown
- About half support/somewhat support medium density residential Option A or B, with slightly more support for B
- High support to exempt small lots from either Option A or B (if either are adopted)
- General support for the key corridor strategy
- Comments about general support for the strategies, opposition and concerns with MUPTE, concerns about staff/planning process, concerns about infill/design/compatibility with existing neighborhoods

Appendix
3.b.i. Envision Eugene Multi-family Housing Options Questionnaire – Full Results
Q1 To help us know if we are reaching a broad range of Eugeneans, please tell us when you learned about Envision Eugene? (check all that are applicable)

Answered: 275  Skipped: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I recently learned about it</td>
<td>30.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have followed it in the news or on the web over the years</td>
<td>38.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive Envision Eugene email updates</td>
<td>36.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have attended public events</td>
<td>37.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have participated in committees, boards or commissions working on Envision Eugene</td>
<td>15.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td>16.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 275

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Other (please specify):</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It took a lot of effort but I finally managed to get on the email list after attending the meeting a couple of times and signing up more than once or twice.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 10:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I just learned about it today when I was invited to take this survey.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 11:24 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I work for the City.</td>
<td>9/23/2016 11:44 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Facrbool</td>
<td>9/22/2016 10:23 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Facebook post from Joshua Skov page.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 3:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I read about it in the YPN email from the Chamber.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 2:42 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>9/22/2016 12:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>City's consultant</td>
<td>9/22/2016 10:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>through PPPM program</td>
<td>9/22/2016 10:48 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>In class at UO</td>
<td>9/22/2016 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>9/22/2016 9:35 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>We received a letter from the City of Eugene regarding possible R-2 zoning code changes to our property.</td>
<td>9/21/2016 2:51 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mailing</td>
<td>9/20/2016 3:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I received your mailing to property owners about the changes.</td>
<td>9/20/2016 12:22 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I keep in touch w/the neighborhood association leads that attend meetings on the topic</td>
<td>9/20/2016 11:36 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I have heard it mentioned for years but not known what it is until now. I was referenced to the multi-family housing study by the AIA-SWO email newsletter</td>
<td>9/19/2016 2:49 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I have attended EVERY one of the Planning Commission meetings over the last five years in regards to the South Willamette Rezone.</td>
<td>9/17/2016 12:01 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Property owner</td>
<td>9/15/2016 5:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Previously involved as City staff.</td>
<td>9/15/2016 2:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I received a letter</td>
<td>9/14/2016 5:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I recently received a letter from the City of Eugene stating that my property, which is a single family residence, in a single family neighborhood of existing homes, may be rezoned to R2.</td>
<td>9/14/2016 1:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>9/14/2016 11:32 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mailing from City of Eugene that I received at my house.</td>
<td>9/13/2016 11:11 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I got a letter in the mail today saying that my property could be affected..and I read the newspaper and followed the flak that occurred in South Eugene. It feels like envisionEugene was not well publicized.</td>
<td>9/12/2016 6:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The city sent out a notification they are tearing down the neighborhoods to build 5 foot setback 14 homes per acre. Even in California they only allow 10 per acre.</td>
<td>9/12/2016 3:01 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I first became aware at an open house and then through much effort and searching finally got on an email list.</td>
<td>9/9/2016 4:49 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>As a League of Women Voter serving on the action team, I have had several discussion with informed members and city staff about process and plans.</td>
<td>9/1/2016 11:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I heard about it during the SWSAZ process and saw it mentioned in documents. After a couple of attempts and going to meetings I am now getting emails. Thank you.</td>
<td>9/1/2016 9:25 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>We've all heard about it for the last five years, BUT the big shocker was the proposal to rezone R1 properties. The SW-SAZ plan was an unwelcome surprised. So was the mayor's rejection of the Oregon Consensus assessment and the Mike Clark/George Brown proposal.</td>
<td>8/31/2016 6:31 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Via email - neighborhood newsletter</td>
<td>8/31/2016 5:42 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>8/31/2016 2:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>testified on plan elements</td>
<td>8/27/2016 3:02 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I saw a link to it from the City of Eugene Facebook page</td>
<td>8/24/2016 10:15 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>8/18/2016 8:52 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>LGAC member</td>
<td>8/17/2016 11:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8/17/2016 10:59 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>My neighbor is very involved and forwards me info by email</td>
<td>8/16/2016 6:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>I work on it.</td>
<td>8/16/2016 12:23 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>NW Neighbors Newsletter</td>
<td>8/16/2016 9:19 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I keep updated also via Southeast Neighbors Association newsletters.</td>
<td>8/15/2016 3:09 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>I have business partners who have participated in the Envision Eugene process</td>
<td>8/14/2016 3:03 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Since the beginning involved in the Local Process since I moved to town in July of 1997.</td>
<td>8/13/2016 9:24 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Neighborhood news letter.</td>
<td>8/12/2016 4:02 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Volunteer community work related to the topic, and individual research</td>
<td>8/10/2016 12:53 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2 Do you think the High Density Residential Downtown strategy balances or supports the City of Eugene’s goals and values regarding housing affordability, compact development and neighborhood livability from the Envision Eugene pillars?

High Density Residential HDR Downtown Redevelopment Strategy: Accommodate our remaining high density housing need downtown through existing programs (dedicated City staff support) and development financial incentives (such as the Multiple Unit Property Tax Exemption (MUPTE) program).

Answered: 187  Skipped: 90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Somewhat Yes</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I don't have enough information</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40.11%</td>
<td>27.81%</td>
<td>8.02%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>12.83%</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Additional comments:</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes, but discontinue using the MUPTE program.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 11:26 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I agree HDR should occur downtown. I think there needs to be more mixed use and and perhaps a height requirement of a two floor minimum downtown and underground parking. If you are going to use MUPTEs they must have sufficient oversight. Higher density may be appropriate in some of our commercial areas along &quot;key corridors&quot; such as West 11th and Hwy 99</td>
<td>9/25/2016 11:15 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I think building downtown is the best option moving forward. But I don't think the city should use MUPTE.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 2:15 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes buildings should go into the downtown area. But I don't like that you think you need to use MUPTE. People are pretty fed up with it, there have got to be better ways than using such a flawed plan.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 1:33 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Any added density should go into the downtown area not in the outside residential neighborhoods. No more MUPTE, everything built with it looks like garbage and its a complete scam for the residents of Eugene to pay to build or remodel their homes but give tax breaks to those that have the money to spend.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 1:19 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The increased density downtown is the correct path, but using MUPTE incentives is not necessary. The downtown development is a made deal as it is proven to be lucrative, no additional Eugene tax dollars are needed to get out of town investors interested. If residents in Eugene who are building a house don't get tax cuts why should out of state developers?</td>
<td>9/24/2016 9:34 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Developers have investors and do not need MUPTE incentives from the City.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 7:57 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Developers do not need MUPTE incentives.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 7:38 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The City has limited affordable housing downtown. There is a great deal of very ugly student housing. The property that was the Rogue Brewery is being developed as high end apartments. You allowed a prime piece of real estate (Whole Foods) to go in without any apartments above it and wasted an enormous amount of square footage for parking. A parking structure that could hold more cars on less square footage could have been required. These are only the project that I read about in the paper. I don't trust the City to inform me of future projects before it is too late to do anything about it.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 5:26 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>No MUPTE! Let the market drive development.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 12:55 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>It makes entry level housing too expensive!</td>
<td>9/24/2016 11:49 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I answered 'yes' here but care needs to be taken that 'high density' doesn't become 'highly expensive'.</td>
<td>9/23/2016 4:01 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The down town area needs to seriously cleaned up. No more vagrancy! Other wise few people will want to live there, especially at night.</td>
<td>9/23/2016 3:13 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The city should develop additional incentives; the tools currently available are few, have risks (i.e., belief or reality that MUPTE robs from taxes available for other uses versus the notion that it is an opportunity cost with a bigger upside upon full implementation). Consider variable SDCs (i.e., discounting charges for developing housing on sites along key corridors) and other concrete, functional tools that can make this a reality.</td>
<td>9/23/2016 2:46 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>High density yes, MUPTE NO!</td>
<td>9/23/2016 2:38 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>There is no protection for existing residence and structures. We have too many infil densities that harm adjacent properties. This should not be allowed.</td>
<td>9/23/2016 2:33 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I support adding more housing units downtown as part of mixed uses buildings - above commercial and employment uses, not as stand alone buildings. We need to preserve our downtown commercial/employment land supply while adding opportunities for housing.</td>
<td>9/23/2016 2:05 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rent control standards should be applied to new buildings to help curb over-inflated exorbitant cost of housing in the downtown area. That the cost of rents in Eugene lack such regulation leads to too many property owners and management companies jacking up the cost of rentals and allowing units to sit vacant to collect the tax write-off rather than lower the rent to get the unit rented to persons or families that could afford a more reasonable rent. Allowing &quot;market prices&quot; to be the norm is not working in Eugene.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 3:34 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Downtown is the place where the City can get the most density and has the most flexible tools in supporting high density housing. There's plenty of opportunity since downtown continues to be a work in progress.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 11:07 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>So much of the value I derive from living in Eugene comes from access to green space and neighborhood aesthetic. Living downtown in a high-density development is a non-starter for someone like me. I think tax incentives should be going toward medium density residential nodes and accessory dwelling units (with proper development standards) rather than high density housing.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 10:21 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I am for additional housing downtown but I have seen the negative sides of MUPTE which becomes a burden for tax payers and the ugly &quot;kicking out&quot; of low income residents when the required time is up.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 10:15 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Envision Eugene Multi-family Housing Options Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>MUPTE subsidy is overly generous and probably unnecessary. Density downtown should also be required, with redevelopment required to be at least 2 or 3 stories. The new Whole Foods development is a 1.5 story building with a large parking lot that is not consistent with density goals.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 9:51 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Nothing beyond 3 stories should be build beyond the emx routes.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 6:54 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>MUPTE has been overused by developers.</td>
<td>9/21/2016 5:33 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>If by downtown you mean from the river to 13th, then I would answer yes. Since MUPTE has covered up to 18th on the south, I would have to say it's damaged neighborhood livability by encouraging building of big apartment buildings that seem to always have vacancies and offer freebies to entice renters. I think MUPTE has served its purpose and then some. I am adamantly opposed to extending it any further than its current area.</td>
<td>9/20/2016 12:42 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>This strategy has absolutely nothing to do with housing affordability and will in fact worsen the current situation. High-density housing is much more expensive to build than low-density housing.</td>
<td>9/19/2016 1:15 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>It would be nice to have some pods of high-density in other areas to bring small retail shops and professional services offices to non-downtown parts of the city.</td>
<td>9/18/2016 8:54 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I think high density downtown is a good idea, but MUPTE just seems to be a giveaway for builders of student apartments</td>
<td>9/15/2016 8:38 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>This option is the most efficient by locating units in areas with existing infrastructure and near services which is more efficient for the transportation system.</td>
<td>9/15/2016 2:33 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I would like an opportunity to live in housing downtown or along the river. The new housing in downtown Eugene is mostly designated for college age students. As a single adult with grown adult children, I do not want to live in a density that is mostly college students. The new housing targets temporary living quarters for students with high turnover and most likely these residents are temporary in our community.</td>
<td>9/13/2016 11:21 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Where are the jobs to support the growth?</td>
<td>9/12/2016 7:03 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>They should do like Mountain View, or San Francisco CA and build apartment building downtown above the first level. level one are shops and restaurants and level 2 through 4 or higher are homes.</td>
<td>9/12/2016 3:11 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Unfortunately, the infamous student housing and parking garage has cast a dark shadow on MUPTE despite changes to the ordinance. I think that the area for high density should be expanded . The County Fair Grounds offer incredible opportunities for various types of development.</td>
<td>9/11/2016 12:25 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Expand the urban growth boundary. Fitting more and more people into the same current space drives up the price and hurts the poor.</td>
<td>8/31/2016 9:46 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I heard we have enough housing for the next 30 years. This survey seems deceptive.</td>
<td>8/31/2016 8:20 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>The downtown continues to have it's problems with the homeless and so called travelers. Capstone turned-out to be not as advertised. Furthermore, I've heard it is only 40-50% occupied. So, its hard to believe that cramming the downtown with more housing projects will appeal to anybody.</td>
<td>8/31/2016 6:51 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I think this strategy does nothing for housing affordability</td>
<td>8/31/2016 5:52 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Previous projects are looked upon as 'failures' by the Eugene public (Capstone etc.) so I think it is important that the process is transparent and that downtown doesn't become all high-mid rise apartments. That said, Downtown is an excellent area to build density.</td>
<td>8/31/2016 1:42 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>No MUPTE. If desired high-density housing is needed, why do we need to bribe someone to build it? A basic component of our society is supply and demand. If it is needed, build it and buyers/renters will occupy it. MUPTE is based on thinking similar to that in which the most efficient way to attain a sexual encounter is to pay for it.</td>
<td>8/26/2016 5:26 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Strategy balances compact development, yes, but affordability, no. In downtown area for new construction, rental rates are already over $2.00/square foot. This is not affordable for most people in Eugene, even with MUPTE. MUPTE does is line the pockets of the developers. But I agree high density should be focused downtown, and with mixed use for commercial areas.</td>
<td>8/26/2016 5:21 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Downtown redevelopment is a critical piece of Envision Eugene. Adding more housing to downtown will continue to make downtown a great place for all community members by having more people downtown at all times. Financial incentives are important tools that Eugene needs to keep utilizing as we continue the work happening downtown.</td>
<td>8/26/2016 4:07 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Unlikely to meet need for truly affordable low income and workforce housing without stronger requirements for percentages in new construction to be held for these price points.</td>
<td>8/26/2016 1:37 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Absolutely no more MUPTE is needed.</td>
<td>8/25/2016 3:30 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>This is assuming that the monthly rents are priced to be affordable to a variety of incomes.</td>
<td>8/18/2016 8:07 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goals are not as widely supported as the planners believe/hope them to be— they should be revisited. The only people that support density seem to be those who don't have to live within it. And most people drive cars— plan for it. Public transportation and bicycles are not the answer for the vast majority of our population and the city's goals should not be to force people out of their vehicles.

Too many tax breaks. Capstone/13th and olive is a disaster and a blight on downtown. Big mistake. If you are going to continue a mupte like thing make more stipulations about sustainability and architecture, sidewalks, etc. Have a few standards

The incentives are not required and have a bad track record. Developers do not need to be subsidized. The city is burdened with the services of the development but without any revenue to pay for it. Its short sighted and directs money to those who do not need it.

The recent high density housing projects like Olive/Willamette complex and the one across 11th from Kiva are not set back far enough from the street.

Important to add ownership options (condos, rowhouses, etc) downtown, so that it welcomes not only the old and young, but also middle age/income people—and so that the broad middle range of residents feel invested in what happens downtown.

We need to not let companies like whole foods come into the down town core and build a single story structure. If we are truly going to achieve this when you Joint Venture Zones where this kind of strip mall thinking is no longer acceptable.

We don't need high density housing inserted in outlying neighborhoods with little access to public transportation.

Would this development prevent transforming downtown Eugene into, well, a "downtown"? When I think of "downtown," I think of a place to GO -- for theater, restaurants, walkability. Currently, absolutely not a place I go unless I have to.

As long as they don't look like Capstone or the new Hilton or whatever that horrible place is over closer to campus on Franklin; the Hub? Also, it would be really nice to stop using the tall buildings as ways to get around putting up cell towers. It is just as terrible to put all that garbage on top of the building as it is to put it on a tower. I can hardly go downtown anymore and I can no longer work downtown.

Why do you need more apartments downtown? Because of the loiterers and homeless downtown, I prefer not to frequent the area!

Definitely.

I support MUPTE for downtown housing. I understand that it is more expensive to build downtown and incentives are necessary to attract housing there.

MUPTE is a horrible tool to develop downtown and create high density areas! Tax payers should not be subsidizing these projects and the tax exemption period is WAY TO LONG! I would prefer looser zoning restrictions to allow medium density options in existing residential areas (ie increase triplex, quads, and duplexes) which tend to be owned and operated by middle class families.

I object to the MUPTE tax breaks.

Don't care for MUPTE. It's not necessary. Those folks are going to invest in Eugene anyway and we can use that tax revenue for more bicycle and pedestrian amenities.

Too many tall apts buildings already that are new and blocking the sky.

Those tall Apartment buildings are a blight on the beauty of the city! They are hideous! Not in keeping with the beauty of Eugene.

For a more vibrant downtown, we need to encourage more high density development downtown. Less parking lots and more buildings downtown. This will help to unify downtown and encourage additional development downtown while alleviating burdens to build mini urban hubs outside of downtown that encourage sprawl (i.e., crescent village, but worse) on the edge to the UGB that encourage driving from mini-hub to mini-hub instead of to one central vibrant city center.

But notore student housing. Good opportunity for seniors and more affordable housing, along with professionals wanting to live and work near the center of the city.

Downtown housing is not affordable even for moderate income people. It is going to be difficult to add 2,400 people downtown if mainly studios and one bedroom units are built. There needs to be a proactive effort to aggregate lots and build larger complexes. There needs to be an effort to make downtown less seedy and safer. MUPTE still needs to be controlled better. It should only be awarded for affordable housing.
Q3 Do you think the Medium Density Residential Option A strategy balances or supports the City of Eugene’s goals and values regarding housing affordability, compact development and neighborhood livability from the Envision Eugene pillars?

Medium Density Residential: OPTION A: Amend the zoning code to preserve medium density residential zones for attached housing (this would result in detached single-family housing being prohibited in these zones). ("Detached" was added here for clarity on 8/10/16) If you would like to dive deeper... For draft zoning code language that could implement this strategy, see this Option A draft code.

Answered: 182  Skipped: 95
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Additional comments:</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I think it may be too restrictive to not allow a second SF home on lots that could support it. I think there needs to be a clear definition of affordability. Tearing down existing housing to allow developers to build expensive dense housing may increase housing but not affordability.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 11:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eugene needs to protect its single family homes, this is where people want to live. Most people don't want to live like sardines in apartments.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 1:19 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Change the wording of the Option A so that both options are possible. Preserve attached housing but also allow detached housing.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 9:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Preserve attached housing.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 7:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Attached housing should be preserved.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 7:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>each neighborhood has to be considered separately as there are unique situations in each.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 3:25 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Preserve character of neighborhoods. My lot is R3 and what's allowed in R3 would be entirely incompatible with the surrounding stable (not a bunch of tear downs) neighborhood.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 12:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>As soon as options are taken away (removal of detached) then the seventh pillar of 'adaptable flexible collaborative' is jeopardized.</td>
<td>9/23/2016 4:01 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>While I can agree that MDR zoning should be reserved, one can imagine being able to mix a variety of housing types on a single site and still achieving desired/expected densities. I'd suggest instead sticking to requirements for minimum densities. If for whatever reason one or more detached S-F homes were included on a site with higher density development, then the objective is met. Prohibiting detached S-F homes is imposing a design imperative. Stick with and focus on outcomes.</td>
<td>9/23/2016 2:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Where would this take place?</td>
<td>9/23/2016 2:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Only if existing properties and designs are protected. New density should not stare into existing windows.</td>
<td>9/23/2016 2:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes, if you find a way to deal with MDR lots that may be too small for MDR development.</td>
<td>9/23/2016 2:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Attached housing will help, but is not the best solution.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 6:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Why are you prohibiting more dwellings (e.g., unattached or duplex/triplex) when you want more density? Why don't you allow more dwellings on properties?</td>
<td>9/22/2016 1:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>What kind of survey open to the public assumes the person has read the explanation elsewhere? If the plan can't be explained in a one paragraph synopsis, it's probably too complicated.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 12:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>This is a pretty simple action that will ensure that medium density is actually medium density. Single-family dwellings can't reach the thresholds under any reasonable configuration.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 11:07 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I see no good reason to require that every unit developed in an area be non-detached.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 10:21 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Use only un-developed lots for medium density as well as single story units over strip shopping areas.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 10:15 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>If not already developed, adding further restrictions make it even less likely to be developed.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 10:05 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>nothing beyond 3 stories outside of Downtown</td>
<td>9/22/2016 8:54 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>No, if it means homeowners having to give up their homes.</td>
<td>9/21/2016 3:23 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>This would take away any option for detached housing in R-2. We have squeezed this sector enough with our present infill, and need to relax the pressure for single family lots.</td>
<td>9/20/2016 12:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Except for young people in their 20s and elderly seniors, most people will prefer to live in a house. I don't think single-family housing should be prohibited and should be allowed on lots that are considered too small for now. If you're concerned about affordability just reduce the supply of single-family homes and watch prices skyrocket.</td>
<td>9/20/2016 12:42 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>This strategy flies in the face of neighborhood livability.</td>
<td>9/19/2016 1:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>You may look to Portland's Plan for &quot;density residential infill&quot; for options, ideas, possibilities, etc. It is quite impressive!</td>
<td>9/16/2016 5:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>This seems to preclude ADUs.</td>
<td>9/16/2016 1:01 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Depends on whether enough SFR land is created in</td>
<td>9/16/2016 6:23 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td>The question is extremely misleading. I don't believe detached, single family housing should EVER be prohibited!</td>
<td>9/15/2016 4:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td>Generally support this concept but don't like that it takes away flexibility for providing small lot and homeownership options in the community. Additionally, the detached option is typically more compatible with surrounding low density zones than multi-family development.</td>
<td>9/15/2016 2:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td>I live in an existing neighborhood of single family homes off of Country Club and Elwood Dr. Please do NOT rezone our neighborhood. It will be a negative impact on all of our homes and we have no more lots for development in this existing neighborhood anyways. Rezoning our neighborhood would cause a hardship for all owners because any potential buyers would not be able to obtain mortgages on a single family home in a R2 zoning. Please leave our zoning as R1. Thank you!</td>
<td>9/14/2016 1:52 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td>B is a much better option.</td>
<td>9/14/2016 9:40 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td>For me to be OK with this, there would have to be a height restriction. What I mean is that some lots can fit a single level duplex and that is fine. Neighbors of mine had a neighbor build a 2 story granny flat 10 feet from their back fence...that is not OK.</td>
<td>9/12/2016 7:03 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td>allow single family detached</td>
<td>9/12/2016 5:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td>bulldozing the surrounding neighborhoods outside of downtown would destroy how Oregonians live.</td>
<td>9/12/2016 3:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td>Keep the levels of density the same except in areas where the population is the lowest.</td>
<td>8/31/2016 8:20 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td>Anything that is newly built will rather expensive to rent. Livability and affordability have become buzz words, or rhetoric, that the city uses to advertise to promote their proposes. Case-in-point, Capstone and the SW-SAZ.</td>
<td>8/31/2016 6:51 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td>I'm uncertain about the affect this would have on neighborhood livability, but otherwise like this</td>
<td>8/31/2016 5:52 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td>Depends on where they are built, preferably not close to other multi unit housing, but spread out into other areas.</td>
<td>8/31/2016 3:07 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td>DO NOT build medium Density in areas that already have detached single family homes.</td>
<td>8/31/2016 3:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td>I think most people would prefer detached housing.</td>
<td>8/31/2016 3:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td>More limiting than option B</td>
<td>8/27/2016 3:10 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td>This question is incomprehensible gibberish. Would it be impossible to explain what would change, what would be the result of the proposed change in the zoning code? &quot;preserve medium density residential zones for attached housing (this would result in detached single-family housing being prohibited in these zones&quot; If this means you could not build single-family housing in R2, why not say that? Define attached housing. If this question means, amend the code to prevent single-family housing from being built in R2, then -- yes</td>
<td>8/26/2016 5:26 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td>Medium density includes courtyard houses and cottage clusters, with small detached houses. These would be excluded if new construction were required to be attached. The small detached medium density houses fit much better in existing neighborhoods.</td>
<td>8/26/2016 5:21 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td>I don't like the prohibiting single family detached in certain zone areas as then you get stratified neighborhoods. I'd rather see smaller (less than 1000sq ft and small lots) single family homes mixed with duplexes/townhouses etc.</td>
<td>8/26/2016 1:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td>Residents have lost trust in city. Housing stock is sufficient without rezoning.</td>
<td>8/25/2016 3:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td>Prohibiting the single-family housing means that this can impact neighborhood livability to an extent.</td>
<td>8/18/2016 6:07 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td>Envision Eugene presumes that the City's growth goals may be met within the boundaries of the existing Urban Growth Boundary and by forcing changes to property zoning to accomplish at least some of these goals. The City's conclusion that adequate vacant land is available within the urban growth boundary is misguided. The UBG should be physically expanded (but rarely, or never, in areas suitable for growing food crops). Much of the land identified as &quot;vacant&quot; or &quot;partially vacant&quot; is vacant by design. The City should not be in the business of forcing zoning changes on property owners to satisfy planners' goals.</td>
<td>8/17/2016 4:36 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td>The density increases could be accomplished without making this change. There is not enough flexibility. Why not allow a breezeway between the portions of the duplex? It helps with noise of neighbors and also accomplishes the density needs.</td>
<td>8/17/2016 12:59 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td>I'd like to see developers challenged to build more attractive multi-family options, as Option A might do--but these lands are not located in the most strategic areas</td>
<td>8/16/2016 12:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td>Houses on small lots seem to be a part of the intent of Medium Density Residential.</td>
<td>8/16/2016 12:26 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td>I believe that new secondary dwellings should be allowed on alley lots in all residential zones.</td>
<td>8/14/2016 3:13 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td>These need to be implemented with more of a local neighborhood involvement process.</td>
<td>8/13/2016 9:51 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td>If this housing fell more in the &quot;key corridor&quot; areas, that would be better.</td>
<td>8/12/2016 4:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Date/Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Suburbs are becoming far too dense. Please expand UGB, especially in North East Eugene towards McKenzie River. Excellent access to I-5 and Beltline without clogging up Coburg road even more. I believe this would be well received by most residents in this area. Homes are so expensive here and we need more single family in this area.</td>
<td>8/12/2016 4:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>I would like to see more development of duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes. Does the code allow for private ownership of each unit (like a condo)? I think it should.</td>
<td>8/11/2016 2:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Off street parking MUST be provided for every unit. The tree canopy MUST be increased. Solar panels should be installed on ALL units and access to sunlight must NOT be impeded. Neighbors MUST be included in design plans.</td>
<td>8/11/2016 12:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>It seems odd to exclude detached single family housing. Homogeneity is more inclusive.</td>
<td>8/11/2016 10:36 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>It appears that townhomes/rowhouses are being classified while being permitted for building as &quot;single-family homes&quot; (see permit for Arcadia Cluster townhomes <a href="http://pdd.eugene-or.gov/BuildingPermits/PermitDetails?log=16-04558-01">http://pdd.eugene-or.gov/BuildingPermits/PermitDetails?log=16-04558-01</a>). I would support this option if it was clear that what would be prohibited is detached housing, as opposed to single-family housing, which seems like it includes attached forms like rowhouse/townhouses.</td>
<td>8/10/2016 1:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>This seems like the best option to promote neighborhood consistency in terms of design and characteristics. But what implications are their for sprawl. Adopting a policy like this also could be potentially perilous and should be written to revisit the density requirements and adjust according every couple years. For instance, what if we can no longer accommodate single family homes without expanding the UGB because of this? Would it be better to allow single family homes in medium density than expand the UGB should that situation arise. Also, this option looks good for now, but what about in the future if the requirement comes up to increase density requirements from 10 to 14 or more? Does this lead to &quot;ghettoization.&quot; Have to be careful and put in check and balances on such a policy now to avoid future issues.</td>
<td>8/10/2016 6:51 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Fare these areas aligned with the key corridors?</td>
<td>8/9/2016 4:14 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 Do you think the Medium Density Residential Option B strategy balances or supports the City of Eugene’s goals and values regarding housing affordability, compact development and neighborhood livability from the Envision Eugene pillars?

Medium Density Residential: OPTION B: Amend the zoning code to increase the minimum number of homes required in medium density residential zones from 10 to about 14 homes per net acre. If you would like to dive deeper... For draft zoning code language that could implement this strategy, see this Option B draft code.

Answered: 185  Skipped: 92

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Somewhat Yes</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I don't have enough information</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential: OPTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B amend the zoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>code to increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the minimum number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of homes required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in medium density</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residential zones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from 10 to 14 homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Additional comments</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Must have sufficient off street parking.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 11:15 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I think residential density should remain the same. No need to cram people together.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 2:15 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I don't think it should be increased.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 1:33 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is no reason to increase so dramatically to 14. Increase to 12.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 1:19 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Decrease the cap to 12.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 9:34 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The increase should only be 12, not 14.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 7:57 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Increase to 12 not 14.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 7:38 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>each site is unique, a blanket increase won't work in every situation.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 3:25 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ONLY with thoughtful transitions.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 12:25 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Care should be taken to ensure that MDR housing blends well with existing/adjacent development. Compatibility is key in feathering in MDR uses within existing neighborhoods-particularly healthy, stable neighborhoods with existing S-F homes in areas with R-2 zoning. The proposed code amendment increases density numerically, but there needs to be other code adjustments needed to ensure compatibility. I can point out examples in my R-2 zoned neighborhood where the introduction of densities meeting the proposed target create problems that should not be replicated elsewhere.</td>
<td>9/23/2016 2:46 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Where are these zones? How does open space play in?</td>
<td>9/23/2016 2:38 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>existing Metro Plan policy</td>
<td>9/23/2016 2:05 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Concerns about impacts to lower density adjacent lands</td>
<td>9/23/2016 11:05 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>option A above could be enacted alongside option B here - I don't see a reason why they would need to be one or the other. Both make sense together.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 3:36 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Option B appears to be the better of the two as they are currently worded.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 3:34 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Minimum densities are pretty blunt tools that ignore market realities. They are attractive in theory, but the implementation is complicated by a diverse land base. Does it immediately apply to a 5000 sq ft lot in an already developed area? Lack of sensitivity to neighborhood context has caused a lot of problems.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 11:07 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I like the idea of density, but there should be a greater variety of options between &quot;no minimum&quot; at R-1 and &quot;14 per acre&quot; at R-2. Why doesn't R-1.5 see greater usage? I would love to open up more opportunities to live in Eugene's wonderful neighborhoods without forcing R-2 to become the domain of profit-driven property investors.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 10:21 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Only if existing homes and local environment are not compromised in the process.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 10:15 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>If not already developed, adding further restrictions make it even less likely to be developed.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 10:05 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>no buildings over 3 stories outside downtown eugene</td>
<td>9/22/2016 8:54 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>No, not if it means homeowners having to give up their homes.</td>
<td>9/21/2016 3:23 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Leave this requirement at 10 lots per/acre and continue on with the urban growth boundary changes.</td>
<td>9/20/2016 12:38 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The word &quot;about&quot; bothers me. There's a lot of room to substitute any number for 14. Also, what is a &quot;net acre.&quot; Is there a legal definition that's in the code or is this another provision that's open to interpretation. Without knowing what a net acre is compared to real acre there's no way to answer this question in the affirmative.</td>
<td>9/20/2016 12:42 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I think it is great to encourage greater density, and even to prioritized attached units. But there is so much creative work going on now around both tiny and cottage housing, and I would hate to see any roadblocks added to that style of development. Cottage house clusters of 14 (or more!) per acre could be a great addition to the Eugene housing supply, for young families, retiring baby-boomers, etc. It combines the best of detached units with increased density.</td>
<td>9/19/2016 4:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>This is no longer medium density. Again, flies in the face of neighborhood livability.</td>
<td>9/19/2016 1:15 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Too dense</td>
<td>9/16/2016 6:23 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I believe that more small homes should be ALLOWED per acre, but I don't agree with forcing a &quot;minimum&quot; on developers. I also believe there should be incentives given for developers who get creative with small footprint detached homes within the current growth boundary. Eugene has many vacant lots of small acreage that could mimic the &quot;Amazon Cottages&quot; style of housing, which is very popular among lower income small families.</td>
<td>9/15/2016 4:18 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Date/Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Of the two options, I think this option does a better job of allowing flexibility in how we provide the needed number of units without taking away the single family home option. This should be coupled with clear and objective standards that support compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods.</td>
<td>9/15/2016 2:33 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>If done only in areas where there are no other single family homes in the subdivision. Please do not negatively effect current home owners in our city. Thank you!</td>
<td>9/14/2016 1:52 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>With the trend toward smaller homes and even smaller detached homes, requiring the minimum density while preserving the detached option increases possibilities while still achieving the density we need.</td>
<td>9/14/2016 9:40 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Again, Eugene wants to be ‘green;’ I am OK without lawn, but some of these sub divisions have no trees to counteract the pavement and heat gain.</td>
<td>9/12/2016 7:03 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>again, bulldozing homes to pack in 7 houses per property is not the answer, for Oregon.</td>
<td>9/12/2016 3:11 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Provides more options for developers and potential home buyers.</td>
<td>9/11/2016 12:25 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I like this option better than Option A</td>
<td>8/31/2016 5:52 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>DO NOT build medium Density in areas that already have detached single family homes.</td>
<td>8/31/2016 3:06 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Even if each single family house within a cluster is smaller with smaller yards, each cluster of homes needs some green space, trees and safe nearby area for kids to play without parents having to make time to go to a park.</td>
<td>8/31/2016 3:06 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Provides more flexibility for developers, more likely to provide owner occupied dwellings than option A</td>
<td>8/27/2016 3:10 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Again, the question is crap. Why not increase the density from 10 to 14 homes? Why do we have two options, why not have both?</td>
<td>8/26/2016 5:26 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Medium density is already too high. Medium density minimum should stay the same, maximum should be decreased to 24 homes per net acre. High density should be increased from 20 to 24 homes per net acre. In most cities, our medium density is considered high density (e.g., new construction at Cascade Manor is high).</td>
<td>8/26/2016 5:21 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I think this better fits for affordability as allows a variety of housing styles so long as fits more per acre.</td>
<td>8/26/2016 1:37 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>No trust in city planning department due to mistakes and dishonesty in south Willamette area. Use citizen-intensive refinement plans or leave it as it is.</td>
<td>8/25/2016 3:30 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Smaller spaces are better for the environment -- there is no reason for Americans to have the huge homes that this country has become accustomed to.</td>
<td>8/18/2016 8:07 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Envision Eugene presumes that the City's growth goals may be met within the boundaries of the existing Urban Growth Boundary and by forcing changes to property zoning to accomplish at least some of these goals. The City's conclusion that adequate vacant land is available within the urban growth boundary is misguided. The UBG should be physically expanded (but rarely, or never, in areas suitable for growing food crops). Much of the land identified as &quot;vacant&quot; or &quot;partially vacant&quot; is vacant by design. The City should not be in the business of forcing zoning changes on property owners to satisfy planners' goals.</td>
<td>8/17/2016 4:36 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>There is currently inadequate public transportation to other cities to allow this without parking for cars. Personally, I have to commute outside the city on a regular basis and need to have my own car. Apartments in Eugene already have parking issues. I would leave it alone.</td>
<td>8/17/2016 12:59 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Design is everything! The greater density can certainly be attractive, but could also be nasty. Also consider strategies to reduce the burden/impact of car parking--maybe financial incentives to help people shift away from auto-dependence.</td>
<td>8/16/2016 12:27 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>This also needs to be implemented more sensitively with not only a comprehensive neighborhood involvement process but added looks at near by parks open spaces.</td>
<td>8/13/2016 9:51 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>That sounds like a lot of homes per acre. How large? (We must be talking apartments, yes?) Big enough only for 1-2 people? Probably fine. Big enough for families of 4 -6 each? Seems very crowded to me...Without a plan to look at, this is a bit vague here. Perhaps if every building had a mini-park or green area planned with it...</td>
<td>8/12/2016 5:18 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>This only works for me if these new homes are kept in the &quot;key corridor&quot; areas. There should be no more destruction of our natural areas for new homes and there also should be more ordinances around removal of trees to build new homes (or other things like the EMx. It really doesn't make it better to cut down hundreds of trees by planting twice as many, unless you can get them to grow as tall as the cut ones in about a month.</td>
<td>8/12/2016 4:50 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Developers may not build to the new density allowed. What then?</td>
<td>8/12/2016 3:51 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>I'm not sure about this. I do believe that allowing private ownership (like condos) could possibly help with housing affordability.</td>
<td>8/11/2016 2:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Envision Eugene Multi-family Housing Options Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>I believe this is the best option on the table at the moment, given other constraints, as it allows us to meet our housing need and thus address affordability issues. However, given the current locations of build-able medium density land, I don't think it supports the other goals of Envision Eugene (related to transportation options, neighborhood livability, compact development, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/10/2016 1:08 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Also a viable option, but less ideal than the first. A 40% increase in density per acre seems like a lot. Seems to have the same affect as option one in that it will encourage attached housing to be able to make 14 units work per acre. But leave in the flexibility to have single family homes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/10/2016 6:51 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>This kind of increased density degrades neighborhoods. Instead cluster townhouses and preserve shared green/common space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/9/2016 8:23 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>If we are talking true apartments, maybe. Cramming more townhouses per acre may not be marketable. The Farm was built out at 14 units per acre and it did not sell like hot cakes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/9/2016 7:06 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5 Do you think the Key Corridors strategy balances or supports the City of Eugene’s goals and values regarding housing affordability, compact development and neighborhood livability from the Envision Eugene pillars? Key Corridors Strategy: Increase housing density along key transportation corridors and core commercial areas throughout the city. Most of the land in these areas is already zoned to allow higher density housing and is already developed. In order to see more housing occur in these places to fit the 1,600 high and medium density homes, analysis indicates that financial incentives would need to be applied to these areas. An existing financial tool which could be expanded along one or more corridors is the Multiple Unit Property Tax Exemption (MUPTE) program which can enable redevelopment of an already developed site to add housing.

