



TBL Sounding Board Feedback

The following notes were taken by facilitators at the Triple Bottom Line (TBL) sounding board meeting on February 6, 2019.

Economic Development

General Feedback:

- Goals and policies touch: Job creation, Workforce diversity, Sustainable business practices (Just need more details on all three)
- Topic Areas do not have enough overlap/interrelation
- Supporting low income, minority businesses requires more robust incentives than big corporations/private capital
- Economic prosperity is good for both jobs and sustainability

Feedback on Goal 1

- 'Growth and creation of local businesses'=limited, need a broader view on prosperity
 - Prosperity could include providing access to benefits (e.g. OAS/VA)
- What does an improved neighborhood economy look like?
 - Higher wages?
 - Less \$ spent?
- Local businesses support access to a variety of goods and services
 - Access may result in less car ownership, reducing costs.
- Efforts to block/stop large businesses. –keep \$ in the community

Feedback on Goal 2

- 'Enhances the character of our neighborhood'- split into another goal, 'increasing access to daily needs' + for equity and social gathering
- Access for all? Missing equity component. More focus on equity.
- Have we identified character of neighborhood so that economic development is consistent with core aspects?
- Recognize tradeoff between redevelopment and neighborhood character (environmental qualities i.e. river trees, open space may be compromised by redevelopment)
- How do you encourage folks to walk and support local businesses?
- "Access to daily needs" could be misinterpreted as economic access rather than proximity
- Neighborhood character preservation could be problematic for equity

Feedback on Goal 3

- 'Living wage'=financial security?
- Goal 3 seems weak on social equity
- Prosperity as more jobs is only one way of looking at prosperity. How do we create economic prosperity for all?
- How to match local economic development with living wages

Policy-Specific Feedback

- 1.4- Are the residents earning enough to afford shopping at local businesses?

- 2.1- Define vibrancy. What does it look like and for who?
- 2.2- Data would support business development (e.g. traffic counts, demographics)
- 3.1- How do you support business development in the neighborhoods? –local mom & pop stores
- 3.2- Remote work opportunities?

Transportation

General Feedback:

- Transportation is key to equity for other topics (ability to get around is an anchor for other policies)
- Data needs: What transportation is used along corridor? (I.e. who bikes to downtown?), example of car sharing- look for innovative options, barrier is cost, include families when considering equity (i.e. a single person may be able to bike somewhere a young family could not)
- Theme: link to development
- Invest in forms that underserved communities use regularly
- There are competing interests of those who use the transportation system (e.g. trucks needed for local agriculture conflict with pedestrians)

Feedback on Goal 4

- Emphasize modes used by low income and people of color
- Environmental and equity: “multi-modal” include access- age and mobility (look at neighborhood demographics), stigma of using public transportation (how to promote it?), push employers to incentivize public transit, address safety (bike boulevards, etc.)
- Economic benefits because it creates livable neighborhood and diverse workforce
- Clarify “equitable” - include access, proximity and ability to move around- replace with “affordable to all”
- Add convenient- define efficient and consider the time required to use each mode

Feedback on Goal 5

- Don’t exclusively target to middle class
- Focus is modes/access, less on reducing total trips

Feedback on Goal 6

- Redesign River Rd to improve safety

Policy-Specific Feedback

- 4.1- Positive for job creation, diversification of workforce, business sustainability practices (also applies to 4.2 and 4.7)
- 4.2- Helps businesses and consumers, very focused on getting to commercial areas—can it be expanded to areas other than commercial areas?
- 4.4- Could conflict with 6.2 (issue with “all”)
- 5.1- Both positive and negative for businesses and workforce, depends on the modes that are added and removed
- 5.2- Positive because it changes thinking, bigger implications, educate community as a whole (use it as an opportunity)

- 6.2- Parking/sidewalks are an equity issue, not all parts of RR-SC can access, also relates to neighborhood livability

Parks and Natural Resources

General Feedback:

- Setbacks are important! Safety, aesthetics, ACCESS
- Inherent conflict with housing development (space at a premium). Balance two priorities!
- High density housing should have land for community gardens (food, \$ independence, relationships. Attend to: Connectivity, Equity in access to park and open space across City/County properties

Feedback on Goal 7

- Natural areas are disproportionately used by mid-high income. Lower income people don't have the means/time to take advantage.

Feedback on Goal 9

- Borrow language/data from existing plans so that it echoes and reflects current/common plan language
- How to balance higher density affordable housing that is usually taller and requires more surface parking? Design of housing near river needs to address equity of view/access.

