



COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE- Summary Minutes

Zoom Webinar

September 15, 2020, 6:00 PM

CAC Members Present: Rick Duncan, Kate Perle, Ed McMahon, Ann Vaughn, Jon Belcher, Mary Leontovich, Hans Wittig, Michele O’Leary

Community Members Present: Jolene Siemsen, Carleen Reilly, Harry Sanger, Don Daniels

Staff Present: Terri Harding, Chelsea Hartman, Elena Domingo, Zoli Gaudin-Dalton

Agenda Items

1. Standing Items

- Introductions
- Zoom meeting protocol/ground rules
- Agenda review – Chelsea sent an updated agenda earlier in the day.

2. Public Comments

- Carleen Reilly – introduced herself and welcomed Zoli.
- Harry Sanger – RRCO member, said he wants to become more involved with CAC.
- Jolene Siemsen – RRCO member, said hello and said she’s participated in transportation and land use groups.

3. Corridor Study Update

- Chelsea pulled up the graphic that shows all of the plan documents on the google drive and how they fit together and how the action plan fits in with the neighborhood plan document.
- Talked about the gap between expectations and results for the Corridor Study and the big remaining questions.
- Discussed how it would be helpful to see how the current Corridor Study code model actually works, would like to see how they put the math together. Concerns that COR-MU development will not be financially feasible and won’t change development along the corridor for a very long time. Want to be able to tell the community what the challenges may be vs. what they’re hoping for if the code is adopted. Asked how we move forward with a code that is substantially different than what the community may be expecting.
- Talked about the importance of exploring and providing incentives for development.
- Terri talked about planning for the long-term and how many short-term factors are out of our control, but just because development may not pencil out currently, that doesn’t mean we shouldn’t put the pieces in place for the future. She acknowledged how many

unresolved topics there are with the current draft code and that city staff will have to continue working on it.

- Mentioned that there is a lot more to the plan than the corridor study and we also need to focus on how we will move those pieces forward.
- Chelsea talked about next steps: consultants will wrap up, city staff will work on code alignment with the neighborhood plan and existing code, alignment with HB 2001, and continued CAC review.

4. HB 2001 Update

- Talked about DLCD's reference to "master plans" and whether the River Road-Santa Clara Neighborhood Plan may be considered a master plan in terms of HB 2001 implementation. Staff said that the way the rule is written wouldn't likely include this plan, DLCD used mostly in the context of greenfield developments.
- Reminder that DLCD public hearing is next Friday, September 25th.
- Terri gave updates about the start of a context study that will review existing neighborhood types across Eugene and the implementation of HB 2001, including River Road-Santa Clara area, such as farmland developed under county regulations. Invited CAC members to join this study in the next couple of weeks.
- Talked about HB 2003 and the importance of monitoring HB 2001 goals, including look at existing CC&Rs and how that will impact how much middle housing we can accommodate.
- We are pausing work on middle housing zone as part of the corridor study while minimum standards are being developed by the state.
- Discussed the opportunity for CAC to send additional testimony to DLCD before they set the minimum standards, the record is open until November. Particularly, addressing whether River Road-Santa Clara area is exempt because of private lanes and county developed roads that don't meet city standards?
- Rick and Jon were willing to help with the context study. Staff will be reaching out to CAC members on next steps.

5. Input on Draft Action Plan Intro and Draft Adoption Package Outline

- Chelsea recapped the Action Plan Intro and the importance of directing energy towards actions in the plan that aren't just code amendments, including those part of existing plans or projects and community partnerships.
- Concerns that there aren't guarantees that non-code actions will be followed through with, especially when the introduction says that the inclusion of an action doesn't require its implementation.
- Chelsea talked about not being able to pre-promise future funding, staff resources, or community partnerships and the need to be flexible as we work on actions and learn more about them and potential different ways to implement them.
- Discussed if the sentence "Because this is a dynamic plan, and subject to regular revisions, it is intended to be non-regulatory in nature and does not constitute an adopted land use plan" would be enough legally so that we could take out the sentence "It is important to note that the inclusion of a particular action does not require implementation of that action,

nor does it prohibit the implementation of other actions that further the policies, whether or not they are listed in this plan.”

- Chelsea talked about wanting to be clear when we go to the city and county that there are a lot of community priorities in the plan that need additional funding and resources to implement. The reason we want this to be a living document is because things change and certain actions may become more of a priority than they previously were.
- Acknowledged that there may be priority actions that are part of an existing plan or program but aren't going to happen for a long time and CAC may want to advocate for them to be more urgent.
- Talked about the Action Plan Highlights document capturing the high community priorities in each topic area and maybe using that as a list of things to get decision-maker support on.
- Talked about lack of momentum during COVID because of the lack of community gathering and outreach and how important community participation is to many of the actions.
- Shared feelings of being burnt out and losing original intent in some of the material because it's been regurgitated so many times. Some CAC member concerns about where we currently are in the process or that neighborhood objectives aren't coming through in the plan.
- Shared feelings of hope that city staff will be directly working with the corridor code to better suit the needs of the neighborhood and it's a good time to shift and build energy around the rest of the plan outside of the study. SCCO has had good discussion about the goals, policies, and actions lately.
- Talked about needing to push forward the pieces that we can and being more realistic with expectations, creating an action plan that gets enough of what we want to be successful.
- Terri acknowledged the stressful time we are all in right now in the world and how everyone is coping in different ways.
- If CAC members have suggestions for bringing more backburner actions to the front, they can connect with the co-chairs who meet with staff during PMT meetings twice a month.

6. Review Topic Area Edits from SCCO/RCCO – Transportation

- Discussed the transportation action - 5.4.6 “Investigate increasing options for north/south traffic flow east of River Road in Santa Clara.” TAC and City transportation staff cautioned against dividing up traffic flow between North and South River Road and advised that infrastructure to increase vehicle flow in this area is very unlikely in the future.
- Some expressed wanting to keep the action despite its infeasibility to let people know in the plan we'd like to see this in the future to relieve traffic on River Road because the East side of River Road doesn't have any other options and this was a big issue brought up by Santa Clara neighbors.

Adjourn.