Answered: 184  Skipped: 93
### Additional comments:

1. **Discontinue using the MUPTE program. No housing along key corridors.**
   - Date: 9/25/2016 11:26 PM

2. **This should be explored.**
   - Date: 9/25/2016 11:15 PM

3. **No density along key corridors. Again, no need for MUPTE.**
   - Date: 9/25/2016 2:15 AM

4. **The city should stop trying to use MUPTE to push building. Also I disagree that transit corridors are a place where housing should go.**
   - Date: 9/25/2016 1:33 AM

5. **Developers do not need further incentives to build. End MUPTE, we do not need to provide tax breaks to developers.**
   - Date: 9/25/2016 1:19 AM

6. **There is no need for MUPTE anywhere in Eugene. We already have plenty of housing there is no need to overbuild. Also the developers already realized that investing in housing is lucrative they will build regardless of incentive. If the residents of Eugene don't get incentives to build houses neither should developers. Also the way you are designating key corridors is arbitrary. Willamette Street and 29th Ave are not under developed, there are many more "key corridors" that would benefit from residential densification like for example West 11th.**
   - Date: 9/24/2016 9:34 PM

7. **Traffic on South Willamette & 29th Ave is already congested with the drastic traffic lane changes. The area already has more density than other areas of the city and is not a "key corridor". New construction will not be affordable housing because building costs are high and rent will increase. The commercial buildings can be improved but I do not want to lose the local businesses due to new expensive rents.**
   - Date: 9/24/2016 7:57 PM

8. **Developers do not need MUPTE incentives. If the need is there the building will happen with their investors money, not with my taxpayer dollars and a loss to the city budget.**
   - Date: 9/24/2016 7:38 PM
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>it will work in some places and not others. we run the risk of poorly developing some key intersections. a better and more flexible mixed use code will better serve the key corridors. 9/24/2016 3:25 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>MUPTE as it currently still needs work in order for me to agree. Too many concessions were made in its revision. 9/24/2016 12:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>If land is already developed as the key corridors strategy identifies, then redevelopment must occur. Redevelopment is very expensive. So MUPTE would very likely need to be employed to keep affordability. 9/23/2016 4:01 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>NO MUPTE! 9/23/2016 2:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Existing residences are not protected. 9/23/2016 2:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes to planning to allow density increase over 20-year planning period. Not sure about increasing public subsidies for development w/MUPTE. Redevelopment will occur over time when market is ripe and as some of the older multi unit housing stock becomes obsolete. Exception: if community wants to support redevelopment of an important, shared area of the City, such as Downtown or the riverfront, public subsidy tools can get things going. 9/23/2016 2:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Need to consider transitions between higher and lower densities to address concerns about livability 9/23/2016 11:05 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The burden should be shared by all citizens and residents, not just those who happen to live next to &quot;key corridors.&quot; Let the richy riches share more of the densification burden! 9/22/2016 8:29 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>couple this with form-based development standards and design review in order to increase public buy-in 9/22/2016 3:36 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I think you should be asking a separate question about MUPTE. It's unnecessarily distracting to slip in that reference as part of the key corridors question. 9/22/2016 12:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Is high traffic areas really better than permitting micro businesses that can meet the needs of people within their neighborhood? 9/22/2016 12:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A big opportunity was missed in the Franklin Corridor by allowing lots of student housing to be subsidized in the WUN and south of campus. The City's own market studies underscore the market challenges with many of the corridors. You'll need to take a long term view on this and maintain the vision in the face of the inevitable opposition that will emerge. 9/22/2016 11:07 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Only in areas that So, we are back to MUPTE again. If density is increased in these areas it must not be by forced rezoning. Where there is commercial zoning, allow single story housing to be built over shopping areas. 9/22/2016 10:15 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>As long as comparability is included. 9/22/2016 10:05 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Expanding MUPTE is a bad idea. We pay taxes for a reason. 10-year exemption is a burden for rest of taxpayers who must pay for services needed by new development. 9/22/2016 9:51 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mupti is welfare for the rich and the city should get off that bandwagon. 9/22/2016 8:54 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>No, not if it means homeowners having to give up their homes. 9/21/2016 3:23 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>This incentive has been used too much(especially university housing) and giving away our tax dollars is killing us. Lets end this give-away program, and put some sense back in development projects. 9/20/2016 12:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I spent the last 20 minutes trying to find a list of the key corridors on the city, envision eugene and Firefox. The only thing I could find was Coburg Road to the Ferry Street Bridge. I'd like to know exactly which streets are the corridors before saying yes. I think the concept is fine as long as these are truly the major corridors. 9/20/2016 12:42 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Unwilling to support another tax giveaway to well-connected developers so the council can pretend to be planners. 9/19/2016 1:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Very much Yes. Exuberantly yes. 9/19/2016 12:02 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>We need more homes on West 11th. Its a storage and strip mall here. So ugly. Nothing to do. 9/16/2016 1:01 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Higher density housing will be essential in these corridors for many decades but we need to make sure that development is consistent with the local residents wishes for their communities. Including ALL stakeholders in the decisions is a must for success. 9/15/2016 4:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Like this as a land efficient strategy that also is good transportation planning. 9/15/2016 2:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>City of Eugene needs to move beyond MUPTE. Out of state corporations are reaping millions...we are still broke. There are city parks that are not maintained because there is not enough money. These plans are touting all the parks, but the reality is that the City can't afford to maintain them so that is a moot point. 9/12/2016 7:03 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>what would help more is adding right turn lanes from coburg rd to beltline. adding all the housing and not access will just create more of a traffic nightmare that it already is. 9/12/2016 3:11 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Staff needs to reflect on why residents and developers are unhappy with how the discussion about higher density have been handled. 9/1/2016 12:25 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>MUTPE steals money from the tax base and gives to developers. Corruption!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Not as long as R1 properties, and properties adjacent to R1, are vulnerable to the dreaded rezoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>I would want to know more about what analysis was used to determine a MUPTE is needed. I would only want MUPTE used for very affordable housing. I want to know the city's definition of affordable. Eugene has a crisis of homelessness and rising rents really hurting single parent households. ds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>This will only work with appropriate and separate truck routes, additional key corridors, and increasing policing of routes. Current key corridors are close to capacity during the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I think people are worried about the impact of MUPTE's and the perception that developers then get to 'run this town'. Financial incentives are important to attract businesses and I agree with the key corridor strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Good strategy but implementation is more complex than the tier one strategies. It is important to complete the process which has taken many years already so that the community can move forward with planning for neighborhoods and urban reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>No MUPTE. Certainly, increase the density along transportation corridors, but if the only way to get this construction is by bribing developers, then wait until the demand for housing provides the incentive for such development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>New construction may be more compact than what is there now, but it is not affordable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Adding high density housing along key corridors is a great way to achieve our community's livability goals. Not only can we accommodate growth within our UGB, but those housing options allow for residents to access alternative transportation options. MUPTE and other financial incentives are key to enabling development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>On key transit corridors we should have denser housing along with robust transit and bike paths to address affordability and climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>No more MUPTE. No benefits in sacrifice of city income to vested interests! For goodness sake stop this insanity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>This will be the most effective strategy to accomplish all of the City's goals and values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Would people living in these areas have to drive to get places? Or would it increase the number of people who don't have to use cars? Being car-free would be a benefit if that would be a result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>The tax exemption is not needed. It should not be expanded. It is basically a developer subsidy. It isn't needed and is short-sighted. The city should tax these developments normally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Please bear in mind that this strategy doesn't require that all of the housing be ON the corridor. Within a block or two would serve the purpose, and might be more livable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>No matter what development, housing or industrial, Transportation Corridors should always be a key part of the City Planning for each project assessment. Area-wide engagement of neighborhoods in business should be part of the process, not excluding everyday and weekly users of agiven area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>What exactly would be the &quot;financial incentives&quot;? Grocery stores? Whatever it is, I'd like more &quot;walkable&quot; communities -- so people would walk to school, grocery shopping, parks, library branches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Eugene is large enough as it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>... the &quot;transition&quot; between new higher density development adjacent to existing lower density residential development needs to be resolved before higher density will be accepted in existing neighborhoods ... this may mean larger back yard setbacks ... and other means of protecting the privacy of existing neighbors ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>I believe the most important thing is to have density adjacent to public transit corridors (bus, EmX).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>MUPTE is a horrible tool to develop and create high density areas! Tax payers should not be subsidizing these projects and the tax exemption period is WAY TO LONG! I would prefer looser zoning restrictions to allow medium density options in existing residential areas (ie increase triplex, quads, and duplexes) which tend to be owned and operated by middle class families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>I object to MUPTE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Again, I disagree that the MUPTE incentive is actually required to set this in motion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>The Key Transit Corridors strategy is, in my opinion, the best way to accomplish all of the goals of Envision Eugene. However, I think broader tactics need to be used than just MUPTE, and in particular smaller scale infill options and the addition of missing middle housing needs to be addressed... for example, another strategy is to adjust the methods used to calculate fees, etc. for ADUs to make them more fiscally reasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td>I like this strategy because it encourage smart growth where people have natural settled along those key corridors. But it really depends on what is a &quot;key corridor&quot; and how you define and restrict them so that over time not everything becomes a &quot;key corridor.&quot; I think this is what people are afraid of, and because no defining criteria and high thresholds for what constitutes a key corridor can lead to sprawl sprawl sprawl (i.e., Houston, with all its key corridors belt lines around the city). Language and policies would need to be clear on what is a &quot;key corridor&quot; and what is not, and why and how key corridors are defined based on what specific immutable criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td>Transition, transition, transition!!! All of these strategies will only be accepted if planners work out good methods of transition between new development and existing neighborhoods. This has not been a concern in the past.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6 If you answered "somewhat no" or "no" to any of the strategies above, please tell us why.

Answered: 136  Skipped: 141

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>33.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I answered &quot;somewhat no&quot; or &quot;no&quot; because...</td>
<td>66.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 136

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>I answered &quot;somewhat no&quot; or &quot;no&quot; because...</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>prohibiting single family housing does not allow builders or neighborhoods to meet market demand. more options is always better than more restrictions on what is allowable.</td>
<td>9/26/2016 8:20 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The MUPTE program should be discontinued. I don't think development should be promoted in residential areas.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 11:26 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I don’t think affordability is clearly defined. There needs to be clearly stated protection of existing neighborhoods and care to preserve solar access, trees and sufficient green space and parking. Any incentive need to address affordable housing. Care must be taken not to shift all of our land into the hands of a few. I’d like to see more clear explanations of the impact of the options and real facts and siting the sources of the data.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 11:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The medium density standards currently in place are not stringent enough to promote a suitable amount of housing, which in turn will increase the overall cost of living in Eugene. Additionally, sustainability features such as public transportation and rural areas outside the UGB are negatively impacted by undue demand from lower density housing options.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 8:07 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stop giving away money to outside developers at the expense of local multi-family owners.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 9:24 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The city should discontinue promoting MUPTE as a strategy for development. The city should preserve residential neighborhoods and promote density only in the downtown.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 2:15 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MUPTE should not be used for building, the city needs to stop pushing it. We do not need density in neighborhoods or along transit corridors. Density should grow in the downtown area and in C2 commercial zones.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 1:33 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Stop pushing MUPTE, its a failed plan and it results in terrible quality buildings that look like garbage. This does not benefit Eugene in the long run. We do not need to incentivize bad investments. Bad for the people that live in these buildings and bad for the long term housing situation in Eugene.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 1:19 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>South Willamette already has a lot of density. The traffic in the area has become significantly worse, especially since the restriping along Willamette Street. The MUPTE incentives have shown to encourage money and land grabbers to build low quality buildings in the area. The city should consider listening to the residents instead of listening to big money developers from outside of the city.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 9:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Developers do not need MUPTE incentives. If the need is there the building will happen with their investors money, not with my taxpayer dollars and a loss to the city budget.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>South Willamette &amp; 29th Ave are already not coping with the drastic traffic changes. The area already has more density than other areas of the city and is not a “key corridor”. Affordable housing is not new construction. The commercial buildings can be improved but I do not want to lose local businesses with new expensive rents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>see comments above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>See comments in each question.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Most people who've studied the situation recommend neighborhood led refinement plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Density should be contextual and high-density housing is not affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>14 houses per acre is way too many</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Serious attention needs to be given to adjacency and compatibility issues. Increased densities within established neighborhoods can be done appropriately, or can be a destabilizing element. As written, the proposed code language is a blunt instrument promoting some numerical standards of achieving density without ensuring the fine-grained detailed site planning that is needed to ensure compatibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I believe that we should concentrate density along key corridors, rather than, for example South Willamette. I question whether MUPTE is needed for this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Current structures and residences are not protected. A street separating changes may be sufficient. A back property line is not enough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Med den should de able to include single fam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1/2 acre or less should be kept to single family detached residence unless in the immediate downtown area. 10-14 homes per acre is too dense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10-14 homes per acre is too dense.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>10-14 homes per acre is too dense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Increasing minimum density would be sufficient, without placing an outright restriction on single family. A development may be able to achieve the density with the generally preferred detached housing. And if so, has met the minimum density goal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>All should be allowed to build single</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>There are other unexplored options. You present false dichotomies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>As noted above: Why are you prohibiting more dwellings (e.g., unattached or duplex/triplex) when you want more density? Why don’t you allow more dwellings on properties?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I feel like these changes are inadvertently removing nuance from our urban fabric. There is a demand for small, detached units in pleasant neighborhoods. The response to that demand seems to have been to incentivize high density housing, disallow ADU’s, and de-emphasize R-1.5 zoning. I understand city staff see the problem from a much different perspective (probably more comprehensively informed), but these proposed changes seem bereft of contextual grace. Example: The Friendly neighborhood is becoming too expensive for renters, yet zoning does not allow developers to build anything other than single family homes. I want to see more small lots, small houses, and ADU’s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I think it’s important to create multi-family housing but I’m skeptical of how very high density changes the “feel” of Eugene. I’m more open to duplexes or four-plexes than I am to high rises.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>See answers above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>City’s previous work on this with SW-SAZ expanded into re-zoning residential neighborhoods and was a disaster. City would need to do it much differently.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Existing property owners have to carry tax bill for MUPTE developers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I don’t want to see more rental apts. but would like to see more owner-occupied housing built but not necessarily on heavy traffic roads but also want it to be affordable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>The Coburg Corridor already has too much traffic. Add more homes, more traffic. And if it means homeowners give up their property so apartments/condos/townhouses can be built, no.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35 My neighborhood is already accommodating duplexes, tri-plexes, as well as trying to fit in line with a set up city of Eugene, so I don't believe changing the code will help at all. That and I can count at least 6 or 7 homes "for sale", so why not account for these houses, as well as wait till the development out in Barger area is filled before we worry about 1,600 additional high and medium density homes?

36 existing housing will open up for the new people coming to town naturally. there are 100's of baby boomers like me who have given up our 3000 sq/ft house for 1700 sq/ft retirement homes. This is happening right now. Do a survey!!

37 I think there is another missing piece to the puzzle. I think that building smaller is part of the overall solution. 60%+ of households house only 1 or 2 people. I can envision a multi family like approach even if the dwellings are not attached. This could include higher density (but smaller) units that are still separate units. Pocket neighborhoods for example. This could even include tiny houses that help to increase density w/out impacting the overall footprint of a site. I'd love to see the code allow for some pilot programs and let developers and the community find innovative and creative solutions to the question of increased density.

38 Based on what happened on my block last year I don't trust the planning department. When a zoning change was asked for the 3 lots on the west side of Oak between 19th Alley and 20th st I asked the planner in charge three questions. Based on her answers I didn't oppose the change. All of her answers turned out to untrue. I don't know whether this was due to incompetence or deviousness. When I followed up I didn't get satisfactory explanations. The planning department gave waivers so people could live in the project while construction was still going on and twice reduced the parking requirements. I was finally told,"it's too bad this turned out to be such a bad experience for you." Along with the developer bragging to his workers that he had flipped it to a California corporation for a $300,000 profit before it was finished and the broken promises about Capstone, I would be an idiot to trust the process and what we're told unless it's written in stone. Experience has taught me the city government bends over backwards for developers and cares little or nothing about the people who are negatively impacted.

39 I think excluding single family residential could have a negative affect. Increasing the required density would achieve the same goal while not placing unnecessary restrictions on the type of development.

40 See above...

41 The more city involvement the lesser quality housing, more cost to build, more money to city for its pers, higher rent to tenant.

42 I do not believe Mupte is a solution to the building problem. I also do not feel that focusing on more medium density residential projects solve the problem efficiently. The Key Corridors plan seems a good idea but again the Mupte component is not good. Capstone was an example of Mupte gone awry. Are there good examples of Mupte being essential and effective from the standpoint of ordinary taxpayers? Why are there so many builders from outside Oregon? Where is the effort to build the local economy? These seem to be unanswered questions.

43 Because these strategies will sound good on paper and will be very difficult to implement because 1) people don't like density, 2) people don't like density, 3) this is not New York or even Buffalo.

44 see comment.

45 I believe retention of adequate lower density housing land is important

46 Through years of study in economic sustainable development, I believe it is essential that "high density" housing be affordable. Real estate values in downtown Eugene, where development has been proposed, will place high rent apartments out of reach economically for too many of our residents. The greatest need for most families, if affordable, quality housing. Many do not want big sprawling homes, but prefer easy to manage properties where communal space is more important than indoor square footage. These two values are important for "livability" in Eugene. Un-housed community members will not be aided by a plush downtown apartment. So as you can see, I have listed no as my answer for many reasons.

47 We work closely with people to help them to save money in affordable projects in order to purchase homes. The small lot homes that are efficiently built seem to be the only somewhat affordable option in the Eugene/Springfield area. Doing away with this option will only drive the market to more un-affordable levels. Particularly for first time owners.

48 I would like to see our urban growth boundary increased where possible.

49 I don't think the newer housing downtown is balanced for all ages and income levels. It currently offers rentals, student housing, high end condo, senior housing, etc. Not anything that attracts the middle age & middle income home owner.

50 I think I answered fully. I have to say I really appreciate having a comment box right next to the question. Thank you for that.

51 Higher density generally means higher crime rates and lower quality of life living situations
There is a property down the road that was only .5 acre or less and they are building 3 houses on it, very ugly and detracts from the neighborhood. It is right by the light and they are not going to be able to get out of the driveway when more houses are built. no thought to traffic studies.

Zoning in the city favors compacting areas, limited parking, and the thought process that this is a good thing. It isn't.

I think option B is better.

Infrastructure like Coberg and Beltline are the same but putting many more vehicles on them.

The only solution is to expand the urban growth boundary.

I answered no to all of them. People are fighting the city, planning department admitted huge mistakes and are not to be trusted.

I already have. Beyond that, I no longer trust the city. Oh, another example of very unfair treatment and poor planning is the Cohousing project the Planning Commission approved on Oakleigh Lane!

DO NOT build medium Density in areas that already have detached single family homes. I had this happen to me and you have devalued my property.

I included answers in comment section.

See above.

No MUPTE. This is a give-away to developers that is levied on the existing tax-payers.

As with what you tried with the SW-SAZ code passed by the planning commission, if you gave incentives to developers for building 3-5 story medium/high density structures, you would be replacing affordable bungalows with high priced medium/high density units. The house torn down at West 24th & Portland is an example. I happen to like what it seems to be replaced with (2 detached units, and the units according to the building permit are 1-2 family units), but planners had proposed this to be 3-5 story apartment/condos, which would not "fit the neighborhood".

I believe we can meet the medium density goals without prohibiting detached homes. Preferences for housing size are changing, meaning many people want a smaller house allowing for medium density without the requirement that it be attached. I believe this will alienate residents from living in these areas that don't want their housing attached to another house. This would disincentivize me to live in a medium density area, pushing me out to the low density housing.

So much deception from city manager and mayor. South Willamette brought people together and we will not allow this travesty to continue.

The downtown area is not affordable and does not have enough amenities.

Let citizens (not big developers with deep pockets) build on land that isn't annexed but within the UGB and much of your problem will be solved. All you guys care about are developers who will eventually pay your salaries, not the lowly land owner stuck with worthless land in the UGB that you won't let them build on because it's not annexed. It's a real crock what you guys do to regular citizens.

I explained in the comments section of the appropriate strategy.

The goals are misguided so any strategy seems equally misguided. The goals should support the way people live, not the way planners believe we should live. We like lower density, adequate lot sizes, wide streets, automobiles as a primary form of transportation and the availability of parking.

Be more careful with tax exemptions and have higher standards like I mentioned before. They are a good tool to help redevelop areas and raise density but don't hand them out like candy.

I believe the MUPTE is flawed and should not be expanded. When rent is high as it is in Eugene, the city does not need to subsidize the developers. They can make their money back without any risk. The density ordinance changes aren't flexible enough and don't address parking issues. As much as public transit within the city has improved, many still need a car to travel outside the city. More units also means the need for more parking.

Consolidate smaller lots.

I want to see property developers who are invested in Eugene's future and not just in making a quick profit.

14 homes per net acre is too dense. Also, a major shortcoming of the plans/survey is that no reference is made to the nature of the established neighborhoods in and around the area. Just because land isn't yet developed doesn't mean it should automatically be designated high and medium density - because "that's where there's room".
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>The upsurge in multiple family homes has drastically reduced the availability of single family homes making the existing homes unaffordable. Density often creates increase in crime and other negative behaviors due to too many people being too close together. Parks, green spaces and other open areas as well as affordable single family homes are very important in keeping Eugene liveable and desirable.</td>
<td>8/16/2016 9:27 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>I believe that detached secondary dwelling units should be allowed in all residential zones where alley access is available. We need to densify all of our residential neighborhoods over time in a reasonable manner. Many of the older neighborhoods already have alley access homes that work just fine.</td>
<td>8/14/2016 3:13 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>I don't think financial incentives best serve the average taxpayer.</td>
<td>8/13/2016 4:50 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>No one answer can address all the needs or challenges (inherent conflicts in EE pillars).</td>
<td>8/12/2016 6:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>I'd like commitment to &quot;walkability&quot; and to placing amenities (health care, schools, libraries, grocery shopping) close to &quot;any&quot; housing. I'd like to see mixed housing, too, as well as more affordable housing and multi-generational housing. I'd like there to be a plan for &quot;neighborhoods&quot; and not just places for where to stick extra homes.</td>
<td>8/12/2016 5:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>See comments for answers in question</td>
<td>8/12/2016 4:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>I moved here from San Diego to get away from high density areas.</td>
<td>8/12/2016 4:39 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>I believe density downtown is great but not in all areas of town. Not when we have so much available land near by but not in current UBG.</td>
<td>8/12/2016 4:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>... see response in 5 above ...</td>
<td>8/12/2016 3:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>I strongly disapprove of MUPTE and the huge tax exemptions offered to wealthy developers! Tax payers should not be subsidizing these developments!</td>
<td>8/11/2016 12:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Developers don't need to be subsidized.</td>
<td>8/11/2016 12:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>I just told you in the additional comments. I doubt MUPTE is a necessary incentive to development in Eugene and we could put the tax revenue to excellent use.</td>
<td>8/11/2016 10:36 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Keep the skyline in Eugene. Don't block out the sky with so many tall buildings.</td>
<td>8/10/2016 10:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>No more mutpe</td>
<td>8/10/2016 9:49 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>I totally disagree with this strategy. People hate being crushed and forced to live on top of each other! People need some room to breath, not to live like rats!</td>
<td>8/10/2016 3:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>See number 7 below.</td>
<td>8/9/2016 8:23 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>The entire planning effort seems to be based on one size fits all. For example: 10 to 12% of Eugene's population is students living off campus at a density of over 2.4 people per dwelling unit. This &quot;hidden density&quot; has always been ignored. It is too easy to say the 2.4 is an average. With a significant portion of the population living at a higher density there should be some adjustments. It might be surprising that fewer unit are needed if more realistic density estimates are used. Remember Eugene is a university town.</td>
<td>8/9/2016 7:06 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7 Would you support exempting smaller lots from the new Medium Density Residential Option A or Option B standards?

Answered: 176  Skipped: 101

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>OtherComments:</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>There also needs to be consideration for solar access, obstruction of iconic views (such as Spenser's Butte), and appropriate height, set backs and sufficient parking for any adjacent lots.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 11:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>If the lot is small it is not adequate for medium density building. It will be too much of a burden on the neighborhood.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 1:33 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Smaller lots are not adequate for medium density they cannot accommodate that kind of building and its rude to the neighbors to crowd them in with density. People don't want to live like that.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 1:19 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>You should exempt lots that are smaller than 1 acre from medium density development.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 9:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lots smaller lots less than .5 acre and with more than $1,000 improvements should not be allowed to build more densely.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 7:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lots smaller than .5 acre and with more than $1,000 improvements should not be allowed to build more densely.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 7:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes, but I'd suggest looking at it the other way; promote the tools that would encourage assembly of a site of say 1 acre and propose cottage-style development that would provide 14 du in a manner that is compatible with existing adjacent housing. Shoe-horning units on lots that are basically too small to effectively support the desired density without having negative impacts on adjacent properties or the surrounding neighborhood. So be careful with allowing smaller lots within R-2, which could have a similar effect as sticking with existing lot sizes and allowing residential housing densities, bulk, size, etc. that is not in scale or otherwise incompatible with existing development.</td>
<td>9/23/2016 2:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>This is a sop to small scale developers that hurts neighbors.</td>
<td>9/23/2016 2:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>There are plenty of multi-unit solutions for small lots.</td>
<td>9/23/2016 2:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>All med should have right to build single</td>
<td>9/22/2016 10:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I think it's a crime to build another house in the beautiful, big backyard of an existing house. I also think that downtown has serious issues to work out before putting more apartments there. I do think there are industrial buildings standing vacant that could make cool apartments. I also think cricket road south of belt line needs more commercial zoning lots, possibly even changing the zoning for some of the house buildings.</td>
<td>9/22/2016 10:08 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We should be pushing for better redevelopment, rather than the status quo. There are plenty of single family homes in Eugene.

Most all existing lots in established neighborhoods, that are walkable to downtown and other areas, are less than 0.5 acres. Seems like this exemption for small lots would more or less neutralize the impact of Medium Density Residential options throughout a HUGE swath of the city.

Exemptions are prudent, but complicated in reality.

Possibly, it depends on how "crowded" the area is. For example, many neighborhoods with small homes and small lots have a family with 2 or 3 generations of of people living there, making the lot low medium density.

No buildings higher than 3 stories outside Downtown. SWSAZ is an example of what not to do, ever again!

I am in favor of trying to accommodate the required MDR housing via infill rather than extending the UGB. If exempting 0.5 acre lots results in too little available MDR land, I suggest reducing the lot size eligible for exemption to 0.3 or 0.4 acres.

Exemptions are prudent, but complicated in reality. 9/22/2016 11:07 AM

Possibly, it depends on how "crowded" the area is. For example, many neighborhoods with small homes and small lots have a family with 2 or 3 generations of of people living there, making the lot low medium density.

No buildings higher than 3 stories outside Downtown. SWSAZ is an example of what not to do, ever again!

If we're talking about lots that are close in size to current minimum requirements

Exempt all lots less than one acre. These changes to the code will build future ghetto in 15 yrs. It will not be affordable.

not sure

We need to encourage people to build homes with smaller footprints, smaller family sizes, and smaller costs. (i.e., affordable "starter" homes).

It needs to happen, and developers need incentives for small footprint development or we might as well stop calling ourselves environmentally aware! Infrastructure to build small homes should not have the same price tag as massive, sprawling single family structures. It has to be affordable for the builder and the end user.

I think so.

Livability is the issue. Life is to be lived outdoors and we are not promoting that with crowding. There are not enough parks because the city doesn't have the money to maintain them.

Please don't make changes that diminishes or destroys the nature of existing neighborhoods. New neighborhoods with new density and other standards should be in new, undeveloped areas.

build up the downtown first adding apartments close to shops. in 10 years as the downtown expands, then start affecting the other housing.

But I think clearly defined exceptions should be made.

But carefully. Established neighborhoods shouldn't be infiltrated with cheap housing, student or other with little limit on number of people living in added house.

I don't trust that two sentences can get across your dangerous intentions. This survey is absurd.

I can't answer that. I need more information.

Only if the definition of Smaller Lots is MUCH smaller than 1/2 an acre. At most 1/4 acre & under should be exempted.

Small single family homes should be welcome in Medium Density Residential zones. Housing diversity is good and small single family homes are not as much of an issue as larger homes

Using refinement plans, neighborhood involvement, site-specific considerations --it is not just either/or. What is appropriate for each specific site?

Yes, support exemption for smaller lots but for Option A's code example, are you saying that the non-attached house "was created before [effective date of ordinance]", so even your exemption of small lots, you still couldn't get NEW construction with non-attached cottage cluster, courtyard houses, etc.? Or the lot? The example code is a bit confusing.

Only refinement plans are acceptable.

This seems like good way to allow current neighborhoods to maintain their character and still allow density increases in other parts of the city.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>But encouraging more-dense development even on smaller parcels makes sense. Try to find the balance of incrementally increasing housing even in existing neighborhoods, without terrifying the current homeowners. If it's possible...</td>
<td>8/16/2016 12:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>But that should still be assessed on a case-by-case local area common good housing stock evaluation. Whereas the local block by block area is developing in a different modality it would not reason to put a single-family home on that half acre lot it could thus be denied.</td>
<td>8/13/2016 9:51 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>with restrictions on dividing larger lots to smaller un restricted lots</td>
<td>8/12/2016 6:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Is there a commitment to historic preservation in Eugene? Any commitment at all to preserving the old houses that do exist? If so, how would these plans affect that?</td>
<td>8/12/2016 5:18 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>.5 acres is not a small lot. Perhaps the exception could be for much smaller lots, say .1 acre.</td>
<td>8/11/2016 2:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>That doesn't seem fair.</td>
<td>8/10/2016 1:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Yes, although this would complicate things if property owners simply started to subdivide all of their land into plots small enough to match this.</td>
<td>8/10/2016 9:34 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>That is good idea. That would help mitigate some of my concerns outlines in my comments about each</td>
<td>8/10/2016 6:51 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Perhaps with a cutoff of .3 acre but .5 seems too large and basically exempts a neighborhood from doing its share to address the city's housing needs when the character of the neighborhood could be preserved, no doubt, with clever design and more density.</td>
<td>8/9/2016 10:31 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Maybe different standards for lot size.</td>
<td>8/9/2016 4:14 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8 Are there any other strategies that you think we should consider to meet our multi-family housing needs? If you would like to see examples of other strategies, please see the Multi-family Housing Options fact sheet.

Answered: 165  Skipped: 112

No, I think you've covered...

Yes, here's my suggestion...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, I think you've covered it</td>
<td>49.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Yes, here's my suggestion...            | 50.91%    | 84

Total 165

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Yes, here's my suggestion...</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>we need to expand the UGB. there is not very much buildable land left in our current UGB and much of it is in high cost areas, which would make affordable multi family housing difficult to achieve in the amounts we need.</td>
<td>9/26/2016 8:21 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Look into developing housing in commercially zoned C2 areas.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 11:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I'd like to see more mixed use in commercial areas instead of strip mall sprawl. Perhaps the building department can work better with local builders and developers. I think realtors need to be engaged in the process as well. There needs to be some flexibility for neighborhoods or sections of neighborhoods to create new housing that fits their character. One size does not fit all. Work with non-profits such as St. Vinnie's to create more affordable housing.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 11:23 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Consider implementing policies which allow for nontraditional housing such as &quot;tiny homes&quot; which can provide cheaper alternatives to increasing housing density versus current choices.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 8:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Build housing on commercial C2 zoned land.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 2:16 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pursue building in C2 zoned commercial areas that are normally reserved for large commercial buildings. The zoning allows for residential buildings and this is a good place to start.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 1:35 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>You should be pursuing building in C2 commercially zoned areas where there are typically large commercial developments. This area is zoned to also accommodate housing. This is where new homes should go, not crammed into already existing and established neighborhoods.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 1:22 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The city has to finally start listening to the residents of the area and implement the suggested refinement plan.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 9:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Your data needs to use an increased number of people per household in your stats.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 8:03 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The number of people per household needs to be increased in your stats.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 7:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>i will try and pull some ideas i have had and submit. i thought that time had passed.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 3:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Expand the UGB b4 Junction City is at our Northern boundary!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Why aren't you including refinement plans here? Seems like a huge omission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Well, I think you've sort of covered it, but then made it improbable, which is to indicate the technical feasibility of increasing the UGB as 'low'. I am amazed that anyone thinks that keeping the UGB as it is, or severely limiting its increase to as low as possible, will result in low cost housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>We are coming close to being another Ashland, to expensive to build pushing people to outlying towns/communities. Still have to drive in to work &amp; shop. Maybe there are too many people?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Consider design review or some variant as a way to allow new development and redevelopment to be suitably incorporated into established neighborhoods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>We need to reduce the cost of permitting and developing ADUs to encourage people to build them legally to code. We need to reduce parking requirements in LDR and other areas of the city to allow more development on a lot. Reduce front yard building setbacks in LDR. Allow mixed use in the corridors. Allow higher density in HDR. Replace the word “family” in our code - it discriminates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1/2 acre lots or less should be restricted to single family dwellings unless within the immediate downtown area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Low income housing and high density housing should be located to within two blocks of major public transportation corridors to eliminate a need for a vehicle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Make a sliding scale for SDCs so tiny homes pencil out and they could be financially viable, both for subsidized housing as well as market rate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Consider siting higher building, i.e., allow more density next to busy roads like at the E. end of 26th where many apartments are already located. S. Willamette area in general cannot hold any more traffic than it already has. It is not a corridor that should be included in key corridors. Allow accessory units on people houses; historically the criteria have prohibited a lot of these additions. Also, be aware that Air B &amp; B has about 700 units available locally. Some move here specifically looking for houses that they can turn into cash cows, which also infects a continual flow of <em>strangers</em> in established neighborhoods and limits affordable housing. People can make more from renting these units for a few days instead of having tenants there all month. Consider putting a tax on them to be able to to build affordable housing, I read that some taxes are being added to the Air B&amp;B units - perhaps add more for this purpose. It might be a good idea to have tiny house areas like in the former Crossfire Church site now for sale for $ 1.5 million (the minister had offered it recently for $750,000 on the front page of the RG so maybe price negotiable?).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Neighborhood refinement plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Additional transit-oriented development incentives for new multi-family/high-density/mixed-use developments along EmX corridors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Rent control in the densest downtown blocks, or financial incentives to property owners to lower rents or set rents to accommodate the real incomes of people and families in Eugene.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Get rid of the maximum unrelated adults regulation, allowing for more shared, co-op, and communal households, which can raise density without increasing the amount of housing!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I suggest exemptions for anyone willing to build dwellings that amaze and inspire. Also for houses that challenge the norms of living spaces, such as tree houses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Modify rules and regulations to encourage tiny home development. Additionally, modify rules and regulations to allow more unrelated individuals to reside in the same residence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Reduce parking minimums, require developers to build walking and biking infrastructure, reduce impediments to ADU's (lot size and SDC payment),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Offer tax incentives for small developers building smaller multi-family homes (duplexes etc.) rather than exclusively to large developers who provide undesirable housing products.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Limit the size of the lots available for construction of new homes within the UGB. The wealthy should not be able to be exempt from the density issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Specifically allocate needed housing amounts to each transit corridor and downtown. Then work with neighbors and other affected parties to define how (not if) the need will be accommodated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Include multifamily potential on commercially zoned land in mixed-use developments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>no buildings higher than 3 stories outside the Downtown corridor along the emx route. Fire the city manager.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Envision Eugene Multi-family Housing Options Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I think MUPTE has been overused and under supervised in the university neighborhoods. Eugene may not want so many quad-type apartments in the future. Developing at a slower pace allows builders to adapt to new residential preferences. Please explore methods that slow the redevelopment of HDR along corridors, for example, putting a cap on the number of units built in a given year.</td>
<td>9/21/2016 9:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I would like to see housing built for aging seniors that is affordable - this means one level (no stairs), elevators for multi-story housing, near transit, walkable, but also would want community gardens built in</td>
<td>9/21/2016 5:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>As I have said, count in the &quot;empty&quot; for -sale homes as well as wait for current developments to be finished. Also, wait and see if people are really coming into the area, given we just had Symantec and then Ben Franklin &quot;downsize&quot; ie people losing jobs, that need these homes….finally, try and get rents to slow down, ie stabilize those and I bet a lot more people will move into them, and they are medium and high density established already</td>
<td>9/20/2016 3:41 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Expand the urban growth boundaries to the North, West, and Southwest. Allow enough acreage for all services and subdivisions. Continued stifling drives lot prices sky high and become unaffordable.</td>
<td>9/20/2016 12:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Again, I think one key is to build smaller units. They have much less impact on the environment, the surrounding neighbors and by using infill can reduce the pressure to expand the urban growth boundary.</td>
<td>9/20/2016 11:59 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Incentivize vacant lot development through a program similar to MUPTE. Incentivise the use of the space we still have prior to expanding the UGB.</td>
<td>9/19/2016 9:48 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Fire the planners who dreamed this up. Bring in more quality land into city limits.</td>
<td>9/19/2016 3:09 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Please find context-appropriate solutions for Eugene.</td>
<td>9/19/2016 1:16 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Take a closer look at what is going on in other cities such as Seattle, where architect, Ross Chapin has been creating interesting communities. With incentives for infrastructure and possibly programs to encourage energy conservation, and quality I believe this type of development could be affordable for our lower income residents. But we need to lift the impediments and encourage it through city action.</td>
<td>9/15/2016 4:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Allow multi-family in R-1 with a density bonus subject to clear standards that address compatibility similar to CIR.</td>
<td>9/15/2016 2:50 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Is there anyway to allow a duplex or multi family home on larger lots in a R1 zoning? As long as the other neighbors do not mind the addition to their neighborhood. Rezoning single family homes to R2 will not work with current lending regulations for homes.</td>
<td>9/14/2016 1:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Cohousing, including Oakleigh Meadow Cohousing. Cohousing has been described as a &quot;hippier version of a condo community.&quot; It's everywhere, but Eugene. The Oakleigh Meadow Cohousing project proposed for the River Road neighborhood is taking years to get through the city processes. Why such problems? What's the big deal? Please check it out and do what you can to get it built sooner rather than later.</td>
<td>9/14/2016 10:06 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Walkability for groceries, parks, general store with multi-modal transportation options to reduce car ownership and increase accessibility.</td>
<td>9/13/2016 11:24 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Change the zoning from R-1 to R-2 in some places, esp. near corridors.</td>
<td>9/13/2016 7:17 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Include cohousing and other types of intentional housing in your analysis and plan as examples of medium-density housing types. This may seem &quot;just too 'Eugene&quot; for a professional plan, but why not make your plan just the slightest bit progressive. It just could make your plan, and Eugene, a bit more interesting.</td>
<td>9/12/2016 10:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Allowing secondary dwelling units changes the character of established low density (R1) neighborhoods. It damages the reason that most home owners chose low density R1 neighborhoods. It effectively changes the zoning characteristics from low to medium density. This is contrary to the purpose of the zone. It may raise the price of a property with the SDU, but lowers the values of the neighboring properties. This is tantamount to a public subsidy for property owners who build an SDU at the cost of those who don't.</td>
<td>9/12/2016 6:07 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>create cloverleaf at 99 and beltline and add housing there with easy access to Eugene and Springfield using existing roads</td>
<td>9/12/2016 3:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>CREATE TINY HOUSE NEIGHBORHOODS AND ALLOW HOMEOWNERS WITH LARGE LOTS TO PUT A TINY HOUSE ON THEIR PROPERTY</td>
<td>9/6/2016 5:31 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Don't try to navigate housing needs with multi-family housing. Limiting growth or compacting growth can have negative effects on traffic and roads, with congestion the outcome. It should not be an outcome at all.</td>
<td>9/3/2016 11:47 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Refinement plans that include full neighborhood representation.</td>
<td>8/31/2016 8:20 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>The cities &quot;blanket&quot; approach is not working. The city has had five years to do prudent infill, but has squandered the opportunity. Maybe the community needs a top-down shake-up in city staff, or new city manager.</td>
<td>8/31/2016 7:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Birth control</td>
<td>8/31/2016 1:22 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
65 Allow smaller minimum lot sizes for single family units, and also reduce the maximum square footage for SFU - so you'd be able to put more SFU in existing areas, and convert some of the other non-developed SF areas to medium density.