Feedback on Goal 10

- Preserving agricultural land so people have closer access to local food is an environmental benefit
- Attend to the equity of distribution of ag. land and open space

Policy-Specific Feedback

- 7.1- Encourage beauty of stormwater as part of their function
- 7.2- Opportunity to provide education of consumers/businesses for sustainable business/landscape and home maintenance practices re: health of and impact to natural areas
- 7.4- Remove "walking" and consider "all modes," etc.
- 8.1- "Walking distance" is problematic for mobility issues, put affordable housing near recreational amenities
- 9.1- Clarify Willamette setback/buffer/river greenway distance, can potentially have adverse impact on economy by restricting development (e.g. restaurants other businesses taking advantage of river access/views)
- 9.2- Define access further to incorporate pedestrian (and wheelchair)/ bike access
- 9.3- "Promote" not strong enough word- need to address that it's a community amenity and look at environmental impacts
- 9.4- Potential plus for economy (e.g. boat landings, kayak access, etc. fishing)
- 10.1- Positive for economy- allowing agriculture to continue, and establishing/reinforcing farm-to-table system
- 10.2- On private property- how do we encourage homeowners to take "ownership" of natural resources on their own property?
- 10.3- Ensure equitable access to land and capital as well as ag. products (including secondary ag. products)

Land Use

General Feedback

- Equity concern with compatible for who? Lots of words that could be interpreted/applied differently. Examples: “appropriate,” “well designed,” “vibrant,” concern- exclusion of low income and homeless
- How to preserve River Road history? Adaptive re-use of historic buildings. Agricultural history too. Add Historic Preservation policy.
- Goals depend on source of capital. Local money helps achieve local goals. Through processes and standards?
- Data on housing needs accommodated by land use designations?
- Equity issue: Cost of taxes in City vs. County and differences in levels of services

Feedback on Goal 12

- Equity: elevate more housing types for various populations (separate policy?)
- Would benefit workforce diversity

Feedback on Goal 14

- TRANSITION, TRANSITION, TRANSITION between residential/other, river buffer low density residential/medium density residential/high density residential
- Too subjective. To homeowners, more single family. To people needing diverse housing, more housing.

Policy-Specific Feedback

- 11.1- Neighborhood specific standards have been used to exclude people (risk and pattern)
- 11.2- Effective collaboration- what does it mean? To whom? Equity- Higher income home owners and developers often engage, not renters and people of color, Add City!, neighborhoods are unique and this process can serve as a model
- 11.3- Add environmentally sustainable energy efficiency
- 11.4- Why large development?, open space needs to be accessible
- 11.5: “social production” definition? Word choice, Garden space- provide community gardens, Huerta garden exists but no City of Eugene gardens
- 12.2- Maintain affordable housing stock to advance equity, household’s prosperity and housing affordability are tied, focus on 60-80% AMI for affordability
- 13.2- Positive for small businesses, 20-minute neighborhoods are good for affordable housing so they advance equity, use multi modes, add 20 minute neighborhood services/community throughout neighborhoods, e.g. corner stores
- 14.1- Design and compatibility can enhance community but if too costly can prohibit or discourage development (also applies to 14.2), Question: Is multistory mixed use compatible? Home business over housing?
- 14.3- Pull from Greenway resources for sustainability, setbacks/stepbacks for length of river

Community

General Feedback:

- Missing- goals around schools?

- What is unique about RR-SC for these goals and how can it be enhanced –more of an asset-based approach
- What is “community”; what about nonhuman community
- Strong and resilient community needs trust; missing in these goals? –County/City residents
- + on homelessness and affordable housing items
- Missing – Community owned businesses, relationships between business owners and residents, this builds sense of community and resilience

Feedback on Goal 16

- Foster relationships in a deeper way to reach traditionally underserved communities- needs lots of outreach-needs a lot of effort and investment
- Really like Goal 16- hits on important things (and Goal 18)
- Taking actions on housing that help current residents of neighborhood be able to stay in place and afford housing- needs data on current rents/housing issues

Feedback on Goal 17

- Could mention social determinants of health and health care

Feedback on Goal 18

- Make sure these efforts are considering lower income households as well (availability, incentives)
- Community can’t be welcoming and inclusive without quality transportation options
- Equal access to quality of life services
- More needed in preserving the (environmental natural resource) character of the neighborhood and how it defines the community

Policy-Specific Feedback

15.1

- Positive because could diversify workforce (also 15.2)
- What is this, what does this mean, what would that look like
- Does leadership help attract other groups?
- How to get everyone involved in the community in a way that builds resilience

15.2

- What other languages; data on this? How will they learn about events?
- Could be tied to economic prosperity if think more broadly

15.3

- Could be “type” not just affordability
- Need to increase and maintain access to affordable housing
- Data need: Metrics on current housing to know what housing types and financial investments are needed; rents; wages

16.3

- What are neighborhood projects?

16.4

- Inequity based on age; sense of community when not as mobile? Making connections between generations, neighborhood ride sharing, changes necessary to create more nodes of “daily needs” services
- Could encourage job creation

- “By foot” is inequitable; maybe multi modes, what is a “daily need” –define the key things, issue is really multi-modal access to services

16.5

- What are small scale resilience networks?

18.1

- Good because it links community resilience to natural environment

18.4

- Could encourage job creation