

## Summary of Housing Tools and Strategies Community Feedback Received via Email

### Introduction

In addition to the online survey, community members also have the option to email the Eugene Housing Tools address to provide feedback. While the online form asks for specific feedback which can be easily compiled and synthesized, emailed feedback tends to be broader, longer, and thus, more difficult to summarize. The emails summarized below include those sent to the [HousingTools@eugene-or.gov](mailto:HousingTools@eugene-or.gov) mailbox that is monitored by City staff and were requested to be shared with the Working Group members. Given the extensive content included in these emails, the Working Group facilitator has identified key points as a means to help interested parties find the feedback they want to read more about. The purpose in making this list isn't to limit or filter information but rather to make extensive content more accessible and easier to navigate. Parties are, of course, welcome to read the emailed [feedback](#) in their entirety.

City staff and the facilitator have not vetted any of the community feedback for accuracy.

### PG 1-25 - Paul Conte

- Critique of strategies and options including whether/how they would be effective to addressing problems of cost, lack of data to support, and negative impacts of some options.
- Promotion of Opportunity Siting as option with supporting explanation/links.
- Notes the challenge in the ways that market forces make affordability difficult and call for more attention to options that will help pay for subsidized units.
- Suggests new options for the group's consideration.
- Lists specific concerns regarding alignment of options with Envision Eugene pillars and neighborhood livability.
- Includes attachments with documents from previous community groups (Mixed-Use Re Development Sub-Group). Predominantly advocating for mixed-use high-density housing options along transportation corridors and guidance on infill compatibility standards.

### PG 26-111- Bill Aspegren

- Broadly concerned that neighborhoods and livability interests are under-represented.
- Critique that terms are poorly defined.
- Critique of specific options (see complete text for details).
- Support for mixed-use and higher density home construction with construction of commercial units.
- Specific comments on stimulating ADU construction and suggestions regarding Urban Reserves.
- Includes attachments:
  - PG 28-79 - "Metro Residential Preference" 2014 draft of study prepared by DHM Research. Data from residents of Multnomah, Washington, Clark, and Clackamas Counties regarding housing preferences. Shows highest preference for housing is for single family detached homes.
  - PG 80-103- "The Gap" 2018 Report from the National Low-Income Housing Coalition – National look focusing on low-income households. Highlights high numbers of cost-burdened households and the extreme shortage of housing available for these income levels. Examines household types. Identifies federal policy responses and the need to invest more heavily in constructing Affordable units.

## **Summary of Housing Tools and Strategies Community Feedback Received via Email**

- PG 104-111 - Comments regarding construction of Secondary Dwelling Units (SDU) – also known as Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs). Key barriers to construction include cost, land (access to alleys), fees, regulation, and property owner preferences. Concern that these types of units won't help with affordability but may damage livability. Reference to and attachment of supporting documentation regarding efforts in Olympia and Gresham.

### PG 112-161 - Paul Conte

- Acknowledgement of the problem (burden of cost for many households) and the difficulty of addressing it.
- Call to make a positive impact without having negative consequences.
- Call for more data to better evaluate the options.
- Call for alignment with previous efforts (Envision Eugene/Comprehensive Plan)
- Analysis of options based on perceived alignment with the Comprehensive Plan and Envision Eugene Pillars. Also includes perception of neighborhood association response to options.
- Analysis of top/bottom ideas based on “Creams and Rocks” analysis.
- Process concerns with polling of options.
- Attachments (repeated from earlier pages) from the MUD sub-group.
- 2011 Information on Opportunity Siting
- Elaboration of process concerns, including disrespect for parts of Eugene's population.
- Call for alignment with Envision Eugene pillars with specific concern for preserving neighborhood livability.
- Concern that the problem has been poorly defined and ill informed (critique of limited data from the housing economist).
- Call to focus on how to finance subsidized units.
- Critique of the list of options and glossary. Concern regarding specific content as well as inconsistencies in language/definitions. Feedback on specific options.

### PG 162-163 – Eben Fodor

- Critique about data available to working group
- Call to address lack of housing for very low income households
- Reference to “The Gap: A Shortage of Affordable Homes”, by The National Low Income Housing Coalition, March 2018 (available at <https://nlihc.org/gap>). (also referenced in a prior email above)

### PG 164-166 – Paul Conte NEW

- Critique of Strategic Economics data presented on 11/14 meeting.
- Specific concern that data regarding likely volume/impact of options wasn't included in the presentation.
- Critique that data was one-sided (over-representing developer interests)
- Suggestion regarding ADUs and low production in areas where regulations are less stringent (but production still low).
- Critique that the data, while well presented, wasn't specific enough (too high level) to be useful, lacked adequate citations/identification of sources, left out details regarding student households, and was overall biased/un-useful.