8/26/2016 5:27 PM

66 I don't hear enough in this plan to address affordability and to assure that low income people and families are not just pushed out to cities edges. I think across the strategies there needs to be plans such as certain rental or buyer owned units being held for families below such as 80% of median. I'd also like to see incentives for existing single family home owners to add accessory dwelling units via garage conversions or new construction and support for financing or creating these units to add density.

8/26/2016 1:39 PM

67 Admit housing stock is adequate for state law. Slow down growth. Concentrate growth in parts of town with lower population.

8/25/2016 3:31 PM

68 Reconsider the "goals" stated in Envision Eugene. They are not as widely supported as you may believe. Most people had neither the time nor the inclination to participate in the Envision Eugene process. As a result, the final document primarily reflects the views of a vocal minority rather than the views of Eugene as a whole. Some may argue that this is a just outcome ("If you don't show up why should soliciting your view count?"). But we all have to live with the results.

8/17/2016 4:48 PM

69 Focus on housing for people other than students especially the aging and families. Aging people want single floor units with an elevator if its a multi story building close to amenities. They want something that is quiet and nice looking. I have talked to many people who like the idea of living downtown and being close to services but are disgusted by capstone and the few options for them. Student housing need have been met and the university needs to figure out their own issues instead of benefiting from the city and their tax breaks.

8/17/2016 1:18 PM

70 Increase taxes on R-2 properties. To get more income, the landlords will begin to consider adding new units to existing construction. They might try to raise rent, but they really can't get much higher. The city may need to consider rent controls.

8/17/2016 1:11 PM

71 Develop more housing in Sutherlin Or

8/17/2016 2:36 PM

72 Consider not being so forceful.

8/13/2016 4:52 AM

73 Don't build anymore!!

8/12/2016 5:18 PM

74 Expand city limits

8/17/2016 12:58 PM

75 Return to a more active SNAP process to gain support and community involvement as you move forward with these Planning goals. There are Opportunities that can be uncovered in each area of our community.

8/13/2016 9:55 AM

76 Make it easier for existing single family homes to add additional housing on their property. For example, making part of an existing home into an apartment, or adding a small house onto the property.

8/12/2016 7:30 AM

77 Please try to make it easier (in terms of code, permits, etc) to build the newer forms of multi-family housing that Eugene lacks. I've heard that the time/money/hassle can be prohibitive

8/16/2016 12:39 PM

78 Increase opportunities for medium and high density housing in Valley River Center area. Provide funding for more medium and high density affordable housing projects along Key Corridors as well as other areas adjacent to single family neighborhoods.

8/16/2016 1:59 PM

79 Increase taxes on R-2 properties. To get more income, the landlords will begin to consider adding new units to existing construction. They might try to raise rent, but they really can't get much higher. The city may need to consider rent controls.

8/17/2016 1:11 PM

80 Please try to make it easier (in terms of code, permits, etc) to build the newer forms of multi-family housing that Eugene lacks. I've heard that the time/money/hassle can be prohibitive

8/16/2016 12:39 PM

81 Create more housing options in Low Density Residential zones.

8/16/2016 12:27 PM

82 Create more housing options in Low Density Residential zones.

8/16/2016 12:27 PM

83 Return to a more active SNAP process to gain support and community involvement as you move forward with these Planning goals. There are Opportunities that can be uncovered in each area of our community.

8/13/2016 9:55 AM

84 Consider not being so forceful.

8/13/2016 4:52 AM

85 See my comments on previous questions.

8/12/2016 5:18 PM

86 Don't build anymore!!

8/12/2016 4:39 PM

87 Expand UGB and add more lots for single family homes. Especially where the demand is greatest.

8/12/2016 4:09 PM

88 Make it easier for existing single family homes to add additional housing on their property. For example, making part of an existing home into an apartment, or adding a small house onto the property.

8/12/2016 7:30 AM

89 I don't see suggestions to encourage owner occupied units instead of rentals. I also don't see discussion about the size of individual units. Many people today are interested in "tiny houses". I believe owner occupancy and units with small square footage are both important factors in affordability.

8/11/2016 2:08 PM

90 Loosen requirements for duplexes, triplexes and quad units to be built in medium and low density areas. These will benefit more middle class families. If any sort of tax exemption should be allowed it should be for this type of construction and not the huge development projects the MUPTE is used for. Tax exemptions should be limited to less than 5 years and should decrease proportionately each year.

8/11/2016 12:33 PM

91 Drop the TIA requirement if the developer is fulfilling a need for the Multi-family.

8/10/2016 3:42 PM
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td>I do not support the &quot;UGB strategies&quot; or &quot;development expectations&quot; strategies. I support the strategies listed in the other two categories, and think in fact the solution in the long term needs to be a combination of them.</td>
<td>8/10/2016 1:15 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td>To have the publicity give input on options without knowing or seeing the implications is very very unprofessional! That being said I would prefer their two first option where it's possible to transform single story commercial to mixed use. This was an option suggested by an outside consultant in regards to transforming VRC into mixed use that capitalized upon the asset of a river frontage.</td>
<td>8/10/2016 12:24 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td>See my suggestion about student &quot;hidden density&quot;.</td>
<td>8/9/2016 11:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td>Assure shared green space, adequate Street side set back, excellent connectivity to transit, safe corridors/passages for biking and walking.</td>
<td>8/9/2016 8:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td>Making an exemption for large R1 lots to have cohousing or other community based multifamily housing strategies. Or make it easier for a large R1 lot to be converted to R2 if the development plan is cohousing.</td>
<td>8/9/2016 4:42 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
<td>UGB expansion for single family homes.</td>
<td>8/9/2016 2:41 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q9 Is there anything else you feel is important to consider?**

Answered: 166  Skipped: 111

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choice</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>46.99% 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, here's my suggestion...</td>
<td>53.01% 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Yes, here's my suggestion...</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Continue efforts to engage all parties. Cite your data sources.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 11:23 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Drop MUPTE. Leave small neighborhoods alone.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 1:35 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Please stop pushing MUPTE, the people of Eugene know that this doesn't work and we don't want anymore buildings of such low quality put in around our town.</td>
<td>9/25/2016 1:22 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The residents want you to go forward with a refinement plan as it was stated on multiple occasions from a overwhelmingly vocal portion of the community.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 9:37 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A community driven refinement plan by those that live in the area should occur. People living outside the UGB should not provide input. Renters do not care and move around town, even out of the city, out of state, or out of the country. They are not stakeholders like property owners or business people that are local.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 8:03 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A refinement plan that is community driven by those that live in the area. Not outside the UGB.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 7:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>reconsider the UBG</td>
<td>9/24/2016 3:27 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Be more straight with the community.</td>
<td>9/24/2016 12:59 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jobs with livable wages for all age groups. Affordability of housing.</td>
<td>9/23/2016 4:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>172 low rent apts. in Cathedral Park is way too many for just 15 acres. This could mean 300 plus people, and much traffic in a single family established neighborhood.</td>
<td>9/23/2016 3:45 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Population control voluntary replace only your self.</td>
<td>9/23/2016 3:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Density shouldn't be an abstraction, and compatibility issues raised by those in established neighborhoods shouldn't be dismissed as simple NIMBYism. There are real issues with increased densities about the function of neighborhoods, not just look and feel. There are ways to do density right, and ways to do it horribly wrong. Don't give density a bad name. Take the time to do it right.</td>
<td>9/23/2016 2:49 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I'm not opposed to a modest UGB expansion to keep Eugene livable to retain living space for trees and nature in our city. If we don't expand, more people will commute back and forth to the outlying cities.</td>
<td>9/23/2016 2:16 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>High density and low income housing should be designed to be no more than two blocks from public transit corridors</td>
<td>9/23/2016 1:31 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1/2 acre lots and smaller should be restricted to single family dwellings unless in the immediate downtown area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Expanding the UGB into areas that are cheaper to build will help deal with the housing affordability struggle our community is having.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Protect solar access. Look up the guest editorial by Whitey - Dennis Lueck - a few years ago where he berated the fact that a neighbor had built a tall legal house on his South side, blocking his sunlight on the winter garden and pollinator plants, his garden in famous in the Amazon neighborhood. This kind of wanton allowance of high buildings adversely affecting neighboring sanctuaries should NOT be allowed! Other examples in this and other neighborhoods look out of place, egregious really, destroying the charm of the neighborhood and the sunlight as a resource for health enhancement, garden enrichment and on-site energy production or displacement with solar PV or solar thermal - in addition to reducing one's ability to supply solar power for electric vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Specific areas should have great range for med</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Greater infill adjacent to McMansions!!! Let rich people share in the reduced quality of life that results in these densification efforts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Make sure streets are walkable and bikeable, invest more in multi modal transportation and streets with planting strips to accommodate these and also manage stormwater. Create more diverse types of housing in the downtown area to try to limit having to expand the UGB.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mixed use development incentives, especially at the edge of W11th business corridor and EmX lines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>As per above, most people in intentional communities (like co-ops) share many resources, consume less, and have smaller environmental/energy footprints, so that strategy also helps Eugene achieve its climate and energy goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Always consider new advances in technology, welcome innovations that improve life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Eliminate parking requirements associated with housing development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Think of where people in high-density will walk their dogs. I see folks taking their dogs to do their business in the turf inlay inside 13th and Olive. High density housing looks fine in a catalog and in renders, but the reality seems to be high-vacancy and low tax contribution due to MUPTE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Quality of life. People should not have to drive/ride/walk/bike for a lengthy distance/time in order to enjoy the very reason they want to live in Eugene. Eugene is known for its trees and green. In light of climate change, this must be considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Return to South Willamette with an inclusive process to design a viable plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The survey is a great way to put out ideas and get feedback but a focused effort to spread the word and create conversation will lead to success.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Put the people who live in these neighborhoods in charge of how they develop. Stop subsidizing big box stores with vast paved parking lots. Fire the city manager!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Infrastructure needs to be fixed first</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>The vacant MDR land is primarily located around the outskirts of Eugene, which may prove to be a burden on low income citizens, due to higher transportation costs, less access to public transportation and reduced access to services. Would it be possible to free up some land closer to downtown, for example allowing existing commercial to change to MDR at time of redevelopment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I know you said it's too expensive, but consider expanding the UGB.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>We should try to employ as many of these strategies as possible. One of the greatest barriers we have to infill or economic development tools is that we have a one tool or strategy fits all approach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Slow down a bit ;) I understand growth needs to be managed, but it also needs to be adjusted...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Why not test some appropriate sites for tiny homes? These could be sited on existing R1 or R2 lots as appropriate. For example, I own a very tiny duplex (500 sf per side) that sits on a (comparatively) large site. There is room for another similar sized duplex or even several tiny houses on the site but that's not currently allowed by code. The ADU code could also be expanded to include rental properties (not just wan owner living on site). Many other municipalities have found they can expand affordable housing (in particular) by building smaller and denser and not just apartments on busy streets. Tiny homes, pocket neighborhoods and ADUs offer many advantages but the city must find a way to make them more affordable to build. This can be done through reduced permit/SDC fees, tax waivers, by offering free pre approved small home plans or other incentives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36 I live in an area that the planning department seems determined to turn into a tenement area. Many of us have lived in our homes for decades and have been supportive of the city money requests. It seems the city government is far more focused on people who may come here in the future than it is about those of us who’ve contributed to the community for decades. One example: two years ago I spent over $1,500 replacing the sidewalk in front of my home with no prompting from the city because I thought it wasn't as safe as it used to be. When you get old like I am it's physically, emotionally and financially much harder to pick up and move when you find you're surrounded by apartment buildings and their attendant problems. People who buy and live in their homes should be able to refuse permission to have out of character buildings built next to them, as Mike Clark's motion in the recent past would have provided. I wouldn't include owners who don't live on the property in this. When are property values go down, mine did and my neighbors' either the city or developer should compensate us.

9/20/2016 12:59 AM

37 Continue to encourage a mix of uses. Such as, allow for housing on a commercially zone property as long as the minimum commercial development standards are met and the housing is above and beyond the base zone standard.

9/19/2016 9:48 PM

38 Please find context-appropriate solutions for Eugene.

9/19/2016 1:16 PM

39 Walkability. Density along with parks and open-space. Preserve the UGB. Enliven the City! Thank you!

9/19/2016 12:03 PM

40 Take a close look at Portland's recent residential "infill" plans; Eugene may want to adopt?

9/16/2016 5:16 PM

41 "Housing first" for the legitimately homeless. (not people who are travelers and/or homeless by choice).

9/16/2016 1:02 PM

42 Always consider how land is used by the residents and make sure they are involved at every step of the way. Success can be achieved more easily when all stakeholders are ENGAGED positively in the process.

9/15/2016 4:32 PM

43 Although it sounds like the expanding UGB ship has sailed, as an affordable housing provider we are seeing land costs for vacant multi-family land sky rocket. Any strategies implemented need to ensure they are seriously considering the impact on affordability of homes and the flexibility to build affordable housing.

9/15/2016 2:50 PM

44 As stated earlier, I would like to see Eugene extend their Urban Growth Boundary where possible without negatively impacting current homeowners.

9/14/2016 1:55 PM

45 Encourage the city of Eugene and the residents of Eugene to be open-minded about new ideas for infill projects. Encourage the local media, especially the Register-Guard, to write about the new ideas for infill projects and to keep us informed.

9/14/2016 10:06 AM

46 How the multi-family housing residents would travel to get to work, play, and social events throughout the community. Traveling by car in Eugene has become a burden over the years with increased traffic and inefficient means to get around the community.

9/13/2016 11:24 AM

47 Don't let NIMBYs control the outcome. This is important for the city. If you are on a major corridor, these changes were foreseeable.

9/13/2016 7:17 AM

48 Parks with parking and facilities are a big deal. Eugene does not have a public transport system that supports no cars and yet there is not always parking available. Look at the LTD weekend and holiday schedule...I catch the bus occasionally but it does not meet my needs on the weekends.

9/12/2016 7:05 PM

49 New rules in new neighborhoods; protect and preserve our existing high quality, low density neighborhoods.

9/12/2016 6:07 PM

50 encourage Amazon, Microsoft, Google and other companies to setup shop along hwy 99 near the airport for easy access for them to fly in from San Jose or Seattle.

9/12/2016 3:15 PM

51 Don't increase the UGB

9/9/2016 8:26 PM

52 THERE ARE NUMEROUS BOOMERS IN EUGENE WHO ARE LIVING ALONE AND HAVE A DIFFICULT TIME FINDING SMALLER HOMES WITH GARAGES IN GOOD NEIGHBORHOODS. I AM ALWAYS WATCHING FOR THESE HOMES AND THINK THAT DEVELOPERS DO NOT HAVE MUCH INTEREST OR INCENTIVES TO CREATE THIS TYPE OF HOUSING. I WOULD WELCOME NEW NEIGHBORHOODS THAT WOULD SERVE THIS NEED AND RELAXING THE ZONING LAWS TO ALLOW NEW SMALLER HOMES AND LOTS IN ESTABLISHED NEIGHBORHOODS, AS WELL AS THE OPPORTUNITY TO BUILD A DUPLEX ON A LARGE EXISTING LOT BY TEARING DOWN AN OLDER HOME.

9/6/2016 5:31 PM

53 I think it's important to build smaller housing options such as condominiums, townhouses, row houses. It seems that we mostly have huge mega mansions being built or tons of apartment buildings. We need more affordable medium density housing especially for smaller families and retirees wanting to downsize but still own. Other communities like Bend and Portland and the suburbs of Portland have more medium density housing options. Eugene has very. It seems that all we are building are apartments.

9/2/2016 12:12 PM

54 Help from city when several homes on large lots could be divided, but it is complicated. This is especially true in areas that had sewers(large lots) and could be developed, but not to degree in options A or B

9/1/2016 12:28 PM
55 City manager needs to be held accountable for damages to our city. 8/31/2016 8:20 PM

56 Cancel the mayor's dog-and-pony forum on the 19th, and use the assessment that was recommended by the Oregon Consensus, and the Mike Clark/George Brown proposal. I believe the community feels the forum is just an end-around. It amount to nothing more than a HUGE public forum that the council conducts every Monday night. It will just add to the chaos. 8/31/2016 7:00 PM

57 I would encourage strategies that promote affordable home ownership vs rentals. Wealth accumulation is very difficult when such high portions of income go to rent. Young people today are strapped with very high costs and unless one inherits wealth the dream of home ownership is fading for many. So many of the people lobbying for land use policy are not the poor people. I am concerned that only the privileged will be making policy that will benefit primarily the privileged. 8/31/2016 3:14 PM

58 Be sure to leave areas for single family units with yards for children to play in, not just parks or common areas. 8/31/2016 3:09 PM

59 DO NOT build medium Density in areas that already have detached single family homes. 8/31/2016 3:06 PM

60 Funding for new key corridors is essential. Increasing housing density without giving consideration to adding new roads and bridges will simply add to greater congestion. Adding additional services, such as parks, mini-markets, police and fire, are additional necessities. 8/31/2016 2:24 PM

61 More outreach around what 'density' looks like. Density is such a nebulous concept that people immediately think Capstone size properties in their neighborhood, when really it could just be more duplex and triplex's that fit the neighborhood character. 8/31/2016 1:44 PM

62 Other strategies may be appropriate in the future but it is important to be able to complete the plan by mid 2017. The tier 1 strategies will allow that to happen. 8/27/2016 3:12 PM


64 Require a minimum number of residential units in mixed use. Provide incentives ONLY for SMALL homes (200-1200 square feet, which at the largest is 1/2 the current median size of 2400 square feet for new homes). This would increase housing affordability. 8/26/2016 5:27 PM

65 City must make serious amends to citizens. 8/25/2016 3:31 PM

66 Housing in Eugene needs to be made more affordable. Housing is out of the price range for the average full-time worker in the Eugene area. 8/24/2016 6:26 PM

67 LET PEOPLE BUILD SINGLE FAMILY HOMES ON LAND IN THE UGB THAT ISN'T ANNEXED!! Why all of a sudden an "annexation agreement" isn't enough is bureaucratic BS. You have plenty of land, just no common sense on how to use it. 8/19/2016 12:14 PM

68 I

69 Don't use tax reductions to encourage the kind of development the city wants. It is offensive to many people that money is being directed to landlords and developers and not to citizens. I have seen the buildings that the current tax system creates, and I'm not impressed. They are expensive, shabby, and will be sold as soon as the tax exemption runs out. The city will suffer at the expense of effectively giving quick money to developers. 8/17/2016 11:06 PM

70 Make the City of Eugene a more "friendly" city for development that is innovative. Watching the process that Oakleigh Meadow Cohousing has had to go through due to "NIMBY" neighbors has been extremely painful... that is just the type of development Eugene needs. The city's multiple errors in handling of this case has been abhorrent, and leaves little energy or enthusiasm for working with the Planning Department, Planning Commission, or the city's legal team in developing innovation in this city. 8/17/2016 9:00 AM

71 Open space and shade trees are critical to healthy living. Adequate off street parking for any new dwellings. 8/16/2016 6:29 PM

72 Consider the nature of the surrounding neighborhoods. Just because there are three or six acres of undeveloped land doesn't mean it's the perfect spot for 14 units/acre when the rest of the surrounding area for a quarter mile (or more) in either direction is 6 units/acre. Traffic is another major consideration as the arteries of town with bits of open land are oftentimes surrounded by streets that aren't ready to accommodate additional cars on the road or feet on the sidewalk. 8/16/2016 4:03 PM

73 Eugene is not a walled city so we don't need to fill in every open space. Expanding the UGB in a thoughtful, methodical way to allow for homeownership and multi-family homes that are two stories or less helps everyone enjoy the beauty of the area. 8/16/2016 9:30 AM

74 making sure that whatever proposal is defendable. 8/12/2016 6:35 PM

75 ... expand the UGB to provide for single family detached housing ... current land supply for this is getting developed ... 8/12/2016 3:56 PM

76 We need to intentionally nurture neighborhoods with a mix of housing, so that low income and middle class folks live together rather than in segregated neighborhoods. 8/12/2016 7:30 AM
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>For affordability, encourage smaller single family homes, less than 1,000 square feet. The single family houses that are being added to our housing stock are almost entirely for upper incomes only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Improvements to pedestrian, bicycle and mass transit transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>You may have to consider that it is not feasible to accommodate that level of growth, regardless of how many strategies we come up with, in other words; there should be a no build option. We will just have to live with what we have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>the City simply cannot proceed with this without addressing the transportation requirements that come with development. If infill and density is important then the City needs to eliminate the TIA and subsequent improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>1. Much clearer definitions of these housing types are needed. It feels like the terms are overlapping, and it is a bit difficult to understand what is being proposed. 2. While I understand the need to move forward with the UGB proposal in a timely fashion, and support one of these two options to address that specific need, I would not like to see this preclude future discussion about how to further implement Envision Eugene along key transit corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Downtown density should be the priority. At the moment there are a lot of surface parking lots downtown that could be made into mixed-use buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>You should keep up all the good work you do. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Is hotel/motel, extended stay considered high-medium housing? Lord knows there has been a lot of it built recently!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>See comments on transition. Start using neighborhood driven planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Use context sensitive design for build out along key corridors. Include green space and common space as much as possible. Avoid tall canyon like structures with no street side set back(see student housing 13th and Olive etc).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Encouraging smaller house size to keep enough land for food gardens, rain gardens, and other ecologically beneficial landscaping. Planning parks and trails into the redevelopment plans of medium density housing projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Parking needs to be adequate and access to the lots well thought out for the safety of both motorists, cyclists and pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10 What zip code do you live in?

Answered: 175  Skipped: 102

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97401</td>
<td>19.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97402</td>
<td>13.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97403</td>
<td>6.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97404</td>
<td>10.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97405</td>
<td>33.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97408</td>
<td>14.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other zip code</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Other zip code</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>99117</td>
<td>9/22/2016 12:53 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>97477</td>
<td>9/9/2016 4:13 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q11 What neighborhood do you live in? To find your neighborhood association, please see the neighborhood associations webpage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Answered</th>
<th>Skipped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Bethel Citizens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon Neighbors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Young Neighbors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Area Neighbors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmount Neighbors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far West Neighbors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly Area Neighbors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodpasture Island Neighbors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlow Neighbors Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Corridor Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Westside Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Hill Valley Citizens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Neighbors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Road Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South University Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Envision Eugene Multi-family Housing Options Questionnaire

Answer Choices | Responses
--- | ---
Active Bethel Citizens | 1.18% 2
Amazon Neighbors | 0.59% 1
Cal Young Neighborhood Association | 6.47% 11
Churchill Area Neighbors | 4.12% 7
Downtown Neighborhood Association | 1.18% 2
Fairmount Neighbors | 4.71% 8
Far West Neighborhood Association | 2.94% 5
Friendly Area Neighbors | 10.00% 17
Goodpasture Island Neighbors | 1.76% 3
Harlow Neighbors Association | 4.12% 7
Industrial Corridor Community Organization | 0.00% 0
Jefferson Westside Neighbors | 5.88% 10
Laurel Hill Valley Citizens | 1.18% 2
Northeast Neighbors | 12.35% 21
River Road Community Organization | 7.06% 12
Santa Clara Community Organization | 4.71% 8
South University Neighborhood Association | 1.76% 3
Southeast Neighbors | 12.35% 21
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Other (please specify):</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>9/22/2016 12:53 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Russel Creek Neighbors</td>
<td>9/19/2016 2:41 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>west Springfield</td>
<td>9/9/2016 4:13 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sutherlin Or</td>
<td>8/17/2016 2:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Outside of Southwest Eugene ugb/churchill</td>
<td>8/17/2016 1:19 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Millrace</td>
<td>8/17/2016 1:13 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Crescent Meadows</td>
<td>8/12/2016 5:56 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Russel Creek Neighbors Association</td>
<td>8/10/2016 5:59 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q12 What is your age?

Answered: 163  Skipped: 114

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 and under</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 24</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 39</td>
<td>23.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 59</td>
<td>32.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>41.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>163</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q13 What is your race?

Answered: 165  Skipped: 112

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>84.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another race (please specify)</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 165

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Another race (please specify)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>not a relevant question</td>
<td>9/24/2016 3:29 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>9/24/2016 1:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/2 Latino 1/2 Caucasian</td>
<td>9/23/2016 3:20 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>9/23/2016 2:35 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>9/22/2016 12:53 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>9/12/2016 7:07 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>8/31/2016 8:22 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>What does race have to do with this.</td>
<td>8/31/2016 7:05 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>8/25/2016 3:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>8/18/2016 8:08 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>8/17/2016 4:49 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Atlantic Islander</td>
<td>8/17/2016 1:13 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>8/16/2016 4:03 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Will not provide</td>
<td>8/11/2016 12:34 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>8/9/2016 7:11 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q14 Please estimate your total household income for 2015 before taxes.

Answered: 150  Skipped: 127

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $25,000</td>
<td>11.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$74,000</td>
<td>38.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 +</td>
<td>44.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>5.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q15 Do you rent or own where you live?

Answered: 166  Skipped: 111

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I rent</td>
<td>20.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I own</td>
<td>79.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q16 **What is your educational attainment?**

Answered: 163  Skipped: 114

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two year degree / some college</td>
<td>11.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree or higher</td>
<td>87.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Envision Eugene: Multi-Family Housing and Expansion Areas
Survey Results from Diverse Communities

In an effort to understand diverse perspectives on Envision Eugene, the City reached out to under-represented populations and gathered views on multi-family housing and the proposed UGB expansion areas. Over 100 individuals were introduced to the project, and over 50 residents completed a short, unscientific survey focused on key questions.

The City contracted with Cogito, a public involvement firm based in Eugene, to identify key questions from the longer and more broadly distributed online questionnaires, draft simple and accessible text, translate the survey into Spanish, and visit several venues to conduct the survey in a two-week period from September 20 to October 4, 2016. Venues included Emerald Park, Petersen Barn Community Center, Skinner’s Butte Park, Camino del Rio Elementary School, Plaza Latina Market, Eugene Public Library Family Music Time, St. Mary’s Church Spanish speaking service, Salsa Dance at Veteran’s Memorial Building, and Downtown Languages (they provide classes in English, foundational computer literacy, and citizenship).

In addition, Cogito shared the survey with several leaders at a meeting of the Integration Network for Immigrants of Lane County on September 21, 2016. Participating organizations included Centro Latino Americano, Beyond Toxics, Department of Human Services, Community Alliance of Lane County, and the City of Eugene Human Rights Commission.

An outreach specialist visited all the venues, set up a station with a display board about Envision Eugene, raffle prizes, and surveys. She shared information about Envision Eugene, answered questions, and encouraged people to participate. Through observation, survey respondents were approximately 80% female, 90% Latino, 5% African American, 1% Asian, and 4% White. Ages ranged from 20 to 60, and average age was approximately 30 years old. Income level ranged from about $15,000 to $50,000, and many of the women were single mothers. Note that comments on each question include both written and verbal feedback.

Overall, people were positive, friendly, appreciated learning, and thankful that the City was taking the time to ask their opinion. Brief surveys provide a snapshot of what people think. If people had participated in a focus group that began with more information, it is quite possible that the results of the surveys would be different. We recommend that future outreach include the opportunity to both educate and survey.

Summary Table of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total Surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key factors in successfully connecting with the Latino community were identifying and visiting venues where people gather, pro-actively talking with people about Envision Eugene, communicating in Spanish, and using terms people can relate to.
Question 1
Do you think the City should support building **more apartments in downtown Eugene?** *Even if* the City doesn’t collect the full taxes on these properties for a certain amount of time to convince builders to do it?

I do not want the city to give developers tax incentives to develop downtown and that instead the City should mandate affordable housing somehow.

Unsure because I think they should be affordable but not decline people for making too much

Unsure because there are already new buildings there, parking is already frustrating

Comments (italic represents common themes)
*Do not want tax breaks for developers*

*Concerned about over-crowding in downtown*

When asked why people answered no, major theme was **concerns about crime downtown**

Frustrated with development in the downtown area. Do not agree with more downtown development. We have **over-crowding, parking issues, and a challenge with the homeless population downtown.** I assist the homeless and would like the city to find helpful solutions for them while avoiding the over-crowding of downtown.

*Tax give-aways have been too generous*

If not collecting taxes, then high standards required, extreme monitoring of housing standards, treatment of workers

Would like to address downtown revitalization, too much homelessness, over-crowded. Clean up downtown drug abuse, dirty, urine. Need bathroom facilities. Do we need more apartments downtown?

*Yes, if affordable*

Would lower cost of homes make people less motivated to work?

Question 2
The City is thinking about putting **new housing along some main streets** where there is bus service and stores so that people who live there might not need to drive as much. Do you think the City should concentrate the new housing that way? *Even if* the City needs to use some of our tax dollars to convince builders to do it?

Comments

*Housing along main streets makes sense*

Only if truly affordable - housing costs are too high for working class families

No, my concern as a citizen is that we need to concentrate on the housing we have in place, make it more affordable, have landlords be more accountable, safer housing, better security, getting things up to code

*Note: Comments for each question include both written and verbal feedback*
Question 3
Right now, people are allowed to build single-family houses on most empty lots in Eugene. Do you think the City should require that people only build apartments or row houses (see photo) in specific areas?

Comments
When asked why people answered no, many people expressed concern about whether people were going to lose their ability to build their dream home.

It depends on the zoning for that area, would like to see more row housing built in a responsible way that is up to code.

Yes, but emphasize “only” and “specific”

No, mixed styles of housing is desirable

Unsure because it depends on where and if it is close to public transport access.

Question 4
Do you think the City should require people to build single-family houses closer together in specific areas?

Comments
When asked why people answered no, many people expressed that they want the ability to build the home they would like to have someday.

Does this mean rezoning?

Question 5
A large part of the Clear Lake expansion area would be used for jobs and industry. Do you think the City should expand to include this area within the boundaries?

Comments
Concerned about the environmental impact

Unsure because wetlands/protected areas

Unsure because not a good place for industry

When asked why people answered no, several people said that the Clear Lake area is good farmland

Unsure because I am new to town

Unsure because don’t know what impact will be

I want a library card, live on Clear Lake Rd

Note: Comments for each question include both written and verbal feedback.
Question 6
In the Clear Lake area, The City is proposing rules to protect health and environment, and make sure large lots are preserved for industry. Do you think the City should have these rules for the Clear Lake area?

**Comments**
- Support protecting health and environment
- Some people wanted to learn more about proposed rules
- No, preserve for industry

Question 7
In the Clear Lake area, the City is also proposing a large new park and a school. Do you think the City should plan for a new park and new school in this area?

**Comments**
- Support schools and parks
- Want more information. Will law enforcement also expand? We do not have enough law enforcement and too much crime.
- Yes, if the population needs it
- Yes, but for example, Camino del Rio had low attendance, with cascading negative effects, worry about competition for our enrollment
- Unsure: only if the wild areas are preserved

Question 8
In the Santa Clara area, the City is planning a large new park. Do you think the City should plan for a new park in this area?

**Comments**
- Support parks
- Starting a family soon and recently moved to Santa Clara, excited about potentially having a new park to go to
- Need more information
- Unsure because I think more money should go to schools

*Note: Comments for each question include both written and verbal feedback*
**Visiona Eugene Encuesta**

¿Qué es su visión sobre cómo debe de crecer Eugene en el futuro? Con anticipación de tomar unas decisiones en unas pocas semanas, el gobierno municipal de Eugene le pide que comparta sus opiniones.

**Proveyendo vivienda para la gente**

[Ilustración de viviendas: casas unifamiliares, multifamiliares, apartamentos]

El gobierno municipal está planificando por proveer más viviendas en las formas de: los apartamentos, hogares multifamiliares, y los hogares unifamiliares.

La meta del gobierno municipal es proveer vivienda a un precio económico y localizarla dentro de los límites urbanos en vez de construirla en las granjas o en los bosques. Promover la construcción de los apartamentos o los hogares más cercanos ayuda a lograr esas metas.

1. ¿Cree que el gobierno municipal debe de promover la construcción de **más apartamentos en el centro de la ciudad de Eugene - aunque la cuidad** no colecta todos los impuestos debidos en esas propiedades por una temporada fija por convencer a los constructores a construirlos?
   - [ ] Sí
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Estoy incierto porque: ________________________________.

2. El gobierno municipal de Eugene está considerando establecer **nuevas viviendas en algunas calles principales** en donde hay tiendas y servicio del autobús para que la gente que vive allí pueda manejar menos. ¿Cree que el gobierno municipal debe de concentrar las nuevas viviendas según este método si usa los fondos públicos por convencer a los constructores a construirlos?
   - [ ] Sí
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Estoy incierto porque: ________________________________.

Por acomodar a más gente en la ciudad, el gobierno municipal está considerando cambiar algunas reglas:

3. Actualmente, los dueños de las propiedades están permitidos a construir hogares unifamiliares en la mayoría de los lotes. ¿Cree que el gobierno municipal debe de requerir a los dueños a construir solamente apartamentos y hogares multifamiliares en áreas específicas (no los hogares unifamiliares, refiere a la foto)?
   - [ ] Sí
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Estoy incierto porque: ________________________________.
4. Cree que el gobierno municipal debe de requerir a los dueños a construir **los hogares unifamiliares más cercanos** en áreas específicas?
   - Sí
   - No
   - Estoy incierto porque: ________________________________.

**Creciendo Más Grande**
Por el aumento de nuestra población, la ciudad de Eugene necesitará más empleo, parques, y escuelas. El gobierno municipal de Eugene está proponiendo incorporar a dos áreas nuevas para expandir a los límites urbanos.

5. *Una gran parte del área de expansión Clear Lake* sería usado por el empleo y la industria. ¿Cree que el gobierno municipal debe de incorporar aquel área en los límites urbanos?
   - Sí
   - No
   - Estoy incierto porque: ________________________________.

6. En el área de Clear Lake, el gobierno municipal está **proponiendo establecer reglas** para proteger a la salud y el medioambiente, y asegurar que los lotes grandes están guardados para el desarrollo industrial. ¿Cree que el gobierno municipal debe de establecer aquellas reglas para el área de Clear Lake?
   - Sí
   - No
   - Estoy incierto porque: ________________________________.

7. *En el área de Clear Lake, el gobierno municipal está proponiendo establecer un gran nuevo parque y una nueva escuela*. ¿Cree que el gobierno municipal debe de planificar para establecer un nuevo parque y una nueva escuela en aquel área?
   - Sí
   - No
   - Estoy incierto porque: ________________________________.

8. *En el área de Santa Clara, el gobierno municipal está planificando establecer un gran parque nuevo*. ¿Cree que el gobierno municipal debe de planificar para establecer un nuevo parque en aquel área?
   - Sí
   - No
   - Estoy incierto porque: ________________________________.

Por favor dé la encuesta a Judith Castro, judith@cogitopartners.com, 541-515-0900.
September 2, 2016

Re: R-2 Zoning Code Changes Being Considered

Dear Property Owner,

You are receiving this letter because you own property zoned as R-2 Medium Density Residential or property that could be rezoned to R-2 because it has a land use designation of Medium Density Residential on the City’s long-range land use map (The Metro Plan). The City is seeking community input on potential changes to R-2 zoning regulations as part of the Envision Eugene project.

Why Are Changes Being Considering? Envision Eugene is our collective vision for how Eugene will grow over the next 20 years while preserving what people love about our community. Eugene is expected to add about 15,100 new homes in 20 years. Analysis has shown that there is room on land across Eugene for most of these homes; we just need to find space for about 1,600 remaining homes before we can adopt our new urban growth boundary. To learn more about how we got to the 1600 number, you can view a video on our website www.envisioneugene.org.

We all care about our neighborhoods and long-term livability. Decisions about how to accommodate our growing population are important and they affect everyone. Envision Eugene’s goal is to balance our needs for housing with our shared community values, including affordability, livability, and economic prosperity. Your input along with other input received will help inform City Council’s decision in the fall on which housing strategies to adopt.

Potential Changes to R-2 Zoned Land: Two options are being considered at this time that would affect R-2 zoned property. If either option was adopted into the land use code, the new standards would only apply when new housing is proposed for an R-2 zoned property. They include:

- **OPTION A**: Amend the zoning code to preserve medium density residential zones for attached housing (this would result in detached, single-family housing being prohibited in the R-2 zone).
- **OPTION B**: Amend the zoning code to increase the minimum number of homes required in R-2 medium density residential zones from 10 to about 14 homes per net acre of land.

Additionally, limitations on how each Option is applied are being considered. For example, smaller lots (such as less than 0.5 an acre) could be exempt from the new standards. This would allow owners of smaller lots within established neighborhoods to develop at existing levels of density, and still build single-family housing. These options are explained in more detail and with pictures and graphics, in the presentation given to the City Council on July 20th (see staff presentation at http://or-eugene.civicplus.com/DocumentCenter/View/28824).


**Questionnaire for Your Input:**

A questionnaire on the options described above, as well as other options to address the multi-family housing needs, is available at [https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/EEmultifamilyoptions](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/EEmultifamilyoptions). This questionnaire along with other input received will help inform City Council’s decision in the fall on which housing strategies to adopt. If either of these options are selected and would impact your property, you will receive an official letter of notification and opportunity to comment during the public hearing process anticipated to begin in Winter 2016.

If you would like more information:

- Informational links about the multi-family options are embedded in the questionnaire including a video, fact sheet, pictures and graphics, and examples of how the R-2 zoning code would change.
- For more detailed questions about the multi-family housing options you can also contact me.
- The latest Envision Eugene project information can be found at [www.envisioneugene.org](http://www.envisioneugene.org) on the What’s New? page.
- Send us an email at [EnvisionEugene@ci.eugene.or.us](mailto:EnvisionEugene@ci.eugene.or.us) to receive the Envision Eugene newsletter for project updates.

Thank you for your help! I look forward to hearing from you.

Best,

Heather O’Donnell, Senior Planner
[Heather.m.odonnell@ci.eugene.or.us](mailto:Heather.m.odonnell@ci.eugene.or.us)
541-682-5488
HOUSING SNAPSHOT
Provide Housing Affordable to all Income Levels

How are we growing?

\[ \approx 1\% \quad \text{ANNUAL POPULATION GROWTH} \]
(Adopted Forecast)

\[ 34,000 \quad \text{NEW EUGENEANS OVER THE NEXT 20 YEARS} \]

\[ 15,100 \quad \text{NEW HOMES NEEDED} \]

Who are we planning for?

THERE WILL BE MORE RESIDENTS OVER 65

- 25% of residents over the age of 65 live in single person households
  (Oregon Office of Economic Analysis for Lane County)

MILLENNIALS WILL HAVE EVOLVING HOUSING NEEDS AS THEY AGE

- This large group is projected to need more affordable housing options.

WE WILL BE MORE DIVERSE

- Between 1990 and 2011
  Eugene's Latino population grew by \( \approx 310\% \)

PEOPLE OF COLOR

- More than doubled between 1990 & 2011
  1 in 6 people in Eugene is a person of color (2010 census)

Housing Affordability

- Median Household Income: \$37,339
  Oregon's median income is \$46,816

- Median Home Value: \$236,600
  Oregon's median home value is \$232,900

- 50% of households are cost burden
- 40% of households can not afford the average cost of a two bedroom apartment at HUD's fair market rent of \$806

What types of housing will we need?

Eugene Today

- Built through 2012
  - Single Family: 59%
  - Multifamily: 41%

New Homes

- 2012 - 2032
  - Single Family: 55%
  - Multifamily: 45%

- 1 shift in total housing stock mix

What housing opportunities are we creating?

- Urban reserve planning for housing needs BEYOND 20 YEARS

  - 200 ACRES Changed to low density residential
  - 1,000 HOMES High density can be met through Downtown Incentives
  - 600 HOMES Medium density Strategies TBD

Data is related to Eugene 2012-2032 unless otherwise noted. Sources are American Community Survey 2011 unless otherwise noted.
HOUSING NEED
Homes for Eugene Residents for 20 Years

34,000 NEW RESIDENTS OVER THE NEXT 20 YEARS

15,100 NEW HOMES NEEDED

SINGLE FAMILY 8,300
MULTIFAMILY 6,800

We can accommodate most of our housing need through existing land supply and efficiency measures.

89% OF TOTAL NEED MET
8,300 SINGLE FAMILY HOMES NEED MET

5,200 MULTIFAMILY HOMES NEED MET

WE ARE HERE
We have options for accommodating the remaining need.

COMMUNITY INPUT
CITY COUNCIL DISCUSSION
MULTIFAMILY HOMES

11% OF TOTAL NEED
Medium Density 600 + High Density 1,000
Multi-family Housing Options - Fact Sheet

What are the multi-family housing strategies?
The multi-family housing strategies are different ways that the City can provide space for about 1,600 new homes over the next 20 years that we currently don’t have space for. Many of these strategies could apply across the city, so we are asking for broad public input before City Council makes a decision on which strategies to pursue.

Why are we looking at new multi-family housing strategies now?
We are expected to grow by 34,000 people by 2032, roughly the same growth rate we’ve experienced over the last 20 years. Whether it’s new people coming for jobs or school, or our kids growing up and staying here, these new Eugeneans will need places to live. To adopt our new urban growth boundary (UGB), we have to show that we have space for this next 20 years-worth of new housing. As part of Envision Eugene we’re planning for about 15,000 new homes, from single family houses to apartments and everything in between. With over five years of community input and technical analysis we’ve found that we have space for the vast majority (about 90%) of the new housing within our current UGB, on vacant and partially vacant land, and by continuing existing policies and programs. Now, we just need to find space for the final 1,600 homes.

QUICK FACTS

- We have space for about 90% of our new housing growth.
- We still need to find space for about 1,600 homes.
- About 1,000 of those are higher density housing.
- About 600 of those are medium density smaller apartments, duplexes and single-family.
- We need to hear from you! Visit: envisioneugene.org
What options have been identified for accommodating our multi-family housing?
We’ve have a range of options to provide space for these remaining homes; from adjusting our
expectations of housing development trends, to actions that would make our land develop more
efficiently in the future, to expanding the UGB for multi-family housing. The complete list is below:

**Multi-family housing development expectations**

- Persons per household
  (the number of persons assumed per new household)
- Mix
  (the assumed mix of new housing types, i.e. housing mix)
- Housing allocation
  (the amount of each new housing type that is assumed for each type of land)
- Density
  (the number of new homes that are assumed to be built per acre of land)
- Others?

**Code or plan amendments efficiency strategies**

- Re-designate ~54 acres to medium density residential
- Re-designate ~47 acres to high density residential
- Increase minimum density requirement
- Code amendment to preserve MDR for attached multi-family housing types
- Create a transition zone that promotes attached housing types
- Reduce the minimum lot size requirement for duplexes
- Reduce development standards, e.g. parking minimums
- Require minimum number of homes if building residential in Commercial

**Incentives efficiency strategies**

- Reduce permit fees (SDCs or other fees) for certain densities, housing types or in certain locations
- Other incentives for certain densities, housing types or in certain locations
- HDR Downtown redevelopment strategy (financial incentives, project coordination, permit facilitation, EWEB code/park/infra-structure)
- Adopt MUPTE in more areas
- Adopt tax increment financing in more districts

**UGB strategies**

- Expand for 614 medium density homes
- Expand for 1,003 high density homes
While any one or more of these strategies might work from a technical standpoint, other considerations such as compatibility within neighborhoods may impact the likelihood that any of these strategies will work.

Some options, however, rise to the top for a variety of reasons including previous Council direction, State law requirements, and potential compatibility with neighborhoods across the city. After preliminary analysis, we’ve grouped them into tiers. Of these strategies, the City Council specifically asked for input on a handful of the possible options; the Tier 1, the Tier 2 and the “key corridor” strategies.

**Tier 1** strategies would make our land develop more housing than we currently see, and appear to most feasible from a technical standpoint. One of the Tier 1 strategies relates to high density housing, and proposes that about 1,000 of these homes be located downtown with existing programs and incentives for higher density apartments. That leaves just over 600 medium density homes to find space for. Medium density housing includes homes like smaller apartments, townhomes, duplexes and some small lot single-family housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Multifamily Housing Strategies per City Council Direction on July 20, 2016</th>
<th>Impact on deficit</th>
<th>Technical Feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 1 – more in-depth analysis:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High Density Residential (HDR) Downtown Redevelopment Strategy (Quantify the number of additional homes assumed to be built as a result of continuing existing financial incentives, project coordination, permit facilitation, EWEB code/park/infrastructure projects)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OPTION A for Medium Density Housing: Amend the zoning code to preserve Medium Density Residential (MDR) land for attached housing types only</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OPTION B for Medium Density Housing: Amend the zoning code to require single-family detached developments on MDR land to achieve a higher density</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The idea of adding density along our “key corridors” is a central growth management principle of Envision Eugene; the question is whether to use it as a way to demonstrate capacity for the remaining 1,600 homes needed to adopt our UGB. In order to do that, we must take some action to show that more development is likely to occur than we are currently seeing and that action must be adopted ahead of or at the same time as UGB adoption. Our analysis shows development incentives along one or
more key corridor (such as the Multiple Unit Tax Exemption) would need to be adopted to achieve the additional housing. If other ways of accommodating the 1,600 homes are possible, planning along key corridors could be done as time and resources allow, and as conditions in different parts of town warrant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Multifamily Housing Strategies per City Council Direction on July 20, 2016</th>
<th>Impact on deficit</th>
<th>Technical Feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy added by City Council:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase housing density along key transportation corridors and core commercial areas throughout the city by adopting development incentives</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other strategies were either found to have low technical feasibility (Tier 2) or were not analyzed (Tier 3) because the analysis would take considerable time and their ability to solve the problem was not as clear and/or they would require expansion or creation of a financial incentive program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Multifamily Housing Strategies per City Council Direction on July 20, 2016</th>
<th>Impact on deficit</th>
<th>Technical Feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 2 - analyzed but low technical feasibility:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Re-designate land from one category to another a multi-family or commercial category that can accommodate the unmet need</td>
<td>Not determined</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase the minimum density required in the zoning code</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expand the UGB to accommodate the unmet need</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adjust a “baseline” multi-family assumption that impacts how much housing demand or housing capacity we are assuming for the future</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Number of persons per household in each new home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The mix of new housing types (i.e. single-family vs. multi-family)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The amount of each housing type that is allocated to each type of land use designation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Density of new housing (number of homes per acre of land)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When will the multi-family housing strategies be chosen?
Over the summer, we need community members to tell us what you think about these strategies. Your input will help the City Council’s decision on which strategies to pursue, which is anticipated for fall 2016. Once Council has made a choice, those strategies will be included with the materials for adopting our UGB. Public hearings on the entire “UGB adoption package” are anticipated to start in January 2017.

How do I give feedback on the multi-family housing strategies?
Summer 2016! This summer, there will be several opportunities to learn more and tell us what you think about these options. Envision Eugene will be coming to events near you this summer. Beginning in July, the Envision Eugene Team will be hosting a booth at community events throughout the City including several of the Party in the Parks, Sunday Streets, and at First Friday in downtown. Go to envisioneugene.org and see the Get Involved! page for the latest events and to watch a video and complete a questionnaire on the multi-family housing options. You can also request that staff come to your meeting or event.

Fall 2016/Winter 2017: Following the summer outreach, the UGB expansion and full UGB adoption package of materials must go through a formal adoption process anticipated to start in late 2016. Feedback this summer will inform the versions that will go through the formal approval process. This process will include work sessions, public hearings, and an opportunity for public comment before the Eugene and Lane County Planning Commissions followed by the Eugene City Council and Lane County Board of Commissioners. The City Council will eventually decide on the UGB adoption package.

Need more details?
More detailed information about the multi-family housing options is available at envisioneugene.org under What’s New? and the Multi-family Housing Options page, which includes links to the latest information sent to City Council on the multi-family housing options, preliminary technical analysis, maps, and other details.
Dear Eugene City Councilors
In your consideration of densifying traffic corridors for their two envision Eugene, I would hope it would not be continuous as this would create monotonous cavernous corridors.
While I endorse allowing C-2 zoning to allow mixed use that encourages residential development, it shouldn't be at the detriment of Eugene's livability. I would hope these corridors would have clear gateways to residential R-1 that's in scale and character with that lower zoning.
Thanks
Charles Biggs
Sent from my LG Mobile
To all,

We continue to wait patiently for a schedule of when the review of certain parcels that reflect inappropriate zoning and are within the current UGB will occur. We continue to wait in large part because of the unreasonably high cost of pursuing a zone change through existing rules. Please let us know when we will be able to get involved to make the case for the specific change we are recommending.

Thank you in advance,

Rob Bennett
What's New with Envision Eugene?

This newsletter provides a brief update on the July 20th City Council work session, and reminders about upcoming Envision Eugene events. You can always get the latest information at the Envision Eugene website - www.EnvisionEugene.org.

July 20th Council Work Session Update

On July 20th, the Eugene City Council passed two motions related to Envision Eugene.

The first motion was “direct staff to focus on tier one strategies, but accepting comments on tier two strategies and a higher density strategy along transit corridors for accommodating multi-family housing, as outlined in Attachment C, for further development and public engagement.”

The second motion was “direct staff to move forward with public engagement activities for the UGB adoption package as described in Attachment E.”

Our planners are developing materials to implement this City Council direction and to get community feedback on how to accommodate multi-family housing. Stay tuned!
Envision Eugene continues community outreach over the summer. The Envision Eugene Team will be hosting a booth at community events throughout the City including several of the Party in the Parks, Sunday Streets, and at First Friday in downtown.

In addition to fun freebies, maps, and a "Love Your 'Hood" activity, this will be an opportunity to share information about our proposed new UGB and let people know how they can give their input.

Upcoming Events:
Sunday July 31st 12-4pm - Sunday Streets (Downtown - Park Blocks)
Sunday July 31st, 5 - 8pm - Friendly Area Neighbors Picnic (Washington Park)

Stay tuned for more events throughout the summer where you will see the Envision Eugene booth!

Go to Get Involved! for the latest information

To subscribe to Envision Eugene, email envisioneugene@ci.eugene.or.us and tell us you would like to receive our emails. Thanks for your interest, and as always, please let us know if we can answer any questions about Envision Eugene.
FYI

From: Margie James [mailto:margjam57@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 18, 2016 9:06 AM
To: HARDING Terri L <Terri.L.Harding@ci.eugene.or.us>
Subject: Envision Eugene Seeks Comments

Good Morning, Terri

Thanks again for coming to the SWN meeting (and your colleagues) on Tue.. appreciate you taking your family time to do this...

As I am reading through the EE newsletter, something that hits me that would be a very valuable piece to include in the city outreach is that instead of having people look at the city as a whole, because I think people think about somewhere else, not their neighborhoods, is to ask them to consider the kind of housing types they would like in their neighborhood should changes need to be made. Or something to that affect without sounding an alarm. As was discovered by SW-SA2, when the community is thinking in generalities it is different than specifics to their home area. Asking the question in this manner does not have to say their neighborhood is to expect change but it does give them a more manageable area to work with and I think would give more accurate information as to what people would really like to see where they live. A thought.

Margie James
Heather,
All we want is to build on our R-1 zoned land just like the neighbors immediately next to us (touching our property line) and in front of us have been allowed to do. 4 years later we still can't understand how the city is willing to call our land "buildable" in one breath while still screwing us over in the next saying we can't build. Please send me a survey on how unfair it is that neighbors get to build, but then Eugene changes the rules making it impossible for other landowners with "buildable" land to do anything with it except grow weeds and I'll gladly complete it. Thank you.

Naomi Bishop

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 19, 2016, at 11:48 AM, O'DONNELL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us> wrote:

Good Morning,
I wanted to reach out to you given our work with you in 2012-2013 on zoning of the Crow Road area, to tell you about a questionnaire we’ve got out right now about the options for accommodating our multi-family housing needs in the future and to clarify any questions about it.

Here is a link to the questionnaire: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/EEmultifamilyoptions. There are informational links embedded in the questionnaire for reference, including details about the multi-family housing options under consideration, pictures, graphics, and other documents.

Here is a video overview of the multi-family options: https://youtu.be/lqF1wAacltY

We are hoping to hear from a broad range of folks so we hope that you’ll take the questionnaire and pass it along.

I hope your summer is treating you well,
Heather

Here’s some more details....
Some of you may be on the Envision Eugene newsletter email and have already heard about this; we’re hoping to get feedback on various options for accommodating about 1,600 new medium and high density homes over the next 20 years. Out of 15,100 new homes expected, the majority fit on our developable land across the city; the 1,600 homes are the remaining amount of medium and higher density housing that we currently don’t have space for.

Two of the options being considered at this time would amend the zoning code for R-2 Medium Density Residential zoned properties; Option A would amend the R-2 zone to allow only attached housing types to be built in R-2 (no single-family detached housing), whereas Option B would amend the R-2 zone to increase the minimum density of homes required to be built on R-2 from 10 to about 14
homes per acre of land. Exempting smaller lots from either of these new standards is also begin considered.

Either option would apply to land that is R-2 zoned (or land zoned R-2 in the future) across the entire city, and would result in an increase in the average number of homes we see built on R-2 land than being built under current trends. Either of these zoning code amendments would help accommodate about 600 medium density homes (out of the 1,600 homes we are trying to find space for). Note that the new standards would only apply when new housing is proposed for an R-2 property.

I also wanted to clarify that it is still part of our work plan to explore with Crow Road area residents and property owners whether different development standards are needed in the area to reflect its unique characteristics as it develops over time. We can’t start this work until the new urban growth boundary is adopted, and figuring out how to accommodate these remaining 1,600 homes is the last piece before we can move forward with adopting the new urban growth boundary.

If you own land that is R-2 zoned, or land that is designated for Medium Density Residential on the City’s long-range plan and could be rezoned to R-2, you will also receive a letter from us about this questionnaire.

www.envisioneugene.org

Heather O’Donnell
Senior Planner | City of Eugene Planning
541-682-5488

Messages to and from this e-mail address may be available to the public under Oregon Public Records Law
From: Zach Bishop <zach@childersmeat.com>
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2016 1:00 PM
To: Naomi Bishop; O’DONNELL Heather M
Subject: Re: Potential changes to R-2 zoned property (Envision Eugene project)

Grow weeds & PAY TAXES
and remember we are paying taxes for "buildable Land"
The city has been told how hard this has been on our family, but do nothing!
We made a huge investment for our family's future, all to have it ripped away by the city with-in months of the purchase.
Which we also paid "Buildable" price for, that we can now not even give away!!!

Zach Bishop
Childers Meat Inc.
Sales, Account Manager
C-(541) 337-6328
Childersmeat.com

From: Naomi Bishop <naomibishop623@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2016 12:07:52 PM
To: O’DONNELL Heather M
Subject: Re: Potential changes to R-2 zoned property (Envision Eugene project)

Heather,
All we want is to build on our R-1 zoned land just like the neighbors immediately next to us (touching our property line) and in front of us have been allowed to do. 4 years later we still can't understand how the city is willing to call our land "buildable" in one breath while still screwing us over in the next saying we can't build. Please send me a survey on how unfair it is that neighbors get to build, but then Eugene changes the rules making it impossible for other landowners with "buildable" land to do anything with it except grow weeds and I'll gladly complete it. Thank you.

Naomi Bishop
Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 19, 2016, at 11:48 AM, O’DONNELL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us> wrote:

Good Morning,
I wanted to reach out to you given our work with you in 2012-2013 on zoning of the Crow Road area, to tell you about a questionnaire we've got out right now about the options for accommodating our multi-family housing needs in the future and to clarify any questions about it.

Here is a link to the questionnaire: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/EEmultifamilyoptions. There are informational links embedded in the questionnaire for reference, including details about the multi-family housing options under consideration, pictures, graphics, and other documents.

Here is a video overview of the multi-family options: https://youtu.be/IqPLwAadtY
We are hoping to hear from a broad range of folks so we hope that you’ll take the questionnaire and pass it along.

I hope your summer is treating you well,
Heather

Here’s some more details....
Some of you may be on the Envision Eugene newsletter email and have already heard about this; we’re hoping to get feedback on various options for accommodating about 1,600 new medium and high density homes over the next 20 years. Out of 15,100 new homes expected, the majority fit on our developable land across the city; the 1,600 homes are the remaining amount of medium and higher density housing that we currently don’t have space for.

Two of the options being considered at this time would amend the zoning code for R-2 Medium Density Residential zoned properties; Option A would amend the R-2 zone to allow only attached housing types to be built in R-2 (no single-family detached housing), whereas Option B would amend the R-2 zone to increase the minimum density of homes required to be built on R-2 from 10 to about 14 homes per acre of land. Exempting smaller lots from either of these new standards is also begin considered.

Either option would apply to land that is R-2 zoned (or land zoned R-2 in the future) across the entire city, and would result in an increase in the average number of homes we see built on R-2 land than being built under current trends. Either of these zoning code amendments would help accommodate about 600 medium density homes (out of the 1,600 homes we are trying to find space for). Note that the new standards would only apply when new housing is proposed for an R-2 property.

I also wanted to clarify that it is still part of our work plan to explore with Crow Road area residents and property owners whether different development standards are needed in the area to reflect its unique characteristics as it develops over time. We can’t start this work until the new urban growth boundary is adopted, and figuring out how to accommodate these remaining 1,600 homes is the last piece before we can move forward with adopting the new urban growth boundary.

If you own land that is R-2 zoned, or land that is designated for Medium Density Residential on the City’s long-range plan and could be rezoned to R-2, you will also receive a letter from us about this questionnaire.

www.environuegine.org

Heather O’Donnell
Senior Planner | City of Eugene Planning
541-682-5488

Messages to and from this e-mail address may be available to the public under Oregon Public Records Law
Hi Heather,

Thanks for the phone call and listening.

Here is the discussion on the TIA related to the needed housing discussion I had with Alissa Hansen. While we weren’t talking specifically about this code provision, this should be considered in the conversation. The City wants to change certain provisions in the land use code because it NEEDS HOUSING of specific types. Simply changing the code without changing the TIA requirement and the tolerance for “failed” intersections will not solve the problem.

Debbie Jeffries
Owner | RiverRidgeOR.com | djeffries@RiverRidgeOR.com
RiverRidge Golf Complex | 541-345-9180 ext. 100 | 541-521-7250 cell

From: O’DONNELL Heather M [mailto:Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us]  
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2016 1:49 PM  
To: Debbie Jeffries <djeffries@riverridgeor.com>  
Subject: link to envision eugene questionnaire

Hi Debbie,

Thanks again for your time this afternoon.

Here’s the link to the questionnaire:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/EEmultifamilyoptions

Best,
Heather

Heather O’Donnell
Senior Planner | City of Eugene Planning
541-682-5488

Messages to and from this e-mail address may be available to the public under Oregon Public Records Law.
Discussion about TIA requirements in connection with residential development of property owned by Bunker, LLC and River Ridge, Ltd.

The residential development is mostly single family and a bit of medium density (south 15 acres on Bunker property). The property is included in the acknowledged 1999 Buildable Land Inventory (BLI) for Eugene and Springfield. (Eugene is in the process of creating its own BLI, separate from Springfield, as part of the legislation passed in 2007 – HB 2337.)

Because the residential land is on the BLI, state law applies directly to any city review of residential development to ensure that the owner has a right to development review under only “clear and objective standards.” This body of state law is referred to as the Needed Housing Statute. The statute was initially enacted in 1981; it was amended over the years; it got a housecleaning by the legislature in 2011, resulting in a more simplified statute that accomplishes the same objective. The relevant part of the statute appears in ORS 197.303-197.307. The part most relevant is ORS 197.307(4) and (6):

197.307 Effect of need for certain housing in urban growth areas; approval standards for certain residential development; placement standards for approval of manufactured dwellings.

* * *

(4) Except as provided in subsection (6) of this section, a local government may adopt and apply only clear and objective standards, conditions and procedures regulating the development of needed housing on buildable land described in subsection (3) of this section. The standards, conditions and procedures may not have the effect, either in themselves or cumulatively, of discouraging needed housing through unreasonable cost or delay.

* * *

(6) In addition to an approval process for needed housing based on clear and objective standards, conditions and procedures as provided in subsection (4) of this section, a local government may adopt and apply an alternative approval process for applications and permits for residential development based on approval criteria regulating, in whole or in part, appearance or aesthetics that are not clear and objective if:

(a) The applicant retains the option of proceeding under the approval process that meets the requirements of subsection (4) of this section;

(b) The approval criteria for the alternative approval process comply with applicable statewide land use planning goals and rules; and

(c) The approval criteria for the alternative approval process authorize a density at or above the density level authorized in the zone under the approval process provided in subsection (4) of this section.
The Bunker, LLC and River Ridge, Ltd are “needed housing” sites because both are on the current, acknowledged residential BLI. In summary, the statute above means the following for either property:

1. The Needed Housing Statute applies directly to decisions regulating development of Needed Housing.
2. Under the default provision of subsection (4), the City may only apply clear and objective standards, conditions and processes.
3. Those standards and conditions “may not have the effect, either in themselves or cumulatively, of discouraging needed housing through unreasonable cost or delay.”
4. The City may have an alternative track regulating “appearance and aesthetics” that it applies to applicants.
5. The City may only apply the alternative track discretionary standards for appearance and aesthetics if the applicant retains the option to proceed under clear and objective standards.

In 2001, when Eugene adopted a complete makeover of its zoning code. The approach that Eugene took was to adopt two separate tracks for getting approvals for housing on any site that is on the BLI. One track has only clear and objective standards; the other has discretionary standards.

The Bunker and RiverRidge sites should receive benefit of the same statute. To subdivide the property you have the choice of either applying under the clear and objective standards of EC 9.8620 (“Needed Housing” Track) or the discretionary standards of EC 9.8515 (General Track). The General Track invokes the TIA requirements. The Needed Housing Track does not.

There are two reason/theories the TIA is not mandatory under the Needed Housing Track. The first relates to the language of the City of Eugene Code. The second derives from the language of the Needed Housing Statute.

Language of the Code:
The language of the code indicates that the TIA requirements do not apply to applications for approval of Needed Housing. The TIA requirement of EC 9.8650 does not appear in the list of approval standards for tentative subdivisions reviewed under the Needed Housing standards of EC 9.8520. In contrast, the TIA requirement does appear in the list of approval standards for tentative subdivisions that are processed under the “General Standards” that appear at EC 9.8515. Specifically, EC 9.8515(11) lists:


If compliance with the TIA code section is listed as required for one approach to subdivision approval, but it is not listed as required for another approach to subdivision approval, that is context indicating an intention to not require it for the latter approach.

Direct Application of the Needed Housing Statute:
At two separate meeting with Nine Springs, LLC, City staff (Planning and Public Works) reported a TIA is required under the Needed Housing Standard. There was no explanation for the requirement. Possibly there is consideration that the TIA requirement in the code sticks to a subdivision proposal directly, based on the TIA language in EC 9.8650, whether or not the TIA requirement is called out in the list of subdivision approval standards. I believe this is an incorrect view.
The Needed Housing Statute operates directly to negate the ability of the City to demand a TIA in conjunction with a Needed Housing tentative subdivision review. The TIA standards call for discretionary judgments about what is needed or desirable in terms of transportation improvements. Therefore, they may not be applied.

The purpose of Traffic Impact Analysis is stated in EC 9.8650, which says in part:

*The purpose of Traffic Impact Analysis Review is to ensure that developments which will generate a significant amount of traffic, cause an increase in traffic that will contribute to traffic problems in the area, or result in levels of service of the roadway system in the vicinity of the development that do not meet adopted level of service standards provide the facilities necessary to accommodate the traffic impact of the proposed development.*

The triggers for doing a Traffic Impact Analysis are stated in EC 9.8670. The most likely trigger that would apply to a development like this appears in EC 9.8670(1), which says:

(1) The development will generate 100 or more vehicle trips during any peak hour as determined by using the most recent edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineer's Trip Generation. In developments involving a land division, the peak hour trips shall be calculated based on the likely development that will occur on all lots resulting from the land division.

The approval criteria for the results of a study are stated in EC 9.8680. The most relevant standard for this project is in EC 9.8680(1), which says:

(1) *Traffic control devices and public or private improvements as necessary to achieve the purposes listed in this section will be implemented. These improvements may include, but are not limited to, street and intersection improvements, sidewalks, bike lanes, traffic control signs and signals, parking regulation, driveway location, and street lighting.*

Applying this standard to the results of a TIA requires exercising discretion. Standards that require discretion are not allowed under the Needed Housing Statute.

If the City is not allowed to apply the TIA standards, then under the same Statute it is not allowed to demand the TIA study in the first place. Requiring information in support of an application that is not relevant to an approval standard unreasonably increases the cost of providing needed housing, contrary to ORS 197.307(4).
“‘Needed housing’ is not to be subjected to standards, conditions or procedures that involve subjective, value-laden analyses that are designed to balance or mitigate impacts of the development on (1) the property to be developed or (2) the adjoining properties or community. Such standards, conditions or procedures are not clear and objective and could have the effect of discouraging needed housing through unreasonable cost or delay.”
Discussion about TIA requirements in connection with residential development of property owned by Bunker, LLC and River Ridge, Ltd.

The residential development is mostly single family and a bit of medium density (south 15 acres on Bunker property). The property is included in the acknowledged 1999 Buildable Land Inventory (BLI) for Eugene and Springfield. (Eugene is in the process of creating its own BLI, separate from Springfield, as part of the legislation passed in 2007 – HB 2337.)

Because the residential land is on the BLI, state law applies directly to any city review of residential development to ensure that the owner has a right to development review under only “clear and objective standards.” This body of state law is referred to as the Needed Housing Statute. The statute was initially enacted in 1981; it was amended over the years; it got a housecleaning by the legislature in 2011, resulting in a more simplified statute that accomplishes the same objective. The relevant part of the statute appears in ORS 197.303-197.307. The part most relevant is ORS 197.307(4) and (6):

**197.307** Effect of need for certain housing in urban growth areas; approval standards for certain residential development; placement standards for approval of manufactured dwellings.

* * * *

(4) Except as provided in subsection (6) of this section, a local government may adopt and apply only clear and objective standards, conditions and procedures regulating the development of needed housing on buildable land described in subsection (3) of this section. The standards, conditions and procedures may not have the effect, either in themselves or cumulatively, of discouraging needed housing through unreasonable cost or delay.

* * * *

(6) In addition to an approval process for needed housing based on clear and objective standards, conditions and procedures as provided in subsection (4) of this section, a local government may adopt and apply an alternative approval process for applications and permits for residential development based on approval criteria regulating, in whole or in part, appearance or aesthetics that are not clear and objective if:

(a) The applicant retains the option of proceeding under the approval process that meets the requirements of subsection (4) of this section;

(b) The approval criteria for the alternative approval process comply with applicable statewide land use planning goals and rules; and

(c) The approval criteria for the alternative approval process authorize a density at or above the density level authorized in the zone under the approval process provided in subsection (4) of this section.
The Bunker, LLC and River Ridge, Ltd are “needed housing” sites because both are on the current, acknowledged residential BLI. In summary, the statute above means the following for either property:

1. The Needed Housing Statute applies directly to decisions regulating development of Needed Housing.
2. Under the default provision of subsection (4), the City may only apply clear and objective standards, conditions and processes.
3. Those standards and conditions “may not have the effect, either in themselves or cumulatively, of discouraging needed housing through unreasonable cost or delay.”
4. The City may have an alternative track regulating “appearance and aesthetics” that it applies to applicants.
5. The City may only apply the alternative track discretionary standards for appearance and aesthetics if the applicant retains the option to proceed under clear and objective standards.

In 2001, when Eugene adopted a complete makeover of its zoning code. The approach that Eugene took was to adopt two separate tracks for getting approvals for housing on any site that is on the BLI. One track has only clear and objective standards; the other has discretionary standards.

The Bunker and RiverRidge sites should receive benefit of the same statute. To subdivide the property you have the choice of either applying under the clear and objective standards of EC 9.8620 (“Needed Housing” Track) or the discretionary standards of EC 9.8515 (General Track). The General Track invokes the TIA requirements. The Needed Housing Track does not.

There are two reasons/theories the TIA is not mandatory under the Needed Housing Track. The first relates to the language of the City of Eugene Code. The second derives from the language of the Needed Housing Statute.

**Language of the Code:**
The language of the code indicates that the TIA requirements do not apply to applications for approval of Needed Housing. The TIA requirement of EC 9.8650 does not appear in the list of approval standards for tentative subdivisions reviewed under the Needed Housing standards of EC 9.8520. In contrast, the TIA requirement does appear in the list of approval standards for tentative subdivisions that are processed under the “General Standards” that appear at EC 9.8515. Specifically, EC 9.8515(11) lists:


If compliance with the TIA code section is listed as required for one approach to subdivision approval, but it is not listed as required for another approach to subdivision approval, that is context indicating an intention to not require it for the latter approach.

**Direct Application of the Needed Housing Statute:**
At two separate meetings with Nine Springs, LLC, City staff (Planning and Public Works) reported a TIA is required under the Needed Housing Standard. There was no explanation for the requirement. Possibly there is consideration that the TIA requirement in the code sticks to a subdivision proposal directly, based on the TIA language in EC 9.8650, whether or not the TIA requirement is called out in the list of subdivision approval standards. I believe this is an incorrect view.
The Needed Housing Statute operates directly to negate the ability of the City to demand a TIA in conjunction with a Needed Housing tentative subdivision review. The TIA standards call for discretionary judgments about what is needed or desirable in terms of transportation improvements. Therefore, they may not be applied.

The purpose of Traffic Impact Analysis is stated in EC 9.8650, which says in part:

The purpose of Traffic Impact Analysis Review is to ensure that developments which will generate a significant amount of traffic, cause an increase in traffic that will contribute to traffic problems in the area, or result in levels of service of the roadway system in the vicinity of the development that do not meet adopted level of service standards provide the facilities necessary to accommodate the traffic impact of the proposed development.

The triggers for doing a Traffic Impact Analysis are stated in EC 9.8670. The most likely trigger that would apply to a development like this appears in EC 9.8670(1), which says:

(1) The development will generate 100 or more vehicle trips during any peak hour as determined by using the most recent edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineer's Trip Generation. In developments involving a land division, the peak hour trips shall be calculated based on the likely development that will occur on all lots resulting from the land division.

The approval criteria for the results of a study are stated in EC 9.8680. The most relevant standard for this project is in EC 9.8680(1), which says:

(1) Traffic control devices and public or private improvements as necessary to achieve the purposes listed in this section will be implemented. These improvements may include, but are not limited to, street and intersection improvements, sidewalks, bike lanes, traffic control signs and signals, parking regulation, driveway location, and street lighting.

Applying this standard to the results of a TIA requires exercising discretion. Standards that require discretion are not allowed under the Needed Housing Statute.

If the City is not allowed to apply the TIA standards, then under the same Statute it is not allowed to demand the TIA study in the first place. Requiring information in support of an application that is not relevant to an approval standard unreasonably increases the cost of providing needed housing, contrary to ORS 197.307(4).
“Needed housing is not to be subjected to standards, conditions or procedures that involve subjective, value-laden analyses that are designed to balance or mitigate impacts of the development on (1) the property to be developed or (2) the adjoining properties or community. Such standards, conditions or procedures are not clear and objective and could have the effect of discouraging needed housing through unreasonable cost or delay.”
Stupid.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "HANSEN Alissa H" <Alissa.H.Hansen@ci.eugene.or.us>  
To: "Debbie Jeffries" <djeffries@riverridgeor.com>  
Subject: Needed Housing - Traffic Impact Analysis Applicability

Hi Debbie-

Here’s my second follow up email. In addition to discussing the 20% slope issue, as part of our July 1 meeting you asked additional questions related to the applicability of the traffic impact analysis review (TIA). Your questions are in italic below, follow by our response.

If the TIA is not required for Needed Housing subdivision approval, why is it a stand-alone requirement? Said another way, if the City Staff’s application of a TIA report is discretionary and there is no approval granted as a result of submitting a TIA, why is the City requiring the unreasonable expense and delay?

We need a way to evaluate impacts on the nearby transportation system of any development that generates significant amounts of traffic, and to be able to make sure that the system remains safe and efficient. For that reason, if any development proposal will generate 100 or more peak hour trips, the City’s TIA code provisions are triggered and an applicant must comply with the City’s TIA requirements (EC 9.8650 through 9.8680). While compliance with the City’s TIA provisions cannot be considered in the approval or denial of the needing housing PUD or subdivision application (because the needed housing approval criteria does not contain a TIA approval criterion similar to general criteria), if the development proposal will generate more than 100 peak hour trips, the applicant must, separately, comply with the City’s TIA provisions.

You note that the approval criteria for a TIA are discretionary, and asked how those could be applied to a needed housing proposal. While the approval criteria for a needed housing application (such as the tentative subdivision or tentative planned unit development) must be clear and objective, because the TIA is not an application for the development of needed housing, it does not fall under the same requirements.

You also asked about how TIAs are scoped. I’ve attached the related administrative order that describes what must be included in the TIA, including how the extent of the study area is determined.
If the TIA is not required as part of the tentative subdivision plan review, at what point in time after the decision would the City plan to apply it?

There is a lot of flexibility here. An applicant can apply for the TIA at any time it chooses – before the tentative subdivision plan is submitted, at the same time, or after the tentative subdivision plan is submitted or approved.

What is the consequence of a developer declining to do the TIA since the subdivision approval is not contingent on a TIA submission? What is the consequence of a developer declining to provide any public improvements as a result of the City Staff’s TIA analysis and recommendation/mandates?

The city would not be able to issue development permits until all land use approvals, including the TIA, were secured and complied with.

Hope this helps. Please feel free to contact me if you have additional questions.
Alissa Hansen | Principal Planner
Eugene Planning Division | Land Use Planning
99 West 10th Avenue | Eugene Oregon 97401
Phone 541.682.5508 | Fax 541.682.5572

Messages to and from this e-mail address may be available to the public under Oregon Public Records Law.
ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER NO. 58-02-02-F
of the
City Manager pro tem of the City of Eugene

ADOPTION OF STANDARDS FOR TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSES (TIA)
ADMINISTRATIVE RULE R-9.8650.

The City Manager pro tem of the City of Eugene finds as follows:

A. Section 2.019 of the Eugene Code, 1971 (EC) authorizes the City Manager to adopt rules for administration and implementation of any provisions of that Code, including provisions of EC Chapter 9 that require the submission of an application for Traffic Impact Analysis Review.

B. Pursuant to that authority, and based on the findings contained in Administrative Order No. 58-02-02 issued on January 31, 2002, the City Manager proposed the adoption of Standards for Traffic Impact Analyses (TIA) Administrative Rule R-9.8650.

C. Notice of the proposed rule adoption was published in the Register-Guard for five consecutive days, to-wit, on February 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, 2002. The Notice was also made available to persons who had requested such notice, and provided that written comments would be received thereon for a period of 30 days from the first date of publication. There were no written comments received within the time or in the manner required by the notice.

Based upon the above findings, which are hereby adopted, and pursuant to the authority contained in Section 2.019 and Chapter 9 of the Eugene Code, 1971, I hereby adopt Standards for Traffic Impact Analyses Administrative Rule R-9.8650 as follows:

STANDARDS FOR TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSES
ADMINISTRATIVE RULE R-9.8650

R-9.8650-A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) - Purpose.

As provided in EC 9.8650, the purpose of Traffic Impact Analysis Review (TIA review) is to ensure that developments that will generate a significant amount of traffic, cause an increase in traffic that will contribute to traffic problems in the area, or result in levels of service of the roadway system in the vicinity of the development that do not meet adopted level of service standards provide the facilities necessary to accommodate the traffic impact of the proposed development. In addition, any TIA Review addressing streets in the jurisdiction of Lane County is also designed to ensure that cross sectional elements of streets, such as the wearing coarse or pavement, base material, soils, or storm water structures (bridges or culverts) have the adequate capacity to accommodate developments that utilize vehicles of heavy weight and associated vehicle traffic as part of their activity.
Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) - Applicability.

As provided in EC 9.8670, a TIA Review is required when one of the following conditions exist:

1. The development will generate 100 or more vehicle trips during any peak hour as determined by using the most recent edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineer's Trip Generation Manual. In developments involving a land division, the peak hour trips shall be calculated based on the likely development that will occur on all lots resulting from the land division. See R-9.8650-C for manner of calculations.

2. The increased traffic resulting from the development will contribute to traffic problems in the area based on current accident rates, traffic volumes or speeds that warrant action under the city's traffic calming program, and identified locations where the City's concern for pedestrian and/or bicyclist safety is documented.

3. The city has performed or reviewed traffic engineering analyses that indicate approval of the development will result in levels of service of the roadway system in the vicinity of the development that do not meet adopted level of service standards.

4. For development sites that abut a street in the jurisdiction of Lane County, a Traffic Impact Analysis Review is required if the proposed development will generate or receive traffic by vehicles of heavy weight in their daily operations.

As used herein, "daily operations" does not include routine services provided to the site by others, such as mail delivery, garbage pickup, or bus service. "Daily operations" does include, but is not limited to, delivery (to or from the site) of materials or products processed or sold by the business occupying the site. As used herein, "heavy vehicles" are defined as a single vehicle or vehicle combination greater than 26,000 pounds gross vehicle weight or combined gross vehicle weight respectively.

Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) - Approval Criteria.

As provided in EC 9.8680, approval, conditional approval, or denial of an application for Traffic Impact Analysis Review shall be based on compliance with the following criteria:

1. Traffic control devices and public or private improvements as necessary to achieve the purposes of R-9.8650-A will be implemented. These improvements may include, but are not limited to, street and intersection improvements, sidewalks, bike lanes, traffic control signs and signals, parking regulation, driveway location, and street lighting.

2. Public improvements shall be designed and constructed to the standards specified in EC 9.6505 Improvements - Specifications. The requirement of improvements based on a traffic
impact analysis does not negate the ability of the City Traffic Engineer to require improvements by other means specified in the Eugene Code, 1971 or rules or regulations adopted thereunder.

3. In addition to the above criteria, if the Traffic Impact Analysis Review was required based on R-9.8650-B-4, (EC 9.8670(4)), the improvements shall also address the structural capacity of the street in the County’s jurisdiction and address identified structural deficiencies, or reduction in the useful life of existing street structures related to the proposed development. Improvements may be needed to eliminate the identified structural deficiencies and to accommodate vehicle impacts to structures.

R-9.8650-D Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) - Determination of Peak Hour Trips.

The determination of peak hour trips shall be made by consulting the most current version of the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ Trip Generation Manual.

R-9.8650-E Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) - Exception to Requirements.

As part of a Type II or III review, the City Planning Director, or designee, may grant an exception to any or all of the content requirements of R-9.8650-F when both of the following are met:

1. A development will generate less than 100 trips in any peak hour.

2. The applicant has demonstrated that submittal of the item(s) listed in R-9.8650-F is not necessary in order to show compliance with the approval criteria of R-9.8650-C.


Unless an exception is granted pursuant to R-9.8650-E, the following items are required as part of a TIA:

1. Report Certification. All traffic studies shall be prepared by or under the direct supervision of a Professional Civil or Traffic Engineer currently licensed to practice within the State of Oregon, and with special training and experience in transportation engineering and planning. The engineer shall certify the TIA document by providing a signature and seal of approval.

2. Extent of Study Area. The applicant and the City Traffic Engineer, or designee shall agree on the defined study area prior to commencement of the preparation of the TIA. The analysis must include an examination of all site access drives, adjacent roadways, and other roadways and intersections that will receive 50 or more additional peak hour trips as a result of completion of the proposed development or land use application.

3. Selection of Horizon Years for Data Required by R-9.8650-F-4 to F-11.
Where a standard in R-9.8650-F-4 to F-11 specifically requires data just for existing conditions, the TIA only needs to address the circumstances at the time of the application. For all other standards in R-9.8650-F-4 to F-11, data shall be provided as follows:

3.1 For projects that are not phased, the TIA shall assess the traffic conditions at the time of the application, those expected at the anticipated time of completion of the entire project, and at 5 years after completion.

3.2 For projects that are phased, the TIA shall assess the traffic conditions at the time of the application, those expected at the anticipated time of completion of each phase, and at 5 years after completion of the entire project.

4. **Study Area Data.** The TIA must include the following data. The information is available from the City, other impacted jurisdictions, or may be obtained in the field. (See TIA Format, Exhibit A; included for reference, but not adopted.)

4.1 **Traffic Volumes.**
   4.1.1 Daily and hourly traffic counts that verify traffic growth and peak hour times for the year prior to application on each street within the study area that carries traffic directly to or from the proposed development.
   4.1.2 Intersection turning movement counts at all intersections within the study area to quantify existing traffic volumes and patterns.
   4.1.3 Percentage of traffic that consists of heavy vehicles, including trucks and buses; for daily and peak periods.
   4.1.4 Pedestrian and bicyclist counts.
   4.1.5 Daily and peak hour volumes for the intersections identified in 4.1.2, and the proposed access points.
   4.1.6 A determination of the need for YIELD, STOP, Traffic Signals, or other traffic control devices at any horizon year, based on warrants in the current edition of the "Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices" (MUTCD).

4.2 **Land Use.**
   4.2.1 Existing zoning, land use designations, densities, and occupancy of lots within 500 feet of the development site.
   4.2.2 Other approved development projects and planned completion dates within the study area.
   4.2.3 Known or anticipated developments within the study area.

4.3 **Demographics.** Population and employment information within the study area by traffic analysis zone (as needed for use in site traffic distribution and assignment). (Available from LCOG staff.)

4.4 **Existing Transportation System.**
4.4.1 Street system characteristics in the study area, including number of
lanes, lane and shoulder widths, access control, and traffic control devices.
4.4.2 A description of roadway geometries, including horizontal and vertical
curvature.
4.4.3 Roadway functional classifications.
4.4.4 Posted speed limits and/or free-flow speeds.
4.4.5 Traffic signal locations, phasing, coordination and timing.
4.4.6 Congested locations within the study area as identified by the City or
previous traffic studies at the time of application.
4.4.7 Accident history for 3 years prior to the application on major roadway
links and intersections within the study area.
4.4.8 Transit stops, service, and usage.
4.4.9 Pedestrian and bicycle linkages.
4.4.10 Available curb and off-site parking facilities.

5. **Peak Traffic Hours.** The TIA shall include peak hour traffic counts for all streets
within the study area at the time of application. Existing traffic counts (less than 2 years old) may
be factored by an average 2% per year growth rate to establish the forecasted background traffic
volumes. Growth rates less than this amount may be used for those roadways that are already
approaching their theoretical capacity during peak periods if the lower growth rates are justified by
a different methodology presented by a professional traffic engineer. Traffic counts shall be
provided for:

5.1 The weekday a.m. peak-traffic period (a one-hour peak in morning traffic
volumes occurring between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m.).

5.2 The weekday p.m. peak-traffic period (a one-hour peak in afternoon traffic
volumes occurring between 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m.).

5.3 The weekday midday peak-traffic period (a one-hour peak in traffic volumes
between 11:30 a.m. and 12:30 p.m.).

5.4 The peak-traffic period on Saturday (a one-hour peak in traffic volumes
between 1:30 p.m. and 2:30 p.m.).

6. **Estimation of Trips Generated.** The TIA shall include an estimate of the trips the
proposal will generate. Project trip generation rates shall be estimated using the most current version
of the Institute of Transportation Engineers' *Trip Generation Manual*. Where available, equations
may be used rather than average trip generation rates, but only if there are at least 20 data points in
the sample and the Coefficient of Determination (R²) for the sample is greater than 0.75.

7. **Site Traffic Distribution and Assignment.** The TIA shall include manual traffic
distribution and assignment based on the gravity model principle. The distribution and assignment
may be accomplished using experience, judgment, and knowledge of local conditions.

8. **Transportation Systems and Level of Service Requirements.** The TIA shall include:

8.1 **Roadway and Intersection Capacity.**
   8.1.1 All streets and intersections contiguous to the development;
   8.1.2 All streets and intersections that provide direct access to or from the development, regardless of the generated volume of traffic;
   8.1.3 All streets and intersections off site from the development that will receive 50 or more additional peak-hour vehicular trips upon completion of any phase of the development;
   8.1.4 Level of Service standards for the completed development as calculated by methods identified in the most current edition of the Transportation Research Board’s **Highway Capacity Manual** or **Highway Capacity Software**. Other capacity analysis programs may be used if approved by the City Traffic Engineer, or designee. All intersections and/or street segment links within the study area must be evaluated for capacity. The manual and software contain separate calculations for two-lane and multi-lane free-flow roadways, signalized arterials, and signalized and unsignalized intersections.

8.2 **Roadway and Intersection Safety.** Projected accident rates for off-site streets and intersections that will receive 50 or more additional peak hour trips upon completion of the development, taking into consideration proposed mitigation measures including access restrictions. Accident records must be researched for all critical segment links and intersections within the study area. If accident rates, or patterns of accidents, are forming at certain locations, a determination must be made on whether the probability of these occurrences will increase with the addition of the projected traffic volumes. Examples of recurring accidents include numerous right-angle or rear-end collisions at an intersection, or a high frequency of vehicles leaving the roadway on a horizontal curve.

9. **Meeting Minimum Level of Service and Safety Standards.** The traffic study shall identify mitigation measures to meet a minimum level of service and safety standards. The TIA shall state whether the applicant will have the mitigation measures in place at the time of occupancy of the properties, or if a financial commitment is in place to complete the necessary infrastructure within a reasonable length of time from the approval date of the development.

10. **On-Site Planning and Parking Principles.**

10.1 The TIA shall show:
   10.1.1 How off-site roadway improvements are integrated with on-site circulation patterns;
   10.1.2 Driveway traffic volumes, both in terms of queuing space and
distributing automobiles to and from parking spaces, pick-up/drop-off points, and drive-through lanes;

10.1.3 Pedestrian linkages to transit stops, parking facilities, building entrances, and between buildings.

10.2 Access Points. For all access points within and abutting the study area, the TIA shall show:

10.2.1 The number of lanes;
10.2.2 Storage and stacking area;
10.2.3 Signing and striping;
10.2.4 Provisions for pedestrian interaction;
10.2.5 Spacing from adjacent street and driveway intersections;
10.2.6 If the driveway is to be signalized, a signal progression analysis;
10.2.7 A driveway capacity analysis, available gap check, and/or lane adequacy check for each driveway;
10.2.8 Angles of intersections between two-way driveways and adjacent right-of-way;
10.2.9 The capacity of on-site intersections; and
10.2.10 Sight distance.

10.3 Vehicular Queueing and Storage. For all access points within and abutting the study area, the TIA shall show:

10.3.1 Provisions for vehicular-exit queueing, including estimates of queue lengths that need to be accommodated at signalized intersections;
10.3.2 The procedures to be used for determining on-site queueing storage, and
10.3.3 The procedures for determining the length of off-site left-turn and/or right-turn lanes.

10.4 Service and Delivery Vehicles. The TIA shall show for all horizon years:

10.4.1 Turning paths for access points anticipated to be used by service vehicles;
10.4.2 The separation between external and internal circulation roads for queuing of large vehicles on entry or exit.

11. Impacts to Lane County. If the study area includes or abuts a street within the jurisdiction of Lane County, the applicant shall include materials that demonstrate how the proposed improvements address the structural capacity of the street in the County’s jurisdiction and address identified structural deficiencies, or reduction in the useful life of existing street structures related to the proposed development. Improvements may be needed to eliminate the identified structural deficiencies and to accommodate vehicle impacts to structures.

R-9.8650-G Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) - Compliance with Other Standards.

Administrative Order - 7
r:adminedrules/02tia2ac.wpd/06/19/02
The applicant shall include in the TIA sufficient information to show the proposed development is in compliance with applicable development standards of the Eugene Code, 1971, including, but not limited to:

1. **Parking.** Adequate parking will be provided to meet site-generated demands, in accordance with the specific dimensions, parking angles, and parking ratio requirements that are contained in the Eugene Code, 1971.

2. **Pedestrian, Transit, Bicycle, and Handicapped Facilities.** The site plans for the development proposal must reflect that applicable provisions have been incorporated to ensure compliance with design standards for the provision of public transportation, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities as required by provisions of the Eugene Code, 1971 and other adopted design standards.

Dated and effective this **25** day of June, 2002.

[Signature]

James R. Carlson
City Manager pro tem

Administrative Order - 8
r:\adminorders\rules\02\dtria2ae.wpd(06/19/02)
Exhibit A
to
Standards for Traffic Impact Analysis
Administrative Rule R-9.8650
Traffic Impact Analysis/Traffic Impact Study Format

Address ___________________________ Date ________________

Land Use Application # ______________ Building Permit # ______________

Project Description: Project Name _________________________________

Map/Tax Lot # _______________________ Land Use __________________
Site Size (s.f.) _______________________ Horizon Year (full buildout)
Existing Access(es)-# and width _________________________________

Analysis Period: Trip Generation Requirements ________________

Weekday PM Peak __________
Weekday AM Peak __________
Weekday Noon Peak __________
Saturday 2PM Peak __________
Other __________

Trip Distribution Requirements ________________

Scope of Analysis or Study (Software required, background traffic growth factors, etc.)
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Intersections to be analyzed: Accident Study/Collision Diagram Required:
1. ______________________________________
2. ______________________________________
3. ______________________________________
4. ______________________________________
5. ______________________________________

Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis Required? Yes ___ No ___

Special Requirements of Study (Truck turning radius diagrams, internal circulation analysis, driveway stacking and operations, movement restrictions, median treatment)
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Exhibit B
to
Standards for Traffic Impact Analysis
Administrative Rule R-9.8650

Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) - Reference Materials.

The following reference materials may be utilized by the City and applicants in the review and preparation of reports hereunder:


Heather,

I wanted to let you know that the multi-family options video is great. Nice job to you and the planning team for creating a video that easily explains the options.

Have a great weekend,

Leigh Anne Hogue
Director of Economic Development
Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce
541-242-2359 w
541-731-7366 c

Website | Facebook | Twitter

From: O'DONNELL Heather M [mailto:Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us]
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2016 11:55 AM
To: 'chris.nunes.hrc@gmail.com'; 'Edward.goehring@gmail.com'; 'editor@skippingstones.org'; CABELL Norton (SMTP)
<norton@cabbellenterprises.com>; CABELL Norton (SMTP2) <jncabell@gmail.com>; PASSARO Bob (SMTP)
<eugenebicyclist@gmail.com>; FISHER Andrew (SMTP) <admin@aifisherdesign.com>; CJURRIER Ellen (SMTP)
<ekcurrier@gmail.com>; JAWORSKI John (SMTP) <3jaworski@gmail.com>; NICOLELLO Bree (SMTP)
<breenicolello@gmail.com>; TAYLOR Kristen (SMTP) <tkctaylor@msn.com>; Brittany Quick-Warner
<BrittanyW@eugenechamber.com>; 'allen.duma@gmail.com'; 'stumpf_s@yahoo.com'; 'howardsaxion@me.com';
'leighanneh@eugenechamber.com'; 'cthomps@uoregon.edu'; 'crw@uoregon.edu'; 'gbolden@uoregon.edu'; PRICE
Thomas (SMTP2) <thomaseprice@gmail.com>; NOWICKI Scott (SMTP) <commissionernowicki@gmail.com>; SKOV
Joshua (SMTP) <joshuaskoveugene@gmail.com>; RUST Mark E <Mark.RUST@co.lane.or.us>; PARISI Jeannine
<Jeannine.PARISI@eweb.org>; Sasha.Luftig@ltd.org; CUTSOGEORGE Sue L <Sue.L.CutsoGeorge@ci.eugene.or.us>
Cc: MCRAE Matt A <Matt.A.McRae@ci.eugene.or.us>; O'SULLIVAN Babe <Babe.OSullivan@ci.eugene.or.us>
VANDERHAEGHEN Jennifer E <Jennifer.E.VanDerHaeghen@ci.eugene.or.us>; JENNINGS Stephanie A
<Stephanie.A.Jennings@ci.eugene.or.us>; O'DONNELL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us>; Brittany
Quick-Warner <BrittanyW@eugenechamber.com>; HYATT Karen (UO) <khyatt@uoregon.edu>; KINNISON Michael J
<Michael.J.Kinnison@ci.eugene.or.us>; HANSEN Alissa H <Alissa.H.Hansen@ci.eugene.or.us>; FIFIELD Anne E
<Anne.E.Fifield@ci.eugene.or.us>; HARDING Terri L <Terri.L.Harding@ci.eugene.or.us>; INERFELD Rob
<Rob.Inerfeld@ci.eugene.or.us>

Subject: Envision Eugene Multi-family Housing Options Questionnaire

Good Afternoon,

Thank you all for your previous assistance and input on the Envision Eugene Comprehensive Plan goals back in September. We anticipate a questionnaire regarding the new comprehensive plan will be out in the next couple of weeks. We’ll let you know when the questionnaire is live.
In the meantime, we also wanted to make sure you are aware of the questionnaire that we’ve got out right now. Some of you may be on the Envision Eugene newsletter list and have already heard about this. We’re hoping to get feedback on various options for accommodating about 1,600 new medium and high density homes over the next 20 years. Out of 15,100 new homes expected, the majority fit on our developable land across the city, the 1,600 is the remaining amount that we currently don’t have space for.

Here is a link to the questionnaire: [https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/EEmultifamilyoptions](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/EEmultifamilyoptions). There are informational links within the questionnaire for reference. Here is a video overview of the multi-family options: [https://youtu.be/3qFLwAqICTy](https://youtu.be/3qFLwAqICTy)

We are hoping to hear from a broad range of folks so we hope that you’ll take the questionnaire and pass this on through your networks.

Thank you!

Heather

[www.envisioneugene.org](http://www.envisioneugene.org)

**Heather O’Donnell**
Senior Planner | City of Eugene Planning
541-682-5488

Messages to and from this e-mail address may be available to the public under Oregon Public Records Law.
KLCC's (9/13/16) episode of "Here & Now" on urban infill.
The episode is titled "Urban Redevelopment in an Age of Inequality, Climate Change.

It featured guests (architect and developer) from St. Louis and Chicago speaking about many of the issues facing South Willamette, Eugene, and many cities on the West Coast. There was a great quote about the success of the "shiny penny" strategy (neighborhood-driven refinement plans) over large-scale, top-down planning.

Please listen to:
http://www.wbur.org/hereandnow/2016/09/13/urban-redevelopment

Janet Bevirth
Hi Heather,
My name is Lance Elliott and I own a manufactured home in Rosewood Park at 2350 North Terry Street. I have received the latest UGB outreach letter and it has me concerned and frightened. I am a first time homeowner, with no mortgage. According to the way I'm reading the map, the land that my home is in is slated for government/education. Am I reading the map correctly? And if I am reading it correctly, will I lose my home in this growth expansion? Thank you for any reply or assistance in this matter.
Sincerely,
Lance Elliott

541-232-1723

Sent from my Verizon 4G LTE Droid
Hello,

with regard to the recent letter on R-2 Zoning Code changes I have the following question on “Potential Changes, Option B:”

Does the change to 14 homes per net acre of land still mean detached, single family houses? Can it include attached townhouses?

I find the description of Option A confusing. It speaks of preserving medium density for “attached housing”, but then qualifies it as “detached single family housing”.

Could you please clarify?

Thank you,

Heidi Sachet
2191 Westwood Lane
Eugene, OR 97401
What Have We Heard?

The Envision Eugene Team is out and about this summer, talking and listening to community members about 20-minute neighborhoods, Envision Eugene, and what residents want to see in the future. Look below to see some of what we’ve heard.

- Is this "What Have We Heard" from the 20-minute game with the disk and heart & star comments about Grocery, Schools, Park, Shopping, Transit Stop, Restaurants, Pool & Rec, Bike, and Other as shown in the photos below?

- It was not part of the Envision Eugene Atrium display yesterday on 9/13/16. I asked to see it since I have heard it mentioned, Terri brought it down after 5pm. It was nice to see the 20-minute radius from my home. I was not able to participate with input since the previous event comments were not recorded.

- You seem to imply that this gathering of info is not that important yet a few comments are selectively being mentioned on the cities website. It would be nice to see all, not some of the comments.

- I’ve stated at several meetings, that gathering input from folks at fun events is not as valid as gathering input from people truly involved and concerned for the development of Eugene, their community and neighborhood, people that have been going to meetings on the subject, involved with the city and would like to be represented through a refinement plan.

Janet Bevirt

Willakenzie Park - Party in the Parks

July 14

We talked to around 40 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:

- How transportation, including roads, paths and signals, impact the sense of a 20-minute trip
- How different parts of the neighborhood and city have access to more or fewer destinations
• What are the City's goals for 20-minute neighborhoods? Do you want everything to be like downtown?
Churchill Park - Party in the Parks

July 19

We talked to around 50 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:

• How do 20-minute neighborhoods happen? What is the City's role?
• How do you manage pollution and toxicity from intense development, like downtown?
• Support for "building up" with taller buildings as opposed to "building out" by expanding the urban growth boundary
Downtown - Sunday Streets

July 31

*We talked to around 80 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:*

- How can community members get involved in City Boards and Commissions?
- We need more housing variety - more types of homes to choose from
- Infrastructure that supports walking and biking (paths, sidewalks and bridges) is important
- In many ways, the western half of Eugene feels like an entirely separate town
Friendly Area Neighbors Picnic

July 31

We talked to around 25 community members at this event. Some topics of interest were:

- Avoid Class 1 farmland, our ability to grow food should be our first priority
- We should support secondary dwelling units
- Better pedestrian and bike connections should be built, like pedestrian bridges over busy streets
Downtown - First Friday Artwalk

August 5

We talked to around 30 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:

- Homelessness and gentrification are major issue for Eugene
- Some residents would really like Eugene to stop growing at all
- Transit connections are difficult to make when the downtown station is such a hub
Bethel Community Park - Party in the Parks

August 9

We talked to around 40 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:

- This part of town needs a lot more restaurants
- Bike paths to connect Bethel to the rest of town would be great
- Echo Hollow Pool is a favorite in this area!

Bethel Family Fun Night

August 11

We talked to around 35 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:

- There are not as many amenities north of Barger
- The busses are good, and get used a lot
- Having two close-by recreation centers is great!
Awbrey Park - Party in the Parks

August 16

We talked to around 30 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:

- We need more restaurants and grocery stores
- The area needs more parks that have been developed, and we support bringing in land for a new community park
- I love how safe it is to walk in this area
River Road Community Organization Picnic

August 21

*We talked to around 25 community members at this event!*
*Some topics of interest were:*

- Can we transform commercial areas to mixed use as a way to manage growth and density?
- We want both EmX and big street trees along River Road
- Walkability is very important!
First Friday Art Walk/Fiesta Cultural

September 2

*We talked to around 60 community members at this event!*

Some topics of interest were:

- It is very important to protect agricultural land both inside and outside the UGB.
- Our bus and transit system would benefit from significant upgrades, including connections to high speed rail.
- Some frustrations with the City stem from a sense of unequal representation and challenges around the process for communication.
Thank you, Ms O'Donnell,
for your quick response.

My negative reaction to the wording of Option A comes from my attitude about Zone R-1 of which there is way too much, in my opinion. Or, at least, there was, years ago, when I was on the Eugene Code Review Committee. I was shocked to see the vast spread of yellow on the zoning map instead of denser housing areas and mixed use, which would encourage close-by businesses and offices in walking distance. I hope things have changed.

Once again, Thank You!
Heidi Sachet

> On 14 Sep 2016, at 16:42, O'DONNELL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us> wrote:
> 
> Hello Ms. Sachet,
> Thank you for contacting me and allowing me to clarify the options.
> 
> Option B would increase the minimum density, or number of homes, that are required when housing is proposed in R-2 Zones;
> - Currently, the R-2 Zone allows a minimum of 10 homes per acre to be built and a maximum of 28 homes per acre to be built.
> - Option B would result in R-2 allowing a minimum of 14 homes per acre to be built and a maximum of 28 homes per acres to be built.
> Allow all housing types (such as single-family detached, townhomes, duplexes, apartments, etc.) would still be allowed but they would all have to meet the new density requirement.
> 
> To say Option A a different way, it would prohibit single-family detached housing in R-2 Medium Density Residential Zones. This would mean that only attached housing types could be built in R-2, such as cuplexes, triples, apartments, townhomes.
> 
> For both of these potential options, we are also exploring an exemptions for smaller lcts (of some yet to be determined size) so that they do not have to meet these new standards.
> 
> I also looked up your property and it looks like it is already developed. Either of these potential changes would only become relevant when new housing is proposed.
> 
> I hope this is helpful but please let me know if I can answer any other questions.
> 
> Best,
> Heather
> 
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Heidi Sachet [mailto:sachetev@gmail.com]
> Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2016 10:37 AM
> To: O'DONNELL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us>
Subject: Proposed Zoning Changes

Hello,

with regard to the recent letter on R-2 Zoning Code changes I have the following question on “Potential Changes, Option B:

Does the change to 14 homes per net acre of land still mean detached, single family houses? Can it include attached townhouses?

I find the description of Option A confusing. It speaks of preserving medium density for “attached housing”, but then qualifies it as “detached single family housing”.

Could you please clarify?

Thank you,

Heidi Sachet
2191 Westwood Lane
Eugene, OR 97401
Hello Heather,

Many thanks for your reply and comments. I will coordinate with Kristen Taylor to find a good time that will fit into your schedule for a meeting. As you may know our company has been developing multi-family projects in the community now for over 40 years. And as someone who also has a strong community bond, I have supported compact urban growth and the increased housing density needed to make it successful. And I have had the benefit of living in Eugene.

However, along the way I have learned that there are certain building sites that are not appropriate for housing. In my judgment the site we have along Southwood Lane immediately adjacent to the freeway that is currently designated in the general plan for R-2 development is one of them.

Thank you again,

Rob

Hello Mr. Bennett,

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to clarify.

This is a general letter that we sent to all R-2 zoned property owners (and those with a property with a Medium Density Residential designation on the Metro Plan) throughout Eugene. I'd be happy to meet with you and Kristen about the letter and about your property on Country Club, but I'll try to explain here.

The letter is about getting feedback on strategies the City is considering that would allow us to get more housing on R-2 land than we would otherwise see given current building trends (such as by requiring R-2 properties to build only attached housing types, no single-family detached, or alternatively increasing the minimum density R-2 property owners are required to build at when they build new housing).

The swapping of the zones on your property, while still something that is still on our radar to look at, does not change the zoning rules in a way that would help us get more housing than our current density averages. We are getting feedback on these other housing strategies because we need Council to give us direction on which additional housing strategies to adopt in order to complete all the parts needed to adopt our new urban growth boundary and then subsequently be able to move on to projects like the new parcel-specific land use diagram (the project that includes looking at zoning issues such as the County Club Road property).
I hope this is helpful. I realize it is taking a long time to get to the parcel-specific diagram project but we cannot start that or other envision eugene projects until we get the urban growth boundary adopted. The good news is, once we get these additional housing strategies wrapped up, we can move forward with the formal adoption process for the urban growth boundary.

I hope this is helpful. Please let me know if you'd like to meet.

Heather

From: Rob Bennett <RBennett@bmc-llc.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2016 3:04:47 PM
To: O’DONNELL Heather M
Subject: FW: Scan for Email

From: Rob Bennett
Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2016 3:01 PM
To: 'Kristen Taylor' <ktaylor@tb-g-arch.com>; 'HeatherO'Donnell@ci.eugene.or.us' <HeatherO'Donnell@ci.eugene.or.us>
Cc: Sarah Bennett <SBennett@bmc-llc.com>; Rob E. Bennett <rebennett@downtownac.com>; 'BRAUD Denny' <Denny.Braud@ci.eugene.or.us>; MEDARY Sarah J <Sarah.J.Medary@ci.eugene.or.us>
Subject: FW: Scan for Email

Hi Kristen,

Please see the attached letter which we received a few days ago. Although not site specific it most likely refers to our Fairway Loop property fronting Southwood Lane and maybe the smaller R2- 10 piece on the north side.

Because we have worked so hard with the City to make a case for a non-residential zone change to the 1.87 acre south parcel, I am having a hard time understanding why Heather would send us this letter without first addressing our request in some formal way, particularly because we understood that the current zoning on certain specific properties within the existing urban services boundary would be reviewed as a part of the Envision Eugene process.

As you know our position is that any reasonable person who actually goes out and walks our south parcel next to Southwood and the freeway at various times during a typical day could not advocate for a residential use with a straight face. As you also know, we at one time attempted to officially exchange uses with a commitment to use a part of our property on the north side of the tree line that is currently zoned G-O for a residential development. The residential project we now have planned on the north side does exactly that. Finally, because most of the property on the north side is already zoned G-O, it makes sense to consider zoning all of the property G-O in the interest of maintaining continuity in what is a fairly large infill development site. The point is why does it make sense on any site going from lower density toward more traffic, a freeway, and more congestion with R2-10, then G0, then back to R-2 zoning?

Please let me know your thoughts on this matter.

Rob

From: Jessica Headrick
Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2016 1:40 PM
To: Rob Bennett <RBennett@bmc-llc.com>
Subject: Scan for Email

Here you go!

Jessica Headrick
Administrative Assistant
Bennett Management Company
541-485-6991x100
www.bmc-llc.com
Both of you have told me the requirements of property that are highlighted in yellow on the R2 maps for Multi-Family Housing.
Please remove the lots on Portland Street, south of 29th Ave that should not be yellowed or included. Both of these lots are below .5 acres and at least 1 has an improvement valued over $1000.

Thank You,
Janet Bevrt

On Fri, Sep 16, 2016 at 9:10 AM, O'DONNELL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us> wrote:

Hi Janet,

I think of stakeholders as a person or group with an interest or concern in something.

For instance, we sent letters to all R-2 zoned property owners because they would have an interest in any changes to the R-2 zone we are considering.

Best,
Heather

Thanks for the feedback.
What are stakeholders?
Janet

On Wed, Sep 14, 2016 at 2:48 PM, O'DONNELL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us> wrote:

Hi Janet,
Thank you for your email and for coming to the Drop-in Session last night.

We are tracking all comments we’ve received. We’ve also been collecting the “voting” comments we’ve received on the 20-minute neighborhood exercise. Right now, we’re making a system to compile all of these comments so we can make the comments available to the general public, stay tuned for that. I wanted to clarify that in no way did we mean to imply last night that the comments we receive at the summer outreach events are not important— we were instead clarifying for you as we did for those at the fun events, that while the 20-minute game has a “voting” sheet that collected comments, we can’t really vote in a park, a restaurant or other amenities they might want for a certain area. That said, the game still brings awareness and discussion about what people love about their neighborhoods and what they want to see more of.

As you mentioned, fun events can be difficult to get really detailed feedback at. So that’s why we are taking a multi-pronged approach to our outreach, using several strategies to help discuss these issues, with different strategies achieving different things. For instance, talking to people at Party in the Parks helps build their interest in Envision Eugene and learn about citywide goals, and we also hear about what peoples’ concerns/enjoyments both at a high level and if they want to talk details. That said, fun events are also a great way to get folks on the Envision Eugene newsletter so they will get notice of open houses and questionnaires and other opportunities for them to give more specific feedback. Other strategies like an open house, online questionnaire, meetings with individuals, stakeholders, or neighborhoods may have a different goal than project awareness, such as getting more specific feedback on key decisions. So I think we are in agreement that we really have to use multiple public engagement and outreach approaches and we are trying to do that.

Thanks for your feedback and also for sending the KLCC story.

Heather

From: Ron-Janet Bevrt [mailto:beznys@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2016 8:49 AM
To: HARDING Terri L <Terri.L.Harding@ci.eugene.or.us>; O’DONNELL Heather M
<Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us>; NICOLELLO Bree (SMTP) <breenicolello@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: KLCC’s Here & Now: Urban Redevelopment in an Age of Inequality, Climate Change
The Envision Eugene Team is out and about this summer, talking and listening to community members about 20-minute neighborhoods, Envision Eugene, and what residents want to see in the future. Look below to see some of what we've heard.

- Is this "What Have We Heard" from the 20-minute game with the disk and heart & star comments about Grocery, Schools, Park, Shopping, Transit Stop, Restaurants, Pool & Rec, Bike, and Other as shown in the photos below?

- It was not part of the Envision Eugene Atrium display yesterday on 9/13/16.

I asked to see it since I have heard it mentioned, Terri brought it down after 5pm.

It was nice to see the 20-minute radius from my home. I was not able to participate with input since the previous event comments were not recorded.

- You seem to imply that this gathering of info is not that important yet a few comments are selectively being mentioned on the cities website. It would be nice to see all, not some of the comments.

- I've stated at several meetings, that gathering input from folks at fun events is not as valid as gathering input from people truly involved and concerned for the development of Eugene, their community and neighborhood, people that have been going to meetings on the subject, involved with the city and would like to be represented through a refinement plan.

Janet Bevirt

**Willakenzie Park - Party in the Parks**

**July 14**

We talked to around 40 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:
• How transportation, including roads, paths and signals, impact the sense of a 20-minute trip

• How different parts of the neighborhood and city have access to more or fewer destinations

• What are the City's goals for 20-minute neighborhoods? Do you want everything to be like downtown?
We talked to around 50 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:

- How do 20-minute neighborhoods happen? What is the City's role?
- How do you manage pollution and toxicity from intense development, like downtown?
- Support for "building up" with taller buildings as opposed to "building out" by expanding the urban growth boundary
Downtown - Sunday Streets

July 31

We talked to around **80 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:**

- How can community members get involved in City Boards and Commissions?
- We need more housing variety - more types of homes to choose from
- Infrastructure that supports walking and biking (paths, sidewalks and bridges) is important
- In many ways, the western half of Eugene feels like an entirely separate town
Friendly Area Neighbors Picnic

July 31

We talked to around 25 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:

- Avoid Class 1 farmland, our ability to grow food should be our first priority
- We should support secondary dwelling units
- Better pedestrian and bike connections should be built, like pedestrian bridges over busy streets
Downtown - First Friday Artwalk

August 5

We talked to around 30 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:

- Homelessness and gentrification are major issue for Eugene
- Some residents would really like Eugene to stop growing at all
- Transit connections are difficult to make when the downtown station is such a hub
Bethel Community Park - Party in the Parks

August 9

We talked to around 40 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:

- This part of town needs a lot more restaurants
- Bike paths to connect Bethel to the rest of town would be great
- Echo Hollow Pool is a favorite in this area!

Bethel Family Fun Night

August 11

We talked to around 35 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:

- There are not as many amenities north of Barger
- The busses are good, and get used a lot
- Having two close-by recreation centers is great!
Awbrey Park - Party in the Parks

August 16

We talked to around 30 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:

- We need more restaurants and grocery stores
- The area needs more parks that have been developed, and we support bringing in land for a new community park
- I love how safe it is to walk in this area
River Road Community Organization Picnic

August 21

We talked to around 25 community members at this event!
Some topics of interest were:

- Can we transform commercial areas to mixed use as a way to manage growth and density?
- We want both EmX and big street trees along River Road
- Walkability is very important!
First Friday Art Walk/Fiesta Cultural

September 2

We talked to around 60 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:

- It is very important to protect agricultural land both inside and outside the UGB.
- Our bus and transit system would benefit from significant upgrades, including connections to high speed rail.
- Some frustrations with the City stem from a sense of unequal representation and challenges around the process for communication.
Hi Heather,
Are there any R2 lots that are vacant with less than $1,000 in improvements and that are larger than .5 acres in the S. Willamette area?

And what does this letter below mean?
How many lots are you thinking of upzoning to R2 from the Metro Plan in the S. Willamette area?
So then would the Metro Plan be High Density?
Can I have a list of properties?
Also the wording is smaller lots could be exempt, not would be exempt, so it sounds like they won't be exempt unless a person wanted them to be exempt.
Janet
Re: R-2 Zoning Code Changes Being Considered

September 2, 2014

Dear Property Owner,

You are receiving this letter because you own property zoned as R-2 Medium Density Residential or property that could be rezoned to R-2 because it has a land use designation of Medium Density Residential on the City’s long-range land use map (The Metro Plan). The City is seeking community input on potential changes to R-2 zoning regulations as part of the Envision Eugene project.

Why Are Changes Being Considered? Envision Eugene is our collective vision for how Eugene will grow over the next 20 years while preserving what people love about our community. Eugene is expected to add about 15,000 new homes in 20 years. Analysis has shown that there is room on land across Eugene for most of these homes; we just need to find space for about 1,680 remaining homes before we can adopt our new urban growth boundary. To learn more about how we got to the 1680 number, you can view a video on our website www.ENVISIONEUGENE.ORG.

We all care about our neighborhoods and long-term livability. Decisions about how to accommodate our growing population are important and they affect everyone. Envision Eugene’s goal is to balance our needs for housing with our shared community values, including affordability, livability, and economic prosperity. Your input along with other input received will help inform City Council’s decisions on the best on which housing strategies to adopt.

Potential Changes to R-2 Zoned Land: Two options are being considered at this time that would affect R-2 zoned property. If either option was adopted into the land use code, the new standards would only apply when new housing is proposed for an R-2 zoned property. They include:

- OPTION A: Amend the zoning code to preserve medium density residential zones for attached housing (this would result in detached, single-family housing being prohibited in the R-2 zone).
- OPTION B: Amend the zoning code to increase the minimum number of homes required in R-2 medium density residential zones from 10 to about 14 homes per net acre of land.

Additionally, limitations on how each Option is applied are being considered. For example, smaller lots (such as less than 0.5 an acre) could be exempt from the new standards. This would allow owners of smaller lots within established neighborhoods to develop at existing levels of density, and still build single-family housing. These options are explained in more detail with pictures and graphics, in the presentation given to the City Council on July 28th (see staff presentation at http://www.eugene.or.us/DocumentCenter/View/28824).

City of Eugene • 155 W. 10th Ave. • Eugene, OR 97401 • 541-482-5400 • 541-482-5372 Fax
www.cityofeugene.org/planning
On Mon, Sep 19, 2016 at 4:29 PM, O'DONNELL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us> wrote:

Hello Janet,

We will work on printing a separate map that shows which MDR lots are over .5 acres.

We will also keep the 4 quadrant maps that you saw at the drop-in session because it shows the entire inventory of medium density residential buildable land because the .5 acre exemption has not been approved yet (meaning it could change, if it even gets adopted).

Are the two small lots that you want me to look into on this attached image- both look to be the same size, square orange lots, in between Portland St and Willamette Street?
Heather

From: Ron-Janet Bevint [mailto:bezvys@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2016 9:39 AM
To: O’DONNELL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us>; HARDING Terri L
    <Terri.L.Harding@ci.eugene.or.us>

Subject: Re: KLCC’s Here & Now: Urban Redevelopment in an Age of Inequality, Climate Change

Both of you have told me the requirements of property that are highlighted in yellow on the R2 maps for Multi-Family Housing.

Please remove the lots on Portland Street, south of 29th Ave that should not be yellowed or included.

Both of these lots are below .5 acres and at least 1 has an improvement valued over $1000.
Thank You,

Janet Bevirt

On Fri, Sep 16, 2016 at 9:10 AM, O’DONNELL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us> wrote:

Hi Janet,

I think of stakeholders as a person or group with an interest or concern in something.

For instance, we sent letters to all R-2 zoned property owners because they would have an interest in any changes to the R-2 zone we are considering.

Best,

Heather

---

From: Ron-Janet Bevirt <beznys@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2016 8:31:19 PM
To: O’DONNELL Heather M

Subject: Re: KLCC’s Here & Now: Urban Redevelopment in an Age of Inequality, Climate Change

Thanks for the feedback.

What are stakeholders?

Janet

On Wed, Sep 14, 2016 at 2:48 PM, O’DONNELL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us> wrote:

Hi Janet,

Thank you for your email and for coming to the Drop-in Session last night.
We are tracking all comments we’ve received. We’ve also been collecting the “voting” comments we’ve received on the 20-minute neighborhood exercise. Right now, we’re making a system to compile all of these comments so we can make the comments available to the general public, stay tuned for that. I wanted to clarify that in no way did we mean to imply last night that the comments we receive at the summer outreach events are not important- we were instead clarifying for you as we did for those at the fun events, that while the 20-minute game has a “voting” sheet that collected comments, we can’t really vote in a park, a restaurant or other amenities they might want for a certain area. That said, the game still brings awareness and discussion about what people love about their neighborhoods and what they want to see more of.

As you mentioned, fun events can be difficult to get really detailed feedback at. So that’s why we are taking a multi-pronged approach to our outreach, using several strategies to help discuss these issues, with different strategies achieving different things. For instance, talking to people at Party in the Parks helps build their interest in Envision Eugene and learn about citywide goals, and we also hear about what peoples’ concerns/enjoyments both at a high level and if they want to talk details. That said, fun events are also a great way to get folks on the Envision Eugene newsletter so they will get notice of open houses and questionnaires and other opportunities for them to give more specific feedback. Other strategies like an open house, online questionnaire, meetings with individuals, stakeholders, or neighborhoods may have a different goal than project awareness, such as getting more specific feedback on key decisions. So I think we are in agreement that we really have to use multiple public engagement and outreach approaches and we are trying to do that.

Thanks for your feedback and also for sending the KLCC story.

Heather

---

**From:** Ron-Janet Bevirk [mailto:beznys@gmail.com]
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 14, 2016 8:49 AM
**To:** HARDING Terri L <Terri.L.Harding@ci.eugene.or.us>; O’DONNELL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us>; NICOLELLO Bree (SMTP) <breenico@icloud.com>
**Subject:** Re: KLCC's Here & Now: Urban Redevelopment in an Age of Inequality, Climate Change
The Envision Eugene Team is out and about this summer, talking and listening to community members about 20-minute neighborhoods, Envision Eugene, and what residents want to see in the future. Look below to see some of what we've heard.

- Is this "What Have We Heard" from the 20-minute game with the disk and heart & star comments about Grocery, Schools, Park, Shopping, Transit Stop, Restaurants, Pool & Rec, Bike, and Other as shown in the photos below?

- It was not part of the Envision Eugene Atrium display yesterday on 9/13/16.

I asked to see it since I have heard it mentioned, Terri brought it down after 5pm.

It was nice to see the 20-minute radius from my home. I was not able to participate with input since the previous event comments were not recorded.

- You seem to imply that this gathering of info is not that important yet a few comments are selectively being mentioned on the cities website. It would be nice to see all, not some of the comments.

- I've stated at several meetings, that gathering input from folks at fun events is not as valid as gathering input from people truly involved and concerned for the development of Eugene, their community and neighborhood, people that have been going to meetings on the subject, involved with the city and would like to be represented through a refinement plan.

Janet Bevirt

Willakenzie Park - Party in the Parks

July 14

We talked to around 40 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:
• How transportation, including roads, paths and signals, impact the sense of a 20-minute trip

• How different parts of the neighborhood and city have access to more or fewer destinations

• What are the City’s goals for 20-minute neighborhoods? Do you want everything to be like downtown?
Churchill Park - Party in the Parks

July 19

We talked to around 50 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:

- How do 20-minute neighborhoods happen? What is the City's role?
- How do you manage pollution and toxicity from intense development, like downtown?
- Support for "building up" with taller buildings as opposed to "building out" by expanding the urban growth boundary
Downtown - Sunday Streets

July 31

We talked to around 80 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:

- How can community members get involved in City Boards and Commissions?
- We need more housing variety - more types of homes to choose from
- Infrastructure that supports walking and biking (paths, sidewalks and bridges) is important
- In many ways, the western half of Eugene feels like an entirely separate town
Friendly Area Neighbors Picnic

July 31

We talked to around 25 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:

- Avoid Class 1 farmland, our ability to grow food should be our first priority
- We should support secondary dwelling units
- Better pedestrian and bike connections should be built, like pedestrian bridges over busy streets
Downtown - First Friday Artwalk

August 5

We talked to around 30 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:

- Homelessness and gentrification are major issue for Eugene
- Some residents would really like Eugene to stop growing at all
- Transit connections are difficult to make when the downtown station is such a hub
Bethel Community Park - Party in the Parks

August 9

We talked to around 40 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:

- This part of town needs a lot more restaurants
- Bike paths to connect Bethel to the rest of town would be great
- Echo Hollow Pool is a favorite in this area!

Bethel Family Fun Night

August 11

We talked to around 35 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:

- There are not as many amenities north of Barger
- The busses are good, and get used a lot
- Having two close-by recreation centers is great!
Awbrey Park - Party in the Parks

August 16

We talked to around 30 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:

- We need more restaurants and grocery stores
- The area needs more parks that have been developed, and we support bringing in land for a new community park
- I love how safe it is to walk in this area
River Road Community Organization Picnic

August 21

We talked to around 25 community members at this event! Some topics of interest were:

- Can we transform commercial areas to mixed use as a way to manage growth and density?
- We want both EmX and big street trees along River Road
- Walkability is very important!
First Friday Art Walk/Fiesta Cultural

September 2

We talked to around 60 community members at this event!
Some topics of interest were:

• It is very important to protect agricultural land both inside and outside the UGB.

• Our bus and transit system would benefit from significant upgrades, including connections to high speed rail.

• Some frustrations with the City stem from a sense of unequal representation and challenges around the process for communication.
I live at 1945 Oak Street and received your notice of Sept.2 on Sept.13. I've been considering how to respond or even whether to because of recent experience where your department representative did not tell me the truth when I asked three specific questions about what could happen with the zoning change. While it was being built another representative of your department gave it several waivers that I and my neighbors disagreed with. The developer bragged to his workers while it was still being built that he flipped it to a California corporation for a quick $300,000 profit. One of the subcontractors on the project told me it's so poorly built that it start falling apart in ten years as will Capstone on which he worked. I should have learned from the broken promises of Capstone. Despite that I trusted your department on a project that adversely affected my life. I will not make that mistake again.

I suspect I'm wasting my time but I did complete the survey and I will give you some input. Regarding option A, most people by their 30s want to live in a single family home. I'm very leery of a ban. While you say that will only apply to new proposals how long will that last? I can see your department deciding in the future that as people die or age out of their homes, they must be torn down and replaced with multi-family housing. Is there any guarantee that a developer would buy the houses on both sides of me and then use city power to get me out of my house?

When the apartment building was built on our block, we homeowners found that the assessed value of our property declined. Where is the requirement that developers provide compensation for these declines? I also think Mike Clark's motion of several months ago that owners who occupied their homes should be able to deny permission to a multi-story apartment building being built next to them. Another provision I would want to see is that multi-family buildings could not be taller than than the tallest owner occupied home withing a block. I would be much more supportive of what you want to do if those provisions were made.

For option B, two things stood out. You say "about 14 homes per net acre." The word "about" gives your department a lot of wiggle room to enable developers to increase their wealth at the expense of those of us who have to live with the damage they do. If an absolute number were attached I could better judge whether I would support the proposal. I also don't know what a net acre is compared to a real acre. What is a net acre and is strictly defined by statute? Without those clarifications I think you're being given a blank check to do what you want.

In principle, if we truly do need 1600 more homes, why shouldn't all areas share the burden equally? Why are some homes protected by R-1 designation and others aren't? Why are those who own the expensive homes protected while those of us of modest incomes in my block and the South Willamette special zone designated to absorb the projected growth. Oh, affluent and powerful people live in those areas while they don't live in my area.

I'll also point out that your department has massive opposition from an area that has always voted strongly in support of city money requests over the 42 years I've lived here. I don't understand why the relevant city departments and the city councilors care so much more for future residents who may or may not establish roots here and contribute to our community as so many of us in the affected area have done. For example, I spent over $1500 to rebuild the sidewalk in front of my home although I don't own it and the city hasn't inspected my block for over 20 years. I did it because the roots of a city owned tree had pushed up panels of the sidewalk. On
my block is a rental owned by a Californian who uses a local property management company that has allowed parts of the sidewalk to crumble into potholes. That's one of the differences between having owner occupied homes and absentee owners who the city seems to favor.

Wayne Gaddy
1945 Oak Street
Hi Heather,

I have been working with Lloyd Helikson to examine multifamily development in Eugene as it relates to Envision Eugene and the MUPTE program. After reviewing his data, it appears he has compiled a rigorous set of data reporting the number of multifamily units being developed in Eugene. Comparing his data with Envision Eugene assumptions and with the City’s permit reporting, there appear to be some significant discrepancies.

The discrepancies fall into three main areas:

1. There has been an ample supply of new multifamily housing units completed or planned which has, or soon will, exceed the need projections in Envision Eugene. The implication is that market factors are providing adequate supply and there is no need for the City to take costly or aggressive actions to encourage, facilitate or subsidize more market-rate multifamily housing.

2. The density of the new multifamily housing that is being built exceeds the density assumptions used in Envision Eugene. Therefore, there is significantly more capacity for multifamily housing within the current UGB than has been projected by Envision Eugene. There is also substantial housing capacity on commercial lands that has not been addressed in the City’s supply analysis.

3. The City of Eugene’s permits system does not seem to be accurately tracking or reporting the number of dwelling units which are being built in the city. Significant errors of under-reporting have been documented by Lloyd. These errors are apparently being transmitted to federal records and databases, and are resulting in large cumulative errors in Eugene’s housing data.

Perhaps we could meet with you to discuss this. Below is some of the summary supporting information developed using Lloyd’s data.

Eben

The graph below shows that MF 5+ units already built or planned total 4,836 units, while the total 20-year demand forecast by EE through 2032 is only 3,776 units. Note that for simplicity, currently-planned units are counted in 2017.
The two tables show actual densities by land use category for all recent multifamily development compared with the range of assumed densities from Envision Eugene. Note that actual densities are significantly higher than high end of the assumed density range. Note also that commercial land has received a significant amount of high-density residential development which is not accounted for in the Envision Eugene available inventory. The implication is that much more multifamily could be accommodated on Eugene's commercial lands than forecast. Simply including mixed use housing capacity on commercial could resolve all projected MF housing needs.

### Actual Developed Density in Eugene by Land Use Category
All Multifamily Housing Built and Planned Since 7/1/12
(includes 5+ units, 2-4 units, and SFA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Sum of Acres</th>
<th>Sum of Units</th>
<th>Average Density du/ac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>39.26</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>44.66</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>48.39</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>14.46</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-WS</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>167.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,205</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fodor & Associates from data provided by Lloyd Helikson
## Envision Eugene Density Assumptions

Eugene Land Model, July 2013 Update

### Residential, Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumed Density, units/acre</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding discrepancies in the actual housing units reported in the City’s building permit records, I began to suspect an issue when I examined data for Eugene permits from the Census Bureau’s Building Permits Survey. This federal data shows about 1800 fewer housing units permitted than have actually been permitted in Eugene for the 2012 to 2016 period we have data for. I assume the Census gets its data from the City.

Lloyd has verified the following examples of errors in permit reporting:

- Permit 15-03325-01 for the senior housing development at Greer Gardens shows “0” dwelling units even though our other sources show 216.
- The Crescent Village permit was applied for in 2014 but not issued until 2015 (14-03636-01). The City permit data shows “0” units even though our other sources show 263 units.
- The American Campus Communities large project, which now has a certificate of occupancy, shows “0” dwelling units in the permit database, even though our other sources show 192 units.

A copy of the basic multifamily data from Lloyd’s spreadsheet is attached for reference. Note that there was a minor error in that Titan Court was counted here as being on HDR land, whereas we just determined that it is located on Commercial.

Eben Fodor  
Fodor & Associates LLC  
Eugene, OR  
541-345-8246  
www.fodorandassociates.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Type Address</th>
<th>Permit No.</th>
<th>Permit App Date</th>
<th>Permit Issue Date</th>
<th>Year of Occupancy</th>
<th>Cert of LU Occup Class</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>5+ Units</th>
<th>2-4, SFA Cumulative</th>
<th>2-4, SFA Cumulative</th>
<th>All MF Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH 940 Hilyard St.</td>
<td>11-02336-01</td>
<td>61/21/11</td>
<td>6/26/11</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7/13/12 HDR</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 940 Hilyard Ave.</td>
<td>11-02336-01</td>
<td>61/21/11</td>
<td>6/26/11</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7/13/12 HDR</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 723 E. 17th Ave.</td>
<td>11-03667-01</td>
<td>8/21/11</td>
<td>8/22/11</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7/30/12 HDR</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Place Apts 877 Park St.</td>
<td>11-5282-01</td>
<td>10/17/11</td>
<td>12/14/12</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8/13/12 HDR</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase Crossing FHA 715 S. Garden Way</td>
<td>11-02041-01</td>
<td>10/21/11</td>
<td>8/16/11</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8/22/12 HDR</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parvin Place 2430 Villavista St.</td>
<td>11-51220-01</td>
<td>10/21/11</td>
<td>3/21/12</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8/22/12 HDR</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland Villag 1840 Villavista St.</td>
<td>11-52449-01</td>
<td>12/14/11</td>
<td>2/14/12</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8/22/12 HDR</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Studies Apartments 1370 E. 19th Ave.</td>
<td>11-02339-01</td>
<td>61/21/11</td>
<td>6/13/11</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8/13/12 HDR</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase Crossing FHA 715 S. Garden Way</td>
<td>11-02041-01</td>
<td>10/21/11</td>
<td>8/16/11</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8/22/12 HDR</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parvin Place 2430 Villavista St.</td>
<td>11-51220-01</td>
<td>10/21/11</td>
<td>3/21/12</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8/22/12 HDR</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland Villag 1840 Villavista St.</td>
<td>11-52449-01</td>
<td>12/14/11</td>
<td>2/14/12</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8/22/12 HDR</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Road apartments 785 River Rd.</td>
<td>11-02339-01</td>
<td>61/21/11</td>
<td>6/13/11</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8/13/12 HDR</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Road apartments 785 River Rd.</td>
<td>11-02339-01</td>
<td>61/21/11</td>
<td>6/13/11</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8/13/12 HDR</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Road apartments 785 River Rd.</td>
<td>11-02339-01</td>
<td>61/21/11</td>
<td>6/13/11</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8/13/12 HDR</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Road apartments 785 River Rd.</td>
<td>11-02339-01</td>
<td>61/21/11</td>
<td>6/13/11</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8/13/12 HDR</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Meadows 2411 Lakeview Dr. etc.</td>
<td>11-51220-01</td>
<td>10/21/11</td>
<td>3/21/12</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8/22/12 HDR</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Meadows 2411 Lakeview Dr. etc.</td>
<td>11-51220-01</td>
<td>10/21/11</td>
<td>3/21/12</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8/22/12 HDR</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Walk Apts 404 E. 13th Ave.</td>
<td>11-51220-01</td>
<td>10/21/11</td>
<td>3/21/12</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8/22/12 HDR</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Walk Apts 404 E. 13th Ave.</td>
<td>11-51220-01</td>
<td>10/21/11</td>
<td>3/21/12</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8/22/12 HDR</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Walk Apts 404 E. 13th Ave.</td>
<td>11-51220-01</td>
<td>10/21/11</td>
<td>3/21/12</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8/22/12 HDR</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Walk Apts 404 E. 13th Ave.</td>
<td>11-51220-01</td>
<td>10/21/11</td>
<td>3/21/12</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8/22/12 HDR</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi Heather,

Thanks for your quick reply. I know your whole department has been pretty busy lately. I am not sure the pipeline development you refer to applies to this analysis. We are simply setting a development “clock” that matches the population projection timetable and counting all development that has occurred since the 7/1/12 start date. A meeting would be the best way to run through these complex issues, so let me know when you’re available.

I think our findings are very timely and affect the City’s current actions around the need for 1600 MF units. We’ve found:

- Actual MF density is higher than was assumed, so you could raise your assumed density and meet the requirement that way.

- More than 1000 units of MF residential have or will be developed on commercially-zone land. Yet it appears that commercial lands are not even included in the supply analysis for residential capacity. You could add the commercial capacity and meet the demand that way.

We’ve also determined that total projected demand for MF housing through 2032 of 6,797 units (including SFA) has already been more than 75% met with 5205 units completed or planned. If the City’s permit tracking and reporting system were working well, you would already know this, without requiring the considerable work that Lloyd has done. I look forward to hearing back from you at your earliest opportunity.

Eben

Eben Fodor
Fodor & Associates LLC
Eugene, OR
541-345-8246
www.fodorandassociates.com
Hi Eben,
Thanks for your email and the opportunity to clarify. Lloyd and I talked in 2015 about analysis he had done on new multi-family development in Eugene at that time. As I recall, I thought that his analysis was counting many of the multi-family housing dwellings that we had already included in our calculations (because we knew they were in the pipeline for development) and that had still resulted in the 1,600 dwelling deficit. We also reviewed this issue at the Technical Resource Group.

I’m not sure if you are referring to the Eugene Construction Activity Report that is on-line as being wrong, but if so, yes we are aware that the Construction Activity Report does not show all housing units. Because of that, we have to pull a separate report from our end of the building permit system and do a review of it in order to make sure we are capturing all of the housing units built. I’ve mentioned this previously to folks that have used the on-line system and found a different number of dwellings built. As part of the monitoring program, our goal is to have an on-line system that doesn’t have these discrepancies and that reporting on new units build will be much easier and quick for the public as well as for staff. Unfortunately we are not there yet but we are gradually working towards a better system.

Regarding density, this is definitely something we want to track and monitor. That said, the density assumptions that we have applied, to for instance vacant land, are based on city-wide averages in each plan designation as seen over a 12 year period. So some development will come in higher than the average and some will come in lower than the average. Through monitoring we need to track the density of all housing types on all plan designations and then be able to compare that comprehensive density analysis to the averages were assuming right now.

I will take a look at this information and can meet to review the issues afterwards, but I wanted to let you know that given other deadlines I’m on right now I’m not going to be able to dig into this right away. I recognize this took some time to develop and so this will take some time to look at and compare with the information I have.

I’ll let you know as soon as I am able to dive back into this.

Best,
Heather

From: Eben Fodor [mailto:eben@fodorandassociates.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 10:05 AM
To: O'DONNEL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us>; HOSTICK Robin A
<Robin.A.Hostick@ci.eugene.or.us>; HARDING Terri L <Terri.L.Harding@ci.eugene.or.us>
Cc: Lloyd Helikson <lhelikson@gmail.com>
Subject: Multifamily Development Data Shows Ample Supply

Hi Heather,

I have been working with Lloyd Helikson to examine multifamily development in Eugene as it relates to Envision Eugene and the MUPTE program. After reviewing his data, it appears he has compiled a rigorous set of data reporting the number of multifamily units being developed in Eugene. Comparing his data with Envision Eugene assumptions and with the City’s permit reporting, there appear to be some significant discrepancies.

The discrepancies fall into three main areas:

1. There has been an ample supply of new multifamily housing units completed or planned which has, or soon will, exceed the need projections in Envision Eugene. The implication is that market factors are providing adequate supply and there is no need for the City to take costly or aggressive actions to encourage, facilitate or subsidize more market-rate multifamily housing.
2. The density of the new multifamily housing that is being built exceeds the density assumptions used in Envision Eugene. Therefore, there is significantly more capacity for multifamily housing within the current UGB than has been projected by Envision Eugene. There is also substantial housing capacity on commercial lands that has not been addressed in the City’s supply analysis.

3. The City of Eugene’s permits system does not seem to be accurately tracking or reporting the number of dwelling units which are being built in the city. Significant errors of under-reporting have been documented by Lloyd. These errors are apparently being transmitted to federal records and databases, and are resulting in large cumulative errors in Eugene’s housing data.

Perhaps we could meet with you to discuss this. Below is some of the summary supporting information developed using Lloyd’s data.

Eben

The graph below shows that MF 5+ units already built or planned total 4,836 units, while the total 20-year demand forecast by EE through 2032 is only 3,776 units. Note that for simplicity, currently-planned units are counted in 2017.

![Cumulative Multifamily Units of 5+ Units Built or Planned in Eugene Since 7-1-12](image)

The two tables show actual densities by land use category for all recent multifamily development compared with the range of assumed densities from Envision Eugene. Note that actual densities are significantly higher than high end of the assumed density range. Note also that commercial land has received a significant amount of high-density residential development which is not accounted for in the Envision Eugene available inventory. The implication is that much more multifamily could be accommodated on Eugene’s commercial lands than forecast. Simply including mixed use housing capacity on commercial could resolve all projected MF housing needs.
### Actual Developed Density in Eugene by Land Use Category

*All Multifamily Housing Built and Planned Since 7/1/12*

(includes 5+ units, 2-4 units, and SFA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Sum of Acres</th>
<th>Sum of Units</th>
<th>Average Density du/ac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>39.26</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>44.66</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>48.39</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>14.46</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-WS</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>167.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,205</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fodor & Associates from data provided by Lloyd Helikson

### Envision Eugene Density Assumptions

*Eugene Land Model, July 2013 Update*

*Residential, Table 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumed Density, units/acre</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding discrepancies in the actual housing units reported in the City’s building permit records, I began to suspect an issue when I examined data for Eugene permits from the Census Bureau’s Building Permits Survey. This federal data shows about 1800 fewer housing units permitted than have actually been permitted in Eugene for the 2012 to 2016 period we have data for. I assume the Census gets its data from the City.

Lloyd has verified the following examples of errors in permit reporting:

- Permit 15-03325-01 for the senior housing development at Greer Gardens shows "0" dwelling units even though our other sources show 216.
- The Crescent Village permit was applied for in 2014 but not issued until 2015 (14-03636-01). The City permit data shows "0" units even though our other sources show 263 units.
- The American Campus Communities large project, which now has a certificate of occupancy, shows "0" dwelling units in the permit data base, even though our other sources show 192 units.

A copy of the basic multifamily data from Lloyd’s spreadsheet is attached for reference. Note that there was a minor error in that Titan Court was counted here as being on HDR land, whereas we just determined that it is located on Commercial.

Eben Fodor  
Fodor & Associates LLC  
Eugene, OR  
541-345-8246  
www.fodorandassociates.com
Heather,

These are the addresses that are coming up for Eugene OR:

- 2150 W 7th Ave, EUGENE Oregon 97402
- 4400 Franklin Blvd, EUGENE Oregon 97403
- 150 Oroyan Ave, EUGENE Oregon 97404

Please let me know when you get a chance. Have a great weekend.

Thanks,

Randy Lopez
Amerco Real Estate Company
2727 N. Central Ave., Suite 500
Phoenix, AZ 85004
(602)263-6555 Ext. 615113
Randy_lopez@Uhaul.com

"O'DONNELL Heather M" <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us> on Friday, September 23, 2016 at 3:14 PM - 0700 wrote:

Hi Randy,

Thanks for your email. Unfortunately, for folks that owned multiple properties, we just sent one letter without the address. I'm about to leave for an appointment but if you can give me the addresses of the properties you own we can look them up and see which one is zoned R-2 or designated medium density residential. I can do this on Monday and get back to you then.

If we can get back to you sooner, we'll do that.

Thank you,
Heather

From: Randy Lopez <randy_lopez@uhaul.com>
Sent: Friday, September 23, 2016 3:03 PM
To: O'DONNELL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us>
Subject: R2 Zoning Code Changes Being Considered
Importance: High
Hi Heather,

I received the attached notice today. Can you let me know what property this is regarding?

Thanks,

Randy Lopez
Amerco Real Estate Company
2727 N. Central Ave., Suite 500
Phoenix, AZ 85004
(602)263-6555 Ext. 615113
Randy.lopez@UHAUF.com
Heather,

These are the addresses that are coming up for Eugene OR:

- 2150 W 7th Ave, EUGENE Oregon 97402
- 4400 Franklin Blvd, EUGENE Oregon 97403
- 150 Oroyan Ave, EUGENE Oregon 97404

Please let me know when you get a chance. Have a great weekend.

Thanks,

Randy Lopez
Amerco Real Estate Company
2727 N. Central Ave., Suite 500
Phoenix, AZ 85004
(602)263-6555 Ext. 615113
Randy_lopez@Uhaul.com

"O’DONNELL Heather M" <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us> on Friday, September 23, 2016 at 3:14 PM - 0700 wrote:

Hi Randy,

Thanks for your email. Unfortunately, for folks that owned multiple properties, we just sent one letter without the address. I’m about to leave for an appointment but if you can give me the addresses of the properties you own we can look them up and see which one is zoned R-2 or designated medium density residential. I can do this on Monday and get back to you then.

If we can get back to you sooner, we’ll do that.

Thank you,

Heather

From: Randy Lopez <randy.lopez@uhaul.com>
Sent: Friday, September 23, 2016 3:03 PM
To: O’DONNELL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us>
Subject: R2 Zoning Code Changes Being Considered
Importance: High
Hi Heather,

I received the attached notice today. Can you let me know what property this is regarding?

Thanks,

Randy Lopez
Amerco Real Estate Company
2727 N. Central Ave., Suite 500
Phoenix, AZ 85004
(602)263-6555 Ext. 615113
Randy_lopez@Uhaul.com
I think we may be reaching clarification here. One of my questions was this, and I'm requesting a concise answer: If my neighbor to the west wants to sell his property and the buyer of that lot (or lots) requests a rezoning to R-2 so that a multi-residential building can be built on the property, while I want to retain my home as is (hopefully as R-1), do I retain the same rights (i.e. setback from my property line, solar access, etc.) that my neighbors who are not being proposed for rezoning have? To be quite frank, the September 19th "conversation," like the other three events I have attended, have never clarified this concern, as there is no opportunity for actual dialog or any way to get specific questions addressed given the event format. I can assure you this concern is shared by many in our neighborhood. While the answer may lie within the documents offered on the Planning Department's website, the language is not easy to translate by the average citizen and is quite ambiguous in many instances. I hope I have made my question clear. Please let me know: do I retain the same rights as other R-1 property owner, or do I lose some rights/protections due to my properties "potential" for rezoning?

Hello Mr. Gallagher,

I understand you have questions about the letter we sent (see attached). A co-worker passed your email to me, thank you for giving us the opportunity to clarify. My understanding is that you thought the letter was about the city rezoning your property. The city is planning for our housing needs for the next 20 years. Our analysis shows that we have about 600 medium density residential homes that we don't have enough space for. We are getting feedback on options to help accommodate those homes.

Two of those options include amending the land use regulations ("development standards") for property that is zoned R-2 medium density residential. You got this letter because your property at 110 E. 31st, while currently zoned R-1 low density, appears designated as Medium Density Residential on the city's long-range land use plan (The Metro Plan). This means your property may be eligible to rezone to R-2. The city is not proposing to rezone your property, we just wanted to reach as many R-2 property owners (or those with the potential to be R-2 zoning) because they might be interested in potential changes to development standards for the R-2 zone.

These land use development standards (whether they are the standards in the current R-2 zone or the changes being considered in Option A or Option B) are triggered at the time development is proposed for a property by the property owner or future developer. These options are about the city proposing to develop your property or rezone it, nor is the city proposing to retroactively require people to comply with these new standards if they get adopted. This is about standards that would apply in the R-2 zone if and when future development happens on an R-2 zoned land.

If you would like to talk about the two options discussed in the letter or have other questions, please let me know.

Best,
Heather
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I had already filled out the questionnaire once, so I didn’t want to do it again. But I wanted to make a couple of points that I’m not sure I made the first time.

I just want to make sure that both options A and B are not imposed on lots smaller than 1/3 of an acre. As I said to you at the Envision Eugene drop in session, I think that letting smaller lots avoid both the higher density requirement and the rule for attached housing would make it more likely that people with existing single family homes on medium density lots would be more likely to build something if it were not attached (or they didn’t have to build multiple units). I know that I would not build an attached dwelling.

ALSO developers should not be able to buy contiguous lots with existing homes on it, then merge the lots into one lot to get around the 1/3 of an acre rule. Otherwise, a developer could buy two lots with one house in between, and fill the adjoining houses with crummy renters to make it so the middle person would give up and move out – destabilizing a neighborhood.

The option A and B rules should just apply to larger lots.

- Joyce Eaton
Dear Mayor Piercy and City Councilors:
Attached are comments from the League of Women Voters of Lane County urging you to complete the planning phase of Envision Eugene and move to the implementation and monitoring phases.

The League has participated in and commented on this planning process for several years. If you have any questions about our position or our interest, please do not hesitate to call me.

Linda Lynch, President
League of Women Voters of Lane County
September 25, 2016

Mayor and City Council
Eugene, Oregon

The League of Women Voters of Lane County has followed the Envision Eugene process and proposals since 2011 and has commented many times on various aspects of the plan. We are pleased that the proposed timeline for the urban growth boundary (UGB) adoption package shows formal adoption in mid-2017.

After years of technical analysis, public engagement, and community debate, it is time to complete the Envision Eugene planning phase and move to the implementation and monitoring of the pillars, policies and strategies. It is time to work with neighborhood groups to incorporate the broad city-wide goals and guidelines into local area decisions. It is time for consideration of longer range growth issues including identifying urban reserves. Delaying formal adoption of the new urban growth boundary past 2017 has the potential to hinder the orderly growth of the city and the planning efforts of other jurisdictions and private developers.

With regard to the proposals for accommodating the need for additional multi-family housing within the current UGB, the League believes that the Tier 1 strategies are reasonable and will require minimal city action to implement, thus allowing the adoption process to continue forward. The city’s recent adoption of a revised Multiple Unit Property Tax Exemption (MUPTE) program and of other incentives and policies are likely to encourage the construction of an additional 1000 high density residential units in the downtown area (50 units per year over 20 years).

With regard to the need for 600 additional medium density residential units (30 units per year over 20 years), the implementation of either option A and option B would more efficiently use land already designated for multi-family residential purposes and would increase the supply of such homes. Neither option requires any rezoning action to implement it. However, option B allows more flexibility in the type of dwelling and would permit the construction of detached homes as seen in some existing subdivisions.

Thank you for the opportunity again to provide input on the Envision Eugene decisions and process. We urge the City Council to expeditiously complete its consideration of how to accommodate the growth expected in our community in the next 20 years, a process that has been guided by technical expertise and community values and input.

Sincerely,

Linda Lynch
President
From: Joyce Eaton <eatonj@uoregon.edu>  
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 9:33 AM  
To: O’DONNELL Heather M  
Subject: RE: feedback on medium density options

I personally will be fine with keeping it at 1/3 of an acre. However, it just was not clear from the descriptions of the options whether or not you would remove the 1/3 of an acre exemption and require all lots to follow A and B options. (Your example said an option was to increase it, but you did not specifically say that you wouldn’t decrease it.)

- Joyce

From: O’DONNELL Heather M [mailto:Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us]  
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 9:26 AM  
To: Joyce Eaton <eatonj@uoregon.edu>  
Subject: RE: feedback on medium density options

Hi Joyce,

Thanks for your input and taking the questionnaire.

Just as a clarification regarding your first suggestion, currently, residentially zoned lots that are less than 1/3 of an acre and have some development on them are already exempt from minimum density requirements. One of the options being considered is that if either option a or option b moves forward is that the exemption is increased so that more lots are exempt from either option a or option b, such as exempting lots that are less than ½ acre.

Heather

From: Joyce Eaton [mailto:eatonj@uoregon.edu]  
Sent: Sunday, September 25, 2016 8:30 PM  
To: O’DONNELL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us>  
Subject: feedback on medium density options

I had already filled out the questionnaire once, so I didn’t want to do it again. But I wanted to make a couple of points that I’m not sure I made the first time.

I just want to make sure that both options A and B are not imposed on lots smaller than 1/3 of an acre. As I said to you at the Envision Eugene drop in session, I think that letting smaller lots avoid both the higher density requirement and the rule for attached housing would make it more likely that people with existing single family homes on medium density lots would be more likely to build something if it were not attached (or they didn’t have to build multiple units). I know that I would not build an attached dwelling.

ALSO developers should not be able to buy contiguous lots with existing homes on it, then merge the lots into one lot to get around the 1/3 of an acre rule. Otherwise, a developer could buy two lots with one house in between, and fill the adjoining houses with crummy renters to make it so the middle person would give up and move out – destabilizing a neighborhood.

The option A and B rules should just apply to larger lots.
I do know the city is not proposing to demolish homes. I was rather inartfully trying to make the case that when we are given falsities by the planning department on multiple occasions then anything becomes believable the most reasonable assertions lack credibility.

You missed my point about the sidewalk. I was using my example of rebuilding the sidewalk in front of my house to illustrate the care and responsibility that single-family owner occupied homeowners contribute to the well-being of the city compared to those owners that don’t live with the consequences of what they do and don’t for areas where they own property.

Similarly, you missed what I was saying about zoning. Why should wealthier areas of Eugene be exempt from sharing the burden of growth while the city radically alters the neighborhoods of people with modest income? Why shouldn’t the Spyglass homeowners, for example, face the prospect of multi-story apartment buildings being built next door right up to their property lines? If we’re going to have this massive growth that some predict then there shouldn’t be R-1 zoning anywhere in the city.

In terms of compensation, I know there is no compensation for decline of property values when apartment buildings are built in a single-family area. I’ll be more direct: the decline of existing homeowners’ property values can be easily predicted as well as a decline in their quality of lives. Why aren’t these taken into consideration when you rezone? I’m sure you have to give lip service to the notion that all citizens are equal but the actions of city staff show we’re clearly not as important as giving a developer a chance to flip property for a quick $300,000 profit. Actions speak louder than words.

You also didn’t answer why the city council and staff are more concerned with people who might move here as opposed to those of us who have lived here and contributed for decades. If we are truly going to have the rapid growth you project then there aren’t many realistic alternatives. One is to turn a large portion of the city into concrete canyons of condos and apartment buildings like Seattle, Portland and the Bay Area; watch home prices escalate and have outlying areas like Veneta eventually reach us or expand the urban growth boundary.

As for your offer to look into what happened on my block I invite you to take a look at the apartment building between 19th Alley and 20th and then come over see me at 1945 Oak and tell me what you think it is. In the past year I have asked this of everyone who has come to my door and not one person has seen what the planning department tells me it is. Please, no cheating by looking up the project in your department’s files.

Finally, I am not a no-growther or NIMBY. I’m fine with one story apartment buildings or genuine duplexes that fit in with the neighborhood being built.

Wayne Gaddy

On 20 September 2016 at 18:48, O’DONNELL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us> wrote:
> Hello Mr. Gaddy,
> 
> Thank you for your email and your comments. While not familiar with
> the recent development/experience near your property, I apologize if
the information you received ended up being wrong. I can look into
that further if you’d like a better explanation of what happened. And
I appreciate you giving me the opportunity to clarify questions
regarding the letter you received. I’ll try to address them in order that you asked them.

Regarding the questionnaire results-

Thank you for taking the time to fill out the questionnaire, I hope
your comments here were also included in the questionnaire. The
questionnaire results and other input received will be made available
to the City Council for their consideration as they work on this difficult decisions.

Regarding when the R-2 development standards would apply-

Development standards (whether the current standards or those changes
being considered in Option A or Option B) are triggered at the time
development is proposed for a property by the property owner or future
developer. The city is not proposing to develop the property. The city
is not proposing to retroactively require people to tear down their
houses and replace them with more housing.

Regarding if in the future a neighboring property owner decides they
want to add housing to their property-

They would need to meet whatever the development standards are that
are in effect at that time, so that could mean adding more homes than
are currently there. For instance, the current R-2 zone standards
require that when housing is proposed, the number of homes must be at
least 10 homes per net acre and no more than 28 homes per net acre.
There is an exemption to having to meet the minimum number if the lot
is developed and is less than
13,500 square feet (.30 acre). This minimum density is one of the
standards we are getting feedback on; Option B would bump up the
minimum required density from 10 to about 14 homes per acre.
Increasing the size of the lots that would be exempt from the new standards is also being considered.

Regarding adding other requirements to Option A or B-

The zoning code does not require any one to compensate anyone else for
development of their property and it mostly doesn’t differentiate on
whether a site is used by the property owner or rented. Land in Eugene
is zoned (and the zoning regulations to go with those zones) to
indicate which areas are suitable for what types of development and
what types of use or development regulations are required for
> development in each zone. The questionnaire includes a comment box for
> suggesting additional ideas or limitations, such as limiting building height in certain areas.
>
> Regarding Option B
>
> We said “about” 14 homes per acre because no decision has been made on
> if to adopt the change, and if so, what exact minimum density to use.
> If the change is adopted, the actual minimum density number will be
> added to the
> R-2 zoning code. Net density in general terms means the number of
> dwellings per unit of land that is in actual residential use, so the
> acreage excludes such things as land for streets, public parks, and
> other things. The actual zoning code goes further about how to
> calculate net density, let me know if you’d like me to send that
> zoning section (Eugene Code 9.2751(1)(a through
> d)) to you.
>
> Regarding sharing the burden equally-
>
> Option A or Option B would apply to any land zoned R-2 across the city
> (except where exempted, such lots that are below 13,500 square feet in
> size). There are other potential strategies, such as re-designating
> land to Medium Density Residential or expanding the urban growth
> boundary for medium density land, that might result in more housing
> occurring in one area than others.
>
> Planning for over 15,000 new homes (with a mix of owner, rental,
> single-family, multi-family, etc.) over the next 20 years is
> challenging, and no matter what we do adding that housing will be
> noticeable. People have continued to move to Eugene over the years,
> some of the new homes are also for people growing up here and needing
> their own homes, and some for those who left and are coming back. We
> are trying to find growth strategies that will protect and enhance
> neighborhood livability for existing and new residents and meet other
> goals like providing housing affordable to a variety of existing and
> new folks and minimizing impacts to farms and forest land. It’s a tall
> order so we appreciate your input on these difficult decisions.
>
> The City does have a sidewalk inspector who can assess the issue and
> inform the nearby-property owner of any improvements that are needed,
> the Public Works Maintenance Department can be reached at 541-682-4800
> to take the information about the issue.
> I hope that this helps clarify some questions. If you have additional
> questions or would like to talk further please let me know.
>
> Thank you again for completing the questionnaire,
>
> Heather
>
> Heather O'Donnell
> Senior Planner | City of Eugene Planning
> 541-682-5488
>
> Messages to and from this e-mail address may be available to the
> public under Oregon Public Records Law
>
> From: wayne gaddy [mailto:wayne2007@gmail.com]
> Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 2:08 AM
> To: O'DONNELL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us>
> Subject: response to zoning change
>
> I live at 1945 Oak Street and received your notice of Sept.2 on Sept.13.
> I've been considering how to respond or even whether to because of
> recent experience where your department representative did not tell me
> the truth when I asked three specific questions about what could
> happen with the zoning change. While it was being built another
> representative of your department gave it several waivers that I and my neighbors disagreed with.
> The developer bragged to his workers while it was still being built
> that he flipped it to a California corporation for a quick $300,000
> profit. One of the subcontractors on the project told me it's so
> poorly built that it will start falling apart in ten years as will
> Capstone on which he worked. I should have learned from the broken
> promises of Capstone. Despite that I trusted your department on a
> project that adversely affected my life. I will not make that mistake again.
>
> I suspect I'm wasting my time but I did complete the survey and I will
> give you some input. Regarding option A, most people by their 30s
> want to live in a single family home. I'm very leery of a ban. While
> you say that will only apply to new proposals how long will that last?
> I can see your department deciding in the future that as people die or
> age out of their homes, they must be torn down and replaced with
> multi-family housing. Is there any guarantee that a developer would
> buy the houses on both sides of me and then use city power to get me out of my house?
>
> When the apartment building was built on our block, we homeowners
> found that the assessed value of our property declined. Where is the
> requirement that developers provide compensation for these declines? I
> also think Mike Clark’s motion of several months ago that owners who
> occupied their homes should be able to deny permission to a
> multi-story apartment building being built next to them. Another
> provision I would want to see is that multi-family buildings could not
> be taller than than the tallest owner occupied home withing a block. I
> would be much more supportive of what you want to do if those provisions were made.
>
> For option B, two things stood out. You say "about 14 homes per net acre."
>
> The word "about" gives your department a lot of wiggle room to enable
> developers to increase their wealth at the expense of those of us who
> have to live with the damage they do. If an absolute number were
> attached I could better judge whether I would support the proposal. I
> also don’t know what a net acre is compared to a real acre. What is a
> net acre and is strictly defined by statute? Without those
> clarifications I think you’re being given a blank check to do what you want.
>
> In principle, if we truly do need 1600 more homes, why shouldn’t all
> areas share the burden equally? Why are some homes protected by R-1
> designation and others aren’t? Why are those who own the expensive
> homes protected while those of us of modest incomes in my block and
> the South Willamette special zone designated to absorb the projected
> growth. Oh, affluent and powerful people live in those areas while they don’t live in my area.
>
> I’ll also point out that your department has massive opposition from
> an area that has always voted strongly in support of city money
> requests over the 42 years I’ve lived here. I don’t understand why the
> relevant city departments and the city councilors care so much more
> for future residents who may or may not establish roots here and
> contribute to our community as so many of us in the affected area have
> done. For example, I spent over $1500 to rebuild the sidewalk in front
> of my home although I don’t own it and the city hasn’t inspected my
> block for over 20 years. I did it because the roots of a city owned
> tree had pushed up panels of the sidewalk. On my block is a rental
> owned by a Californian who uses a local property management company
> that has allowed parts of the sidewalk to crumble into potholes.
> That’s one of the differences between having owner occupied homes and absentee owners who the city seems to favor.
>
> Wayne Gaddy
>
> 1945 Oak Street
Yes thank you for taking the time to clarify. While possible zoning changes that may come along may not be to our liking, we just wanted to be assured that we would not lose any of the considerations/protections others in the neighborhood might have due to our being “on the wrong side of the line” in terms of zoning changes. We do believe that infill is a good idea in general and can be beneficial to the neighborhood if done right. Again, Thanks for taking the time to address our issue.

Hello Mr. Gallagher,

I just want to clarify my intent with asking you questions, I had hoped that my questions would help me get you the most accurate answer to your question. I am not trying to be evasive, I am truly trying to get to the crux of the question and in my mind, I needed some clarification such as around what you mean by “rights.”

I completely understand that our availability doesn’t work for everyone, so if it would be helpful to talk later, such as at 5 or 5:30, please let me know and we can schedule a time.

Maybe this is helpful at getting at your questions, although I acknowledge it is lengthy:

You asked whether you can remain zoned R-1. Yes because the letter is not about rezoning your property. A key clarification is that, the potential changes to the R-2 zoning code that you received the letter about are not the same as the South Willamette project: they are not about a rezoning of your property. These options are the result of trying to find other ways to accommodate more housing without relying on key transportation corridors like the South Willamette area planning project and special area zone.

Instead, these options would change the R-2 zoning code regarding the development standards that apply to R-2 zoned property. So, yes, under these options you can stay R-1. The options for changing the R-2 zoning code (if either option were adopted) would affect development on your property IF you decided to rezone to R-2 and you wanted to add more housing. The properties to the west and south of you, like your property, are currently zoned R-1 low density but are on the city’s long range land use plan, the Metro Plan, as Medium Density Residential designation which means they could rezone to R-2. So similarly, the options for changing the R-2 zoning code (if either option were adopted) would affect development on their property if they decided to rezone to R-2 and they wanted to add more housing. If either option were selected, we are also getting feedback on what size of lots should be exempt from these new standards because they feel like infill lots in already developed neighborhoods.

You also asked if you have the same rights (i.e. setback from my property line, solar access, etc.) as other citizens in your neighborhood if you decide to stay R-1 but they rezone. These options we sent the letter about are not about/proposing to rezone anyone’s property so I’m not sure if this question is still applicable. That said, your property is zoned R-1 and medium density residential designation, and so you have the same rights as others that are zoned R-1 and medium density residential designation. The development rights of your property under the zoning code doesn’t change because someone else’s zoning changes, but what they are allowed to do changes given their new zoning (e.g. R-2 allows and
required more density than R-1, there is a higher allowed height in R-2 than R-1, there are different solar setbacks for buildings for an R-1 property vs an R-2 property).

I hope this is helpful at least to some degree,

Heather

From: peter gallagher [mailto:pgallagher321@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 8:01 PM
To: O’DONNELL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us>
Subject: RE: Letter you received regarding R-2 zoning

I am a teacher and I do not have the opportunity to talk in person or really be phone during the day. I think the question is pretty clear and really needs just a yes or no answer. Do I have the choice of remaining zoned R-1 and do I have the same rights as other citizens in my neighborhood if I choose to do so? Frankly, the fact that city planning cannot supply this type of answer is why there is such ill will surrounding h this issue. Thank you t for your time.

From: O’DONNELL Heather M [mailto:Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 1:54 PM
To: peter gallagher
Subject: RE: Letter you received regarding R-2 zoning

Hello Mr. Gallagher,
I hear what you are saying about the South Willamette process and so in an effort to really get at your question and be more available, would it be helpful for us to discuss it over the phone or in person?

There are some building setbacks and height limits required right now for some zones that are next to R-1 zone. Is the question- Does your property still get the benefit of those additional setbacks and height limits because it is currently zoned R-1, even though it is on the Metro Plan as Medium Density Residential (and therefore is eligible to rezone to R-2)?

I am available most of the week with some exceptions (for instance I’ve got an appointment for the rest of this afternoon). If you are interested, let me know what days and times you have available for a call or an in-person meeting.

Best,
Heather

From: peter gallagher [mailto:pgallagher321@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 24, 2016 11:30 AM
To: O’DONNELL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us>
Subject: RE: Letter you received regarding R-2 zoning

I think we may be reaching clarification here. One of my questions was this, and I’m requesting a concise answer: If my neighbor to the west wants to sell his property and the buyer of that lot (or lots) requests a rezoning to R-2 so that a multi-residential building can be built on the property, while I want to retain my home as is (hopefully as R-1), do I retain the same rights (i.e. setback from my property line, solar access, etc.) that my neighbors who are not being proposed for rezoning have? To be quite frank, the September 19th “conversation,” like the other three events I have attended, have never clarified this concern, as there is no opportunity for actual dialog or any way to get specific questions addressed given the event format. I can assure you this concern is shared by many in our neighborhood. While the answer may lie within the documents offered on the Planning Department’s website, the language is not easy to translate by the average citizen and is quite ambiguous in many instances. I hope I have made my question clear.
Please let me know: do I retain the same rights as other R-1 property owner, or do I lose some rights/ protections due to my properties “potential” for rezoning?

From: O’DONNELL Heather M [mailto:Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us]
Sent: Friday, September 23, 2016 3:04 PM
To: pgallagher321@comcast.net
Subject: Letter you received regarding R-2 zoning

Hello Mr. Gallagher,

I understand you have questions about the letter we sent (see attached). A co-worker passed your email to me, thank you for giving us the opportunity to clarify. My understanding is that you thought the letter was about the city rezoning your property. The city is planning for our housing needs for the next 20 years. Our analysis shows that we have about 600 medium density residential homes that we don’t have enough space for. We are getting feedback on options to help accommodate those homes.

Two of those options include amending the land use regulations (“development standards”) for property that is zoned R-2 medium density residential. You got this letter because your property at 110 E. 31+, while currently zoned R-1 low density, appears designated as Medium Density Residential on the city’s long-range land use plan (The Metro Plan). This means your property may be eligible to rezone to R-2. The city is not proposing to rezone your property, we just wanted to reach as many R-2 property owners (or those with the potential to be R-2 zoning) because they might be interested in potential changes to development standards for the R-2 zone.

These land use development standards (whether they are the standards in the current R-2 zone or the changes being considered in Option A or Option B) are triggered at the time development is proposed for a property by the property owner or future developer. These options are about the city proposing to develop your property or rezone it, nor is the city proposing to retroactively require people to comply with these new standards if they get adopted. This is about standards that would apply in the R-2 zone if and when future development happens on an R-2 zoned land.

If you would like to talk about the two options discussed in the letter or have other questions, please let me know.

Best,
Heather

Heather O’Donnell
Senior Planner | City of Eugene Planning
541-682-5488
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I used to live in a town of 25,000 (state) when the university was in session they had 3 fully stocked grocery stores (real grocery stores, chains) open 24 hrs a day 365 days a year within walking distance of the university. Downtown and SW to Chambers is a food desert. I don't see the time or money how you can meet the needs of families if you have no grocery stores or parks Downtown? It's shameful that in a town of 300,000 (Eugene Springfield) there isn't a grocery store downtown open 24/7 or by the UO.
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How will the property be designated and zoned?
The City's long-range land use plan, the Metro Plan, includes land use designations that indicate the planned use of land throughout the city. The park site is proposed to be a Parks and Open Space designation. At time of UGB expansion, the property will be zoned AG Agriculture with the /UL Urbanizable Land Overlay Zone and will remain zoned as such until the City receives approval for annexation (when development can actually occur). Upon annexation into the city, the site will be rezoned to PL Public Land. Two overlay zones will also be applied to protect the stream channels and to address water quality including the /WR Water Resources Conservation Overlay Zone and the /WQ Water Quality Overlay Zone.

When will the park be developed?
Timing of park development is dependent on funding availability. The City is currently updating our Parks and Recreation System Plan, which will determine projects and priorities for park development throughout the city, including the Santa Clara Community Park. For information about this process, please visit http://www.eugparksandrec.org/. Once both construction and maintenance funds are secured, the City will engage neighborhood residents for input for the actual design of the park.

How do I give feedback on the proposed UGB expansion?
Summer 2016/2017: This summer, there will be several opportunities to learn more and tell us what you think about these options. Beginning in July, the Envision Eugene Team will be hosting a booth at community events throughout the City including several of the Party in the Parks, Sunday Streets, and at First Friday in downtown. Go to envisioneugene.org and see the Get Involved! page for the latest on events and other opportunities.

Fall 2016/Winter 2017- Following the summer outreach, the UGB expansion and full UGB adoption package of materials must go through a formal adoption process anticipated to start in late 2016. Feedback this summer will inform the versions that will go through the formal approval process. This process will include work sessions, public hearings, and an opportunity for public comment before the Eugene and Lane County Planning Commmissions followed by the Eugene City Council and Lane County Board of Commissioners. The City Council will eventually decide on the UGB adoption package.

Need more details?
For more project-specific information on UGB expansion, visit www.eugene-or.gov and see the Adopting Our Urban Growth Boundary page.

August 2016
Proposed Santa Clara UGB Expansion Area

- Proposed UGB Expansion for Future Santa Clara Community Park
- UGB Expansion Boundary
- Urban Growth Boundary (2012)
- Water Bodies

July 2016 Draft

Note: This map is based on incomplete source data, subject to change, and for general reference only.
What is the Santa Clara Community Park?
To fulfill a longstanding need for a community park in the Santa Clara area, the City is proposing to expand the current urban growth boundary (UGB) by 35 acres for a new park adjacent to Madison Middle School (between Wilkes Drive and River Loop 2).

Why a new park in Santa Clara?
Historically, the Santa Clara neighborhood has been underserved by parks and the area does not contain any community parks. Aware of this need for some time, the City has actively searched for the most suitable property to serve this area. After an exhaustive study of suitable land, that was feasible to acquire, the City found none available inside the current urban growth boundary. Because of the lack of available land, an expansion of the urban growth boundary is necessary to bring in land for a community park to serve the Santa Clara community.

Why does the property have to come into the urban growth boundary?
Community parks are intended to provide recreational opportunities, accommodate large group activities, and, typically, include children's play area, basketball courts, open play areas, picnic areas, restrooms, ball fields, pathways and trails, natural areas, on-site vehicle and bicycle parking and transit access. To develop these uses, community parks require urban levels of utilities (including water and sewer) which means they need to already be inside the urban growth boundary before utilities can be extended to the site.
Heather: In preparation for our meeting on Monday, I have identified some topics and questions which need to be addressed to bring more clarity to the 3,776 5+ du goal and the perceived 1,600 du multi-family deficit:

1) Progress towards meeting mf goal:
   a) For 3,776 5+ goal: 4,836 du in 7-8 years of 20 year period, exceeding goal by over 1,000 units
   b) For 6,797 overall mf goal: 5,205 du in 7-8 years of 20 year period, 77% of goal
   c) 5+ Units are 71% of 6,797 mf goal
   d) Did the City find any perceived errors in the data in the spreadsheet Eben submitted?

2) Claimed 1600 Multi-Family Supply Deficit:
   a) Is there any more specific analysis of the claimed 1,600 deficit beyond the flow chart dated 5/22/14, and is there a revision to that flow chart?
   b) The actual claimed deficit is 1,582 units (1,454 in 2014 plus 128 added by the City in 2015), correct?

3) Multi-family Redevelopment:
   a) The City assumed no redevelopment would occur in the City over the 20 years, at least without government assistance such as MUPTE, correct?
   b) The 943 du pipeline redevelopment assumed by the City appears to have consisted of housing for which a permit had been obtained or was under construction, while the 716 unit baseline redevelopment assumed by the City appears to have consisted of planned housing for which the City had knowledge but without a permit application. Is this correct?
   c) To the extent redevelopment has occurred or is planned to occur in the City within the 20 year period, beyond the 1,659 units included as pipeline or baseline redevelopment, those units should be subtracted from the claimed 1,600 deficit, correct?

4) Multi-Family Development on LDR:
   a) It appears the City assumed that 446 multi-family units would be built on LDR land. To the extent that multi-family development or redevelopment occurs or is planned on LDR land beyond the 446 units, those units should be subtracted from the claimed 1,600 deficit, correct?

5) Multi-Family Development on Commercial, Public, General Office, S-WS, etc.:
   a) It appears the City assumed that no development would occur on vacant or partially vacant land with land use classifications of Commercial, Public, General Office, S-WS or similar special planning areas. Is this correct?
   b) Redevelopment on land with such classifications is addressed above under topic 2.
c) To the extent development on vacant or partially vacant Commercial, Public, General Office, S-WS or similar special planning areas has occurred or is planned to occur in the City within the 20 year period, those units should be subtracted from the claimed 1,600 deficit, correct?

6) Density Assumptions:

a) The City uses a land inventory database (BLI) of vacant or partially vacant land capacity showing lots by map lot number, land use classification, zoning, status of existing development, acreage, slope, and elevation, correct? The BLI is updated annually on August 1 of each year, and was also updated on 5/20/13, correct? Where can we get access to the BLI databases and updates from 2011 forward?

b) Density assumptions were apparently made by looking at data from 2001 to 2012. Did the City determine that it had a sufficient number of data points to obtain accurate density assumptions for each combination of then-current use, land use classification, acreage, slope and elevation? Can we get access to the data base used for such assumptions?

c) Does the City consider its slope data to be accurate, given the apparent inaccuracy of slope data in Property Explorer?

d) Does the City agree that development on vacant or partially vacant MDR and HDR land completed since 7/1/12 has occurred at a higher density than assumed in the Eugene Land Model, and does it agree that the MDR and HDR land on which developments have occurred or are planned provides the additional du capacity we identified? See attached spreadsheet. The additional units from capacity beyond that assumed in the Land Model can be deducted from the claimed 1,600 du deficit, correct?

7) Analysis Starting Date:

a) The City appears to use a housing start date of permit applications submitted on or after January 1, 2012, correct? What ordinance, law or standard requires or recommends this starting date? Why did the City use a start date different than the date for determining when a lot changes from being vacant to being developed (permit issue date)? Why is it not logical and appropriate to use a housing start date of certificate of occupancy on or after July 1, 2012, since the goal is to have housing come on line for population growth beginning July 1, 2012? For what period of time is housing considered to be available for new residents, where a permit application is submitted prior to 1/1/12, but the housing is not completed until on or after 7/1/12?

b) It appears that the 5-22-14 flow chart analysis of the “deficit” used an 8/13 BLI to determine available vacant and partially vacant MDR and HDR land capacity, correct?

c) It appears that the City uses the date of the BLI as a start date for determining when housing satisfies the claimed “deficit,” correct?

d) To the extent the City asserts that housing permitted on or after January 1, 2012, through to the latest BLI update, is accounted for by BLI adjustments to the vacant or partially vacant land capacity, how are the units which reduced that capacity accounted for in the claimed 1,600 du deficit? If development reduces the land capacity during the 20 year period, should not the units reducing the capacity be counted against the claimed 1,600 deficit? You indicated that the BLI was updated to change Vacant lots with addresses (e.g. building permits) on 5/20/13 to Developed. Does this mean that all developments with permits applied for on or after 1/1/12 with the permit issued on or before 5/20/13 are deleted from the capacity but not deleted from the “deficit”? For example, was the land in Heritage Meadows (12-2466-01) deducted from supply to get the vacant and partially vacant land capacity used in the 1,600 deficit analysis, where the permit application was submitted after 1/1/12, but the project was completed before the 5/20/13 and 8/13 BLIs? How were the 149 units in Heritage Meadows treated in the 1,600 deficit analysis?

Lloyd Helikson

Comprehensive Plan Questions

1. Inclusion of Developed Land Likely to Be Redeveloped

Does the Eugene BLI and Land Model include developed land likely to be redeveloped pursuant to ORS 197.295(1), or lands that may be used for residential infill or redevelopment pursuant to 197.296(4)(D)? See OAR 660-024-0050(1). Is this land included in the 1,600 mf deficit analysis?

2. Planning Start Date

ORS 197.296(2) provides that the 20-year period shall commence on the date initially scheduled for completion of the periodic or legislative review. OAR 660-024-0040(2) provides that the 20-year planning period must commence on the date initially scheduled for completion of the appropriate work task, and that if the UGB analysis or amendment is conducted as a post-acknowledgement plan amendment, the 20-year period must commence either on the date initially scheduled for final adoption of the amendment specified by the local government in the initial notice or the start of the 20-year population forecast, whichever is later. When did the 20-year period commence for Eugene’s planning, and what is the supporting documentation?

3. Use of Certificate of Occupancy Date Pre and Post Planning Start Date

ORS 197.296(5)(a) and (b) provide that the determination of housing capacity and need must be based on data which shall include: (A) The number, density and average mix of housing types of urban residential development that have actually occurred; (B) Trends in density and average mix of housing types of urban residential development; and ** (E) The number, density and average mix of housing types that have occurred on the buildable lands.

Development does not "actually occur" or "occur" until a certificate of occupancy is issued. If the data for planning purposes is required to be based upon development which has actually occurred prior to the commencement of the 20-year planning period, then the same standard needs to be applied to development after the commencement of the period. Otherwise, there is a missing gap of development not considered at all, namely development with permit applications submitted prior to the start of the 20-year period and certificates of occupancy issued after the start of the 20-year period.

OAR 660-024-0040(4) provides that the determination of 20-year residential land needs for an urban area must be consistent with the appropriate 20-year coordinated population forecast. The two can only be consistent where the residential land needs analysis accounts for development after commencement of the 20-year period which actually occurs (certificate of occupancy) so as to be available for the new residents included in the 20-year population forecast.

4. Pre Planning Period Time Frame for Determining Plan Density

ORS 197.296(5)(a) and (b) provide that the determination of housing capacity and need pursuant to subsection (3) of this section must be based on data relating to land within the urban growth boundary that has been collected since the last periodic review or five years, whichever is greater. The data shall include: (A) The number, density and average mix of housing types of urban residential development that have actually occurred; (B) Trends in density and average mix of housing types of urban residential development; ** (E) The number, density and average mix of housing types that have occurred on the buildable lands described in subsection (4)(a) of this section. The local government may use a shorter time period of not less than three years if it finds that using such data will provide more accurate and reliable data related to housing capacity and need.
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ORS 197.296(5)(c) provides that a local government shall use data from a wider geographic area or use a time period for economic cycles and trends longer than the time period described in paragraph (a) of this subsection if the analysis of a wider geographic area or the use of a longer time period will provide more accurate, complete and reliable data relating to trends affecting housing need than an analysis performed pursuant to paragraph (a) of this subsection. The local government must clearly describe the geographic area, time frame and source of data used in a determination performed under this paragraph.

When was the last periodic review for the City of Eugene? Did the City of Eugene use density and other data from prior to the last periodic review in the Land Model? Did the City choose to use a longer period? Why did the City not choose a shorter time for the data since the multi-family development happened at a much greater rate and at a higher density after 2008? Has the City documented the choice and rationale for the time period of the data used to determine housing capacity and need, including the number, density and average mix of housing types which have actually occurred?

5. Safe Harbors For Determining Plan Density

OAR 660-024-0040(f)(g)(h) & (i) provide housing density and housing mix safe harbors. The Incremental Housing Density safe harbor allows increasing the actual density data by 25%. Is the City using any of these safe harbors and if not, why not?

6. Use of Density Trends for Determining Plan Density

ORS 197.296(5)(a) authorizes use of actual density data as well as “trends in density and average mix of housing types.” Did the City consider using trends in density as reflected in actual significantly higher multi-family density occurring between 2009 and 2016?

7. 2.24 People/Dwelling Assumption

Where did the 2.24 people/dwelling come from; what is the factual basis used by the City?

"Based on continuation of 2007 data, holding steady what otherwise has been a slow decline."

US Census provides: Persons per household, 2010-2014 - 2.30 (393 less units)
Hi Heather and Stephanie,

Thanks for passing along this inquiry. I spoke to both Terry and Nora in my office about these changes. We fully admit that we can't fully predict how these changes will impact affordable housing, but I will share the thoughts/ideas/reactions we had.

A general overarching comment—we've said over and over how difficult it is to find land to develop for affordable housing. The planner/community member side of me/us understands and supports the need to increase density in targeted areas. However, the 'economist' side of me wonders if focusing on this—increasing density and the existence of incentives—that increases the value of land making it difficult for affordable housing developers to get at all, or if we can access it, making it more expensive than it currently is.

For us, I think that reinforces the need or even greater need for the City Land Acquisition program as well as thinking of other creative ways for affordable housing providers to access flexible funds for acquisition of land.

This isn't a new issue that affordable housing developers have a hard time competing with market rate developers to acquire land, but I think these changes and the fact that there is just less available will keep exacerbating this dynamic.

More comments about each item are below.

Hopefully these will make sense—I'm heading out on vacation tomorrow (so my thoughts are kind of scattered), but let me know if you have questions/clarifications.

Thanks,
Kristen

Kristen Karle
St. Vincent de Paul Society of Lane County, Inc.
PO Box 24608
Eugene, OR 97402
P: 541.743.7152
F: 541.683.9423
Hello Affordable Housing Provider,

We need your input on strategies being considered to accommodate our multi-family housing needs in the future. If possible, please provide your comments by Thursday Oct 6th.

Background: Envision Eugene is our collective vision for how we will grow over the next 20 years while preserving what we love about our community. Eugene is expected to add about 15,100 new homes in 20 years. Our five years of work shows we have room across Eugene for most of these homes, we just need to find space for about 1,600 remaining homes (1,000 high density and 600 medium density). We all care about our neighborhoods and long-term livability. So we need your feedback on the options for accommodating these remaining homes. The input on these options along with other input received will help inform City Council’s decision in the fall on which housing strategies to adopt.

*If you would like more background, here’s a video overview of Multi-family Housing Options (3+ minutes).

Key Question: We would like to know how you think the following changes would affect development of affordable housing in Eugene.

1. **High Density Residential HDR Downtown Redevelopment Strategy**: Accommodate our remaining high density housing need (1,000 dwellings) downtown through existing programs (dedicated City staff support) and development financial incentives (such as the Multiple Unit Property Tax Exemption (MUPTE) program).

   We all think this is the direction that the City should be headed and support this as the #1 priority. The existing programs listed don’t benefit affordable housing developers (we have our own property tax abatement). Again, as said above, the issue would be accessing land. Terry emphasized that we and the City should work on developing relationships with downtown landowners who have parcels that are underdeveloped (specifically some of the churches) to establish interest and ability to acquire (and plan to acquire) parcels if and when parties are ready to sell.

2. **Medium Density Residential- OPTION A**: Amend the zoning code to preserve the R-2 medium density residential zone for attached housing (this would result in detached single-family housing being prohibited in these zones).

   This doesn’t directly seem to change anything we actually build. Again, this just gets back to I think this will increase the value of R2 land and thus decrease our ability to access/afford.

3. **Medium Density Residential- OPTION B**: Amend the zoning code to increase the minimum number of homes required in R-2 medium density residential zones from 10 to about 14 homes per net acre. (“net” acre means the site acreage excluding things like roads and parks).

   This doesn’t directly seem to change anything we actually build. Again, this just gets back to I think this will increase the value of R2 land and thus decrease our ability to access/afford. While I would hope this would enable us to build more units on R-2 land that we did acquire, I would also add that because of the public scrutiny/process involved with affordable housing, I’m not sure if we could take full advantage of increased density minimums.

   (these two are the ones that I’m most curious about/am most unsure how it will impact the market).

4. **Key Corridors Strategy**: Increase housing density along key transportation corridors and core commercial areas throughout the city. Most of the land in these areas is already zoned to allow higher density housing and is already developed. In order to see more housing occur in these places to fit the 1,600 high and medium density homes, analysis indicates that financial incentives would need to be applied to these areas. An existing financial tool which could be
expanded along one or more corridors is the Multiple Unit Property Tax Exemption (MUPTE) program which can enable redevelopment of an already developed site to add housing.

We agree with this strategy for development in general and again, accessing the land for affordable housing is a challenge. One area that we hope sees more redevelopment in general is the W.11th between Chambers and Garfield.

5. Would you support exempting smaller lots from the new Medium Density Residential Option A or Option B standards (such as lots that are .5 acre or less in size)?

Not sure. Don’t feel strongly either way.

6. Are there any other strategies that you think we should consider to meet our multi-family housing needs?

For development in general (not necessarily focused on affordable housing), we were discussing how we kind of like what has happened at 28th and Friendly...we like those little nodes in neighborhoods...some already have housing—and some don’t and could (like 19th and Jefferson—there is the Amazon Mkt, restaurant, and offices across the street—it would be nice if they had some housing above).

7. Is there anything else you feel is important to consider?

I think this might already be happening, but the City should make it easier/cheaper for homeowners to have ADUs/SDUs in their backyards. I’m sure you know all the arguments for/against, but I think they can meet some of the needs for moderate income housing.

Thank you so much for your important input. Feel free to contact me if you have questions or to provide comments that way.

P.S. If you are interested in diving into the details more on these issues, here’s a link to the Multi-family Housing Options page which includes a fact sheet, infographics, draft code language for option a and b, and other background materials.

Heather O'Donnell
Senior Planner | City of Eugene Planning
541-682-5486

Messages to and from this e-mail address may be available to the public under Oregon Public Records Law.
O’DONNELL Heather M

From: Kristen Karle <kristen.karle@svdp.us>
Sent: Tuesday, October 04, 2016 1:02 PM
To: O’DONNELL Heather M; JENNINGS Stephanie A
Subject: RE: Envision Eugene questions for affordable housing providers

Thanks...again, we don’t want to pretend we know if/how these changes could impact the market—these were just things we thought might be possibilities.

Thanks for all your work on this huge project!!

---

From: O’DONNELL Heather M [mailto:Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us]
Sent: Tuesday, October 04, 2016 12:59 PM
To: Kristen Karle; JENNINGS Stephanie A
Subject: RE: Envision Eugene questions for affordable housing providers

Hi Kristen,
Thank you (and Terry and Nora) for your input. We appreciate your time and comments and cautions.

Have a great vacation!

Heather

---

From: Kristen Karle [mailto:kristen.karle@svdp.us]
Sent: Tuesday, October 04, 2016 11:27 AM
To: JENNINGS Stephanie A <Stephanie.A.Jennings@ci.eugene.or.us>; O’DONNELL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us>
Subject: RE: Envision Eugene questions for affordable housing providers

Hi Heather and Stephanie,

Thanks for passing along this inquiry. I spoke to both Terry and Nora in my office about these changes. We fully admit that we can’t fully predict how these changes will impact affordable housing, but I will share the thoughts/ideas/reactions we had.

A general overarching comment—we’ve said over and over how difficult it is to find land to develop for affordable housing. The planner/community member side of me/us understands and supports the need to increase density in targeted areas. However, the ‘economist’ side of me wonders if focusing on this—increasing density and the existence of incentives—that increases the value of land making it difficult for affordable housing developers to get at all, or if we can access it, making it more expensive than it currently is.

For us, I think that reinforces the need or even greater need for the City Land Acquisition program as well as thinking of other creative ways for affordable housing providers to access flexible funds for acquisition of land.

This isn’t a new issue that affordable housing developers have a hard time competing with market rate developers to acquire land, but I think these changes and the fact that there is just less available will keep exacerbating this dynamic.

More comments about each item are below.
Hopefully these will make sense—I’m heading out on vacation tomorrow (so my thoughts are kind of scattered), but let me know if you have questions/clarifications.

Thanks,
Kristen

Kristen Karle
St. Vincent de Paul Society of Lane County, Inc.
PO Box 24608
Eugene, OR 97402
P: 541.743.7152
F: 541.683.9423

From: O’DONNELL Heather M
Sent: Thursday, September 29, 2016 1:44 PM
To: JENNINGS Stephanie A <Stephanie.A.Jennings@ci.eugene.or.us>
Cc: HARDING Terri L <Terri.L.Harding@ci.eugene.or.us>
Subject: questions for affordable housing providers

Hello Affordable Housing Provider,

We need your input on strategies being considered to accommodate our multi-family housing needs in the future. If possible, please provide your comments by Thursday Oct 6th.

Background: Envision Eugene is our collective vision for how we will grow over the next 20 years while preserving what we love about our community. Eugene is expected to add about 15,100 new homes in 20 years. Our five years of work shows we have room across Eugene for most of these homes, we just need to find space for about 1,600 remaining homes (1,000 high density and 600 medium density). We all care about our neighborhoods and long-term livability. So we need your feedback on the options for accommodating these remaining homes. The input on these options along with other input received will help inform City Council’s decision in the fall on which housing strategies to adopt.

*If you would like more background, here’s a video overview of Multi-family Housing Options (3+ minutes).

Key Question: We would like to know how you think the following changes would affect development of affordable housing in Eugene.

1. **High Density Residential HDR Downtown Redevelopment Strategy**: Accommodate our remaining high density housing need (1,000 dwellings) downtown through existing programs (dedicated City staff support) and development financial incentives (such as the Multiple Unit Property Tax Exemption (MUPTE) program).

We all think this is the direction that the City should be headed and support this as the #1 priority. The existing programs listed don’t benefit affordable housing developers (we have our own property tax abatement). Again, as said above, the issue would be accessing land. Terry emphasized that we and the City should work on developing relationships with downtown landowners who have parcels that are underdeveloped (specifically some of the churches) to establish interest and ability to acquire (and plan to acquire) parcels if and when parties are ready to sell.
2. **Medium Density Residential- OPTION A**: Amend the zoning code to preserve the R-2 medium density residential zone for attached housing (this would result in detached single-family housing being prohibited in these zones).

This doesn’t directly seem to change anything we actually build. Again, this just gets back to I think this will increase the value of R2 land and thus decrease our ability to access/afford.

3. **Medium Density Residential- OPTION B**: Amend the zoning code to increase the minimum number of homes required in R-2 medium density residential zones from 10 to about 14 homes per net acre. (“net” acre means the site acreage excluding things like roads and parks).

This doesn’t directly seem to change anything we actually build. Again, this just gets back to I think this will increase the value of R2 land and thus decrease our ability to access/afford. While I would hope this would enable us to build more units on R-2 land that we did acquire, I would also add that because of the public scrutiny/process involved with affordable housing, I’m not sure if we could take full advantage of increased density minimums.

(these two are the ones that I’m most curious about/am most unsure how it will impact the market).

4. **Key Corridors Strategy**: Increase housing density along key transportation corridors and core commercial areas throughout the city. Most of the land in these areas is already zoned to allow higher density housing and is already developed. In order to see more housing occur in these places to fit the 1,600 high and medium density homes, analysis indicates that financial incentives would need to be applied to these areas. An existing financial tool which could be expanded along one or more corridors is the Multiple Unit Property Tax Exemption (MUPTE) program which can enable redevelopment of an already developed site to add housing.

We agree with this strategy for development in general and again, accessing the land for affordable housing is a challenge. One area that we hope sees more redevelopment in general is the W.11th between Chambers and Garfield.

5. **Would you support exempting smaller lots from the new Medium Density Residential Option A or Option B standards** (such as lots that are .5 acre or less in size)?

Not sure. Don’t feel strongly either way.

6. **Are there any other strategies that you think we should consider to meet our multi-family housing needs?**

For development in general (not necessarily focused on affordable housing), we were discussing how we kind of like what has happened at 28th and Friendly...we like those little nodes in neighborhoods...some already have housing—and some don’t and could (like 19th and Jefferson)—there is the Amazon Mkt, restaurant, and offices across the street—it would be nice if they had some housing above).

7. **Is there anything else you feel is important to consider?**

I think this might already be happening, but the City should make it easier/cheaper for homeowners to have ADUs/SDUs in their backyards. I’m sure you know all the arguments for/against, but I think they can meet some of the needs for moderate income housing.

Thank you so much for your important input. Feel free to contact me if you have questions or to provide comments that way.

P.S. If you are interested in diving into the details more on these issues, here’s a link to the Multi-family Housing Options page which includes a fact sheet, infographics, draft code language for option a and b, and other background materials.
Heather O'Donnell
Senior Planner | City of Eugene Planning
541-682-5468

Messages to and from this e-mail address may be available to the public under Oregon Public Records Law.
Thanks Heather!

Eben Fodor
Fodor & Associates LLC
Eugene, OR
541-345-8246
www.fodorandassociates.com

Hi Eben,
Thanks, I’m glad to say I’m on the mend.

When the TRG was active we updated the land model regularly to reflect any completed analysis so it the land model had been updated several times since the July 2013 version. The version I sent the link to is the most recent version with the caveats I stated about the estimates that are currently under review; once the multi-family housing deficit is resolved then we’ll update the spreadsheet again with that information.

I remember Robin asking if the multi-family housing that had happened was student housing or MUPTE, I think this was particularly around redevelopment.

Attached is the density data.

Thanks also for meeting and talking about the concerns the three of you have raised.

Best,
Heather
Hope you are feeling better. Thanks for sending the link to the Land Model. I had previously been looking at a version of the land model which was labeled “Eugene Land Model_2012Update_ExistingCapacityFinal_July2013_201403251408063398.xlsx” and had assumed it was final. I will assume the version you linked to is more recent and will use that going forward.

I will send you summary data on the share of MF development that was MUPTE subsidized (compiled by Lloyd). I think that is what Robin asked about. If it was something else, let me know.

Thanks for agreeing to share with us your data used to calculate actual densities from 2001 to 2012. If you have this pre and post 2008, that would be great, as we believe more recent data shows higher density, and that this is a trend which continues in our 2012-16 data.

Eben

Eben Fodor
Fodor & Associates LLC
Eugene, OR
541-345-8246
www.fodorandassociates.com

From: O'DONNELL Heather M [mailto:Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us]
Sent: Monday, October 03, 2016 1:40 PM
To: Lloyd Helikson; HARDING Terri L; HOSTICK Robin A
Cc: FODOR Eben (SMTP); ASPEGREN Bill (SMTP); Christine L. Sundt
Subject: Re: Meeting Topics

Hello Lloyd,

Following up from our meeting today, here is where the TRG spreadsheet is that shows the assumptions about demand and incorporates in the acres from the BLI:
and the spreadsheet is called this:
Eugene Land model - 2012 Update- LDR Update- Feb 2015 Revised Recommendation(2) (Feb 2015)*

The spreadsheets are meant to be walked through in order, starting with the assumptions sheet.

Assumptions sheet:
Table 3a, net density assumptions
These get converted to gross density assumptions using the assumptions in table 3B

Residential Sheet:
Residential table 3 shows the resulting gross densities applied to the land supply.
Acres from the BLI are in table 4
Estimated capacity is in table 5a (vacant land), 5b (partially vacant), 5c (baseline redevelopment)

Pre-policy sheet:
Table 23 shows the remaining deficit or surplus before efficiency measures. It also accounts for the capacity used up by demand for other uses (e.g. public, group quarters).

Efficiency strategies sheet:

2
Table 24 shows the amount of jobs/dwellings we are estimating capacity is created for through efficiency strategies (the amount shown for "interventions" and naval reserve re-designations are the amount that we are trying to find now). Table 26 shows the remaining deficit or surplus after capacity from efficiency strategies are applied, but keep in mind that it’s showing no deficit for MDR or HDR because this is the last version of spreadsheet that was done when the approach was to make up the MDR and HDR deficit through interventions.

I’ll follow-up with the density information hopefully tomorrow when I’m back at work.
Best,
Heather

Envision Eugene Technical Resource Group | Eugene, OR Website

www.eugene-or.gov

Technical Resource Group (TRG) Meetings and Documents The TRG is no longer meeting regularly. Some TRG work may occur on an as needed basis and that work will still ...

---

From: Lloyd Helikson <lhelikson@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 30, 2016 12:25:58 AM
To: O’DONNELL Heather M; HARDING Terri L; HOSTICK Robin A
Cc: FODOR Eben (SMTP); ASPEGREN Bill (SMTP); Christine L. Sundt
Subject: Meeting Topics

Heather: In preparation for our meeting on Monday, I have identified some topics and questions which need to be addressed to bring more clarity to the 3,776 5+ du goal and the perceived 1,600 du multi-family deficit:

1) Progress towards meeting mf goal:

a) For 3,776 5+ goal: 4, 836 du in 7-8 years of 20 year period, exceeding goal by over 1,000 units
b) For 6,797 overall mf goal: 5,205 du in 7-8 years of 20 year period, 77% of goal
c) 5+ Units are 71% of 6,797 mf goal
d) Did the City find any perceived errors in the data in the spreadsheet Eben submitted?

2) Claimed 1600 Multi-Family Supply Deficit:
a) Is there any more specific analysis of the claimed 1,600 deficit beyond the flow chart dated 5/22/14, and is there a revision to that flow chart?  
b) The actual claimed deficit is 1,582 units (1,454 in 2014 plus 128 added by the City in 2015), correct?  

3) Multi-family Redevelopment:

a) The City assumed no redevelopment would occur in the City over the 20 years, at least without government assistance such as MUPTE, correct?  
b) The 943 du pipeline redevelopment assumed by the City appears to have consisted of housing for which a permit had been obtained or was under construction, while the 716 unit baseline redevelopment assumed by the City appears to have consisted of planned housing for which the City had knowledge but without a permit application. Is this correct?  
c) To the extent redevelopment has occurred or is planned to occur in the City within the 20 year period, beyond the 1,659 units included as pipeline or baseline redevelopment, those units should be subtracted from the claimed 1,600 deficit, correct?  

4) Multi-Family Development on LDR:

a) It appears the City assumed that 446 multi-family units would be built on LDR land. To the extent that multi-family development or redevelopment occurs or is planned on LDR land beyond the 446 units, those units should be subtracted from the claimed 1,600 deficit, correct?  

5) Multi-Family Development on Commercial, Public, General Office, S-WS, etc.:

a) It appears the City assumed that no development would occur on vacant or partially vacant land with land use classifications of Commercial, Public, General Office, S-WS or similar special planning areas. Is this correct?  
b) Redevelopment on land with such classifications is addressed above under topic 2.  
c) To the extent development on vacant or partially vacant Commercial, Public, General Office, S-WS or similar special planning areas has occurred or is planned to occur in the City within the 20 year period, those units should be subtracted from the claimed 1,600 deficit, correct?  

6) Density Assumptions:

a) The City uses a land inventory database (BLI) of vacant or partially vacant land capacity showing lots by map lot number, land use classification, zoning, status of existing development, acreage, slope, and elevation, correct? The BLI is updated annually on August 1 of each year, and was also updated on 5/20/13, correct? Where can we get access to the BLI databases and updates from 2011 forward?  
b) Density assumptions were apparently made by looking at data from 2001 to 2012. Did the City determine that it had a sufficient number of data points to obtain accurate density assumptions for each combination of then-current use, land use classification, acreage, slope and elevation? Can we get access to the data base used for such assumptions?  
c) Does the City consider its slope data to be accurate, given the apparent inaccuracy of slope data in Property Explorer?  
d) Does the City agree that development on vacant or partially vacant MDR and HDR land completed since 7/1/12 has occurred at a higher density than assumed in the Eugene Land Model, and does it agree that the MDR and HDR land on which developments have occurred or are planned provides the additional du capacity
we identified? See attached spreadsheet. The additional units from capacity beyond that assumed in the Land Model can be deducted from the claimed 1,600 du deficit, correct?

7) Analysis Starting Date:

a) The City appears to use a housing start date of permit applications submitted on or after January 1, 2012, correct? What ordinance, law or standard requires or recommends this starting date? Why did the City use a start date different than the date for determining when a lot changes from being vacant to being developed (permit issue date)? Why is it not logical and appropriate to use a housing start date of certificate of occupancy on or after July 1, 2012, since the goal is to have housing come on line for population growth beginning July 1, 2012? For what period of time is housing considered to be available for new residents, where a permit application is submitted prior to 1/1/12, but the housing is not completed until on or after 7/1/12?

b) It appears that the 5-22-14 flow chart analysis of the “deficit” used an 8/1/13 3LI to determine available vacant and partially vacant MDR and HDR land capacity, correct?

c) It appears that the City uses the date of the BLI as a start date for determining when housing satisfies the claimed “deficit,” correct?

d) To the extent the City asserts that housing permitted on or after January 1, 2012, through to the latest BLI update, is accounted for by BLI adjustments to the vacant or partially vacant land capacity, how are the units which reduced that capacity accounted for in the claimed 1,600 du deficit? If development reduces the land capacity during the 20 year period, should not the units reducing the capacity be counted against the claimed 1,600 deficit? You indicated that the BLI was updated to change Vacant lots with addresses (e.g. building permits) on 5/20/13 to Developed. Does this mean that all developments with permits applied for on or after 1/1/12 with the permit issued on or before 5/20/13 are deleted from the capacity but not deleted from the “deficit”? For example, was the land in Heritage Meadows (12-2466-01) deducted from supply to get the vacant and partially vacant land capacity used in the 1,600 deficit analysis, where the permit application was submitted after 1/1/12, but the project was completed before the 5/20/13 and 8/1/13 BLIs? How were the 149 units in Heritage Meadows treated in the 1,600 deficit analysis?

Lloyd Helikson
Heather: I have the following followup Questions to our meeting on October 3. We need to get answers, including the 2001-2008, 2008-2012 density breakdown, as soon as possible with the Council meeting only one week away:

1) What was the date initially scheduled for completion of the periodic or legislative review pursuant to ORS 197.296(2)?

2) What was the time period start and stop dates for the 20 year planning density assumptions, and was it based upon permit application date, permit issue date or certificate of occupancy?

3) What will be the time period start and stop dates for the 20 year planning density assumptions divided between 2001-2008 and 2008-2012, in the set you will be providing to us, and was it based upon permit application date, permit issue date or certificate of occupancy? When will you be able to get this set to us?

4) What other parameters were used for the density assumptions? How did you treat land use classifications? Where did you get your slope data? Where did you get your acreage data? Do you have a listing or database of developments used to establish the density assumptions?

5) Is it correct that the City assumed no redevelopment beyond the 1,659 units listed as pipeline and baseline redevelopment?

6) I understand that the City assumed 256 units of development on commercial land? Our data shows 1160 5+ mf units on Commercial.

7) Is it correct that the City assumed 446 mf units on LDR? Our data shows 559 mf units on LDR.

8) Is it correct that there was no appreciable change in the acreage of vacant or partially vacant land between the 8/1/12 BLI and the 5/20/13 BLI, and in fact such land increased?

9) Who is the City’s comprehensive plan consultant you mentioned? Is there a plan guide you are following beyond the statutes and rules? If so, I would like to access that?

Thank you.

Lloyd Helikson
Heather: Thank you for the density information. It does not appear to be broken out the way it was in Residential, Table 3 of the Land Model (by land classification, acreage, slope and elevation), for total and then 2001-2008 and 2009-2012. Hopefully you can respond to my email questions including as to the density starting and stopping dates, and whether you used permit app date, permit issue date or certificate of occupancy.

Thanks.

Lloyd Helikson

On Oct 5, 2016, at 1:21 PM, O'DONNELL Heather M <Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us> wrote:

Hi Eben,
Thanks, I'm glad to say I'm on the mend.

When the TRG was active we updated the land model regularly to reflect any completed analysis so it the land model had been updated several times since the July 2013 version. The version I sent the link to is the most recent version with the caveats I stated about the estimates that are currently under review; once the multi-family housing deficit is resolved then we'll update the spreadsheet again with that information.

I remember Robin asking if the multi-family housing that had happened was student housing or MUPTE, I think this was particularly around redevelopers.

Attached is the density data.

Thanks also for meeting and talking about the concerns the three of you have raised.

Best,
Heather
Hope you are feeling better. Thanks for sending the link to the Land Model. I had previously been looking at a version of the land model which was labeled “Eugene Land Model_2012Update_ExistingCapacityFinal_July2013_201403251408083398.xlsx” and had assumed it was final. I will assume the version you linked to is more recent and will use that going forward.

I will send you summary data on the share of MF development that was MUPTE subsidized (compiled by Lloyd). I think that is what Robin asked about. If it was something else, let me know.

Thanks for agreeing to share with us your data used to calculate actual densities from 2001 to 2012. If you have this pre and post 2008, that would be great, as we believe more recent data shows higher density, and that this is a trend which continues in our 2012-16 data.

Eben

Eben Fodor
Fodor & Associates LLC
Eugene, OR
541-345-8246
www.fodorandassociates.com

---

From: O’DONNELL Heather M [mailto:Heather.M.ODonnell@ci.eugene.or.us]
Sent: Monday, October 03, 2016 1:40 PM
To: Lloyd Helikson; HARDING Terri L; HOSTICK Robin A
Cc: FODOR Eben (SMTP); ASPEGREN Bill (SMTP); Christine L. Sundt
Subject: Re: Meeting Topics

Hello Lloyd,
Following up from our meeting today, here is where the TRG spreadsheet is that shows the assumptions about demand and incorporates in the acres from the BLI:
and the spreadsheet is called this:
Eugene Land model - 2012 Update- LDR Update- Feb 2015 Revised Recommendation(2) (Feb 2015)*

The spreadsheets are meant to be walked through in order, starting with the assumptions sheet.

Assumptions sheet:
Table 3a, net density assumptions
These get converted to gross density assumptions using the assumptions in table 3B

Residential Sheet:
Residential table 3 shows the resulting gross densities applied to the land supply.
Acres from the BLI are in table 4
Estimated capacity is in table 5a (vacant land), 5b (partially vacant), 5c (baseline redevelopment)

Pre-policy sheet:

---

2
Table 23 shows the remaining deficit or surplus before efficiency measures. It also accounts for the capacity used up by demand for other uses (e.g. public, group quarters).

Efficiency strategies sheet:
Table 24 shows the amount of jobs/dwellings we are estimating capacity is created for through efficiency strategies (the amount shown for "interventions" and naval reserve re-designations are the amount that we are trying to find now).
Table 26 shows the remaining deficit or surplus after capacity from efficiency strategies are applied, but keep in mind that it’s showing no deficit for MDR or HDR because this is the last version of spreadsheet that was done when the approach was to make up the MDR and HDR deficit through interventions.

I’ll follow-up with the density information hopefully tomorrow when I’m back at work.
Best,
Heather

---

From: Lloyd Helikson <lhelikson@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 30, 2016 12:25:58 AM
To: O’DONNELL Heather M; HARDING Terri L; HOSTICK Robin A
Cc: FODOR Eben (SMTP); ASPEGREN Bill (SMTP); Christine L. Sundt
Subject: Meeting Topics

Heather: In preparation for our meeting on Monday, I have identified some topics and questions which need to be addressed to bring more clarity to the 3,776 5+ du goal and the perceived 1,600 du multi-family deficit:

1) **Progress towards meeting mf goal:**

a) For 3,776 5+ goal: 4,836 du in 7-8 years of 20 year period, exceeding goal by over 1,000 units
b) For 6,797 overall mf goal: 5,205 du in 7-8 years of 20 year period, 77% of goal
c) 5+ Units are 71% of 6,797 mf goal

d) Did the City find any perceived errors in the data in the spreadsheet Eben submitted?

2) Claimed 1600 Multi-Family Supply Deficit:

a) Is there any more specific analysis of the claimed 1,600 deficit beyond the flow chart dated 5/22/14, and is there a revision to that flow chart?

b) The actual claimed deficit is 1,582 units (1,454 in 2014 plus 128 added by the City in 2015), correct?

3) Multi-family Redevelopment:

a) The City assumed no redevelopment would occur in the City over the 20 years, at least without government assistance such as MUPTE, correct?

b) The 943 du pipeline redevelopment assumed by the City appears to have consisted of housing for which a permit had been obtained or was under construction, while the 716 unit baseline redevelopment assumed by the City appears to have consisted of planned housing for which the City had knowledge but without a permit application. Is this correct?

c) To the extent redevelopment has occurred or is planned to occur in the City within the 20 year period, beyond the 1,659 units included as pipeline or baseline redevelopment, those units should be subtracted from the claimed 1,600 deficit, correct?

4) Multi-Family Development on LDR:

a) It appears the City assumed that 446 multi-family units would be built on LDR land. To the extent that multi-family development or redevelopment occurs or is planned on LDR land beyond the 446 units, those units should be subtracted from the claimed 1,600 deficit, correct?

5) Multi-Family Development on Commercial, Public, General Office, S-WS, etc.:

a) It appears the City assumed that no development would occur on vacant or partially vacant land with land use classifications of Commercial, Public, General Office, S-WS or similar special planning areas. Is this correct?

b) Redevelopment on land with such classifications is addressed above under topic 2.

c) To the extent development on vacant or partially vacant Commercial, Public, General Office, S-WS or similar special planning areas has occurred or is planned to occur in the City within the 20 year period, those units should be subtracted from the claimed 1,600 deficit, correct?

6) Density Assumptions:

a) The City uses a land inventory data base (BLI) of vacant or partially vacant land capacity showing lots by map lot number, land use classification, zoning, status of existing development, acreage, slope, and elevation, correct? The BLI is updated annually on August 1 of each year, and was also updated on 5/20/13, correct? Where can we get access to the BLI databases and updates from 2011 forward?

b) Density assumptions were apparently made by looking at data from 2001 to 2012. Did the City determine that it had a sufficient number of data points to obtain accurate density
assumptions for each combination of then-current use, land use classification, acreage, slope and elevation? Can we get access to the data base used for such assumptions?
c) Does the City consider its slope data to be accurate, given the apparent inaccuracy of slope data in Property Explorer?
d) Does the City agree that development on vacant or partially vacant MDR and HDR land completed since 7/1/12 has occurred at a higher density than assumed in the Eugene Land Model, and does it agree that the MDR and HDR land on which developments have occurred or are planned provides the additional du capacity we identified? See attached spreadsheet. The additional units from capacity beyond that assumed in the Land Model can be deducted from the claimed 1,600 du deficit, correct?

7) Analysis Starting Date:

a) The City appears to use a housing start date of permit applications submitted on or after January 1, 2012, correct? What ordinance, law or standard requires or recommends this starting date? Why did the City use a start date different than the date for determining when a lot changes from being vacant to being developed (permit issue date)? Why is it not logical and appropriate to use a housing start date of certificate of occupancy on or after July 1, 2012, since the goal is to have housing come on line for population growth beginning July 1, 2012? For what period of time is housing considered to be available for new residents, where a permit application is submitted prior to 1/1/12, but the housing is not completed until on or after 7/1/12?
b) It appears that the 5-22-14 flow chart analysis of the “deficit” used an 3/1/13 BLI to determine available vacant and partially vacant MDR and HDR land capacity, correct?
c) It appears that the City uses the date of the BLI as a start date for determining when housing satisfies the claimed “deficit,” correct?
d) To the extent the City asserts that housing permitted on or after January 1, 2012, through to the latest BLI update, is accounted for by BLI adjustments to the vacant or partially vacant land capacity, how are the units which reduced that capacity accounted for in the claimed 1,600 du deficit? If development reduces the land capacity during the 20 year period, should not the units reducing the capacity be counted against the claimed 1,600 deficit? You indicated that the BLI was updated to change Vacant lots with addresses (e.g. building permits) on 5/20/13 to Developed. Does this mean that all developments with permits applied for on or after 1/1/12 with the permit issued on or before 5/20/13 are deleted from the capacity but not deleted from the “deficit”? For example, was the land in Heritage Meadows (12-2466-01) deducted from supply to get the vacant and partially vacant land capacity used in the 1,600 deficit analysis, where the permit application was submitted after 1/1/12, but the project was completed before the 5/20/13 and 8/1/13 BLIs? How were the 149 units in Heritage Meadows treated in the 1,600 deficit analysis?

Lloyd Helikson

<Density 01 to 12 Summary_v2(columnformatting).pdf>
Heather:
Rick and I find ourselves scratching our heads whenever we see emails about Envision Eugene and the strategies for gaining more Multi-Family units.
It seems there have been a few opportunities on our own drawing boards that continue to fail/stall as a result of either neighborhood intervention, city staff discretionary decisions or both.

Collectively we have 176 units on Rest-Haven that are almost approved but has one issue still unresolved at the city attorney level so as to make the project undevelopable (for affordable housing)
The potential of approximately 80 – 90 acres of R-1 property on Laurel Ridge that has the potential for 5 units per acre (450 units) – this has been back and forth to LUBA since 2011.
And our next project on Capital Hill for which we don’t even dare propose multi-family (could be 60 units by the math).

We recently barely got through completeness review on another infill project because trees in very poor condition were being held up as more valuable than homes site. (multi-family).
The comment at completeness review was that perhaps the client could consider removing some of the units to save the trees in poor condition (23 total on 2 acres).

So that being said, I hope you would consider that not all of the challenges are external. Not always about unavailable land, etc.
I say all of this with respect for all the hard work that city staff does.
It is just frustrating to see requests for suggestions for infill when a large portion of this issue is solvable with current projects.
And those are only the ones on our desks.

If you ever want to sit down and have a conversation about this perhaps we could both learn something.
We would love to add to the solution but we think we already have.
We just can’t get any of them approved.

Thanks

Carol Schirmer
Schirmer Satre Group
Planners, Landscape Architects, Environmental Specialists
375 West 4th
Suite 201
Eugene, OR 97401

www.schirmersatre.com

PH: (541) 886-4540 x1
Fax: (541) 886-4577
Dear Mayor and City Councilor,

Attached is a 5-page letter summarizing the results of our analysis of actual multifamily development in Eugene since 2012, the start of the Envision Eugene 20-year planning period. As you can see, there are a number of remarkable findings, including:

- Actual development is greatly exceeding projections.
- Development is occurring at a far higher density than assumed.
- Much more multifamily development is occurring on commercial lands than was assumed.
- Much more redevelopment is occurring than was assumed.

These findings mean that there is far greater capacity for multifamily housing in Eugene than has been forecast by the Envision Eugene Land Model. This additional capacity is much greater than the 1600-unit deficit reported by the City, so there is no need to make major zoning or policy changes to accommodate projected needs.

Thank you for considering this information in your upcoming deliberations.

Eben

Eben Fodor
Fodor & Associates LLC
Eugene, OR
541-345-8246
www.fodorandassociates.com
October 10, 2016

RE: Analysis of Multifamily Housing Deficit Issue

Dear Mayor and City Councilors,

The City of Eugene is reporting a 1600-unit deficit in multifamily housing and is identifying policy changes which would create more capacity. However, based on an analysis of actual development in Eugene, it appears that there is no deficit and that a surplus capacity exists.

I have been working with Lloyd Helikson, who has collected data on all the multifamily developments that have occurred since July 1, 2012, the official start date of the Envision Eugene’s 20-year planning timeframe. The data includes those projects which are currently planned, but not yet completetc, which are counted as completed in 2017.

The remarkable findings include the following:

**Actual development is greatly exceeding projections.** 5,205 dwelling units (du) of multifamily housing are already built or planned for the 5-year period we have data for (2012-17). Envision Eugene (EE) forecasts a need for a total of 6,797 du of multifamily housing over the entire 20-year planning period. Thus, we have already achieved 77% of the needed development with 15 years left to go! It’s notable that 88% of this development has occurred without MUPTE subsidies (the 12% MUPTE projects were largely Capstone and Core Campus).

**Development is occurring at a far higher density than assumed.** The actual density of multifamily development on medium- and high-density land since 2012 is 97% and 14% higher, respectively, than what was assumed as the maximum density in the current EE model. This means that our existing land supply can accommodate more development than has been estimated. The development trend since the recession ended in 2009 is toward higher densities. Since EE is a forward-looking plan, this trend should be included in the EE
assumptions. The result would show that Eugene already has more than adequate multifamily capacity.

**Much more multifamily development is occurring on commercial lands than assumed.** The EE analysis has assumed only 256 dwelling units will be accommodated on commercial lands. But we have identified 1,098 units that are already built or planned on commercial land in the first 5 years of the 20-year plan. There is considerable capacity for more housing on commercial lands, so it’s reasonable to expect this trend to continue. At the current pace, more than 4,000 units could be accommodated on commercial land by 2032.

**Much more redevelopment is occurring than was assumed.** The current EE analysis assumes a total of 716 dwelling units from redevelopment over the entire 20-year planning period. However, our data shows that there are already 2,442 units of redevelopment built or planned. This means far more capacity exists in Eugene for accommodating housing through redevelopment than was assumed. In fact, at the current rate, about 9,000 more dwelling units could be accommodated on redeveloped land than has been forecast in the EE Land Model.

**In conclusion,** we are recommending three changes in the EE Land Model based on an analysis of actual development which has occurred in Eugene. They are: 1) increase density assumed; 2) increase residential capacity on commercial land; and, 3) increase redevelopment estimates. Each of these changes could eliminate the reported 1600-unit deficit. Combined, they demonstrate that there is substantial existing capacity for multifamily housing within the City of Eugene well beyond the projected 20-year demand. Additional supporting information is attached.

Sincerely,

Eben Fodor
Principal Planner
Additional Supporting Material

The full spreadsheet of multifamily development compiled by Lloyd Helikson has been shared with the Planning Department. Supporting summary data is provided below.

Figure 1 shows that actual multifamily development already built or planned is on pace to significantly exceed the need forecast in Envision Eugene.

Figure 1

 Cumulative Multifamily Units Built or Planned in Eugene Since 7-1-12 (5+, 2-4, SFA)  
(units planned as of 9/14/16 counted in 2017)

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>3,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>3,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>4,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>5,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>5,797</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Source: Fodor & Associates from data provided by Lloyd Helikson and Eugene Land Model, February 2015 Update.

Figure 2 (below) shows that the actual density of multifamily development in Eugene has increased significantly since 2009, after the recession. The original 2001-2008 planning data from the Eugene Comprehensive Lands Assessment (ECLA) was update by the City by averaging it with newer 2009-2012 data. We believe using post-2008 data better reflects the actual density that is occurring, and will continue to occur over the 20-year planning period. Using the City’s 2009-2012 actual densities would add more than 500 dwelling units of capacity. Using data for the more-recent development since 2012 would add more than 4,000 du of capacity within our UGB (see Table 1).
Figure 2

Actual Density of Development in Eugene Compared to EE Assumptions

Table 1
Eugene Multifamily Housing Supply Adjustments for Actual Increased Density*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EE Current Land Model</th>
<th>Based on 2009-12 Actual</th>
<th>Based on 2012 to Present Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vacant Land</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>2,345</td>
<td>4,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partially Vacant Land</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>4,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Supply (du)</strong></td>
<td>6,033</td>
<td>6,597</td>
<td>10,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity Increase (du)</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>4,492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: A conservative (low) estimate was required since the EE Land Model does not indicate inventory of partially vacant MDR and HDR land. Actual capacity increases will be higher than shown here.
As shown in Table 2, almost half of all multifamily development since 2012 has been redevelopment (47%). With 2,442 dwelling units of redevelopment in the first five years, we could reasonably expect a total of more than 9,000 units on redeveloped land over 20 years, whereas the City has only assumed 716 dwelling units.

Table 2
Multifamily Dwelling Units Built or Planned Since 7-1-12
(includes 5+ units, 2-4 units, and SFA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use**</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017*</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Redevelopment</th>
<th>Redevelopment %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDR</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>440</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>243</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-WS</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>331</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Total</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>5205</td>
<td>2442</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fodor & Associates from data for Eugene compiled by Lloyd Helkson.

*Units planned, but not built as of 9/26/16 are counted in 2017

**Notes: LDR, MDR, and HDR are low-, medium-, and high-density residential. GO is general office; Public includes UO dormitory; S-WS is Walnut Station Special Area Zone. SFA is single-family attached.
Heather:

I am concerned about getting the answers to my questions and additional information sufficiently in advance of the 24th in order to prepare comments for the City Council. I also need to know soon exactly how you calculated the 1,600 multi-family deficit. I have been using the attached flow chart from the 2014 TRG meeting, which you previously identified. The only two changes of which I am aware are the additional 128 du MDR/HDR multi-family deficit added in 2015, and the additional 249 du of assumed multi-family built on LDR you recently pointed out to me. Are there any other changes and how were they calculated? How was the 128 du additional deficit calculated? Essentially, how have you changed the flow chart information for the current perceived 1,600 du MDR/HDR multi-family deficit?

Thank you.

Lloyd
O’DONNELL Heather M

From: kathyjenson@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, October 12, 2016 3:05 PM
To: O’DONNELL Heather M
Subject: 9-2-16 letter in regard to R-2 Zoning

Dear Ms. O’Donnell,

I think we received the letter from you dated 9-2-16 because we own property at 3461 Westward Ho in Eugene. Last fall we looked into dividing the property and adding another house. We haven’t proceeded because of the steps necessary and the uncertainty as to whether or not we would be able to get this project approved by the city.

Please let us know if you have any information or suggestions as to how we could make this happen.

Kathleen Jenson