February 2021 Middle Housing Public Engagement Summary

Introduction
In 2019, the Oregon Legislature passed House Bill 2001, a law that requires large cities in Oregon, including Eugene, to allow “Middle Housing” in residential areas. Eugene’s fall and winter 2020 outreach focused on spreading awareness of the house bill and its requirements while beginning preliminary outreach with groups such as the Healthy Democracy Panel, Equity RoundTable, Local Partners RoundTable, and Boards and Commissions RoundTable. Ultimately, it culminated in the development of project Values and Principles. The outreach in February 2021 launched community-wide input on code concepts to guide the technical, code-writing portion of the project.

Overall, we received 741 survey (730 in English and 11 in Spanish), held 15 meetings and events, created two new profiles on social media, and heard from renters and homeowners, community members in every ward and of every age, and folks who had never been involved with City processes before.

741 SURVEYS
15 MEETINGS & EVENTS
2 NEW SOCIAL MEDIA PROFILES

The major components about the house bill that shaped the public engagement strategy were the history of single-family zoning, the COVID-19 pandemic, the state-mandated timeline for implementation, and the state’s adopted minimum standards and model code that guide implementation of the house bill.

History of Single-Family Zoning
Residential zoning has a complex history that resulted in exclusion of low-income, black, indigenous, and people of color from certain neighborhoods throughout our nation. In Oregon this history was especially harmful with direct exclusion of non-white people from the state from 1844 until 1926*. Although those exclusions are illegal today, their negative impacts are still affecting our community through the legacy of exclusionary zoning. Housing policy and code changes are an opportunity to mitigate those.
As summarized by Oregon Land Conservation and Development (LCDC) Commissioner Anyeley Hallova during a rulemaking meeting on the House Bill, “before racial segregation through zoning, some neighborhoods had more diverse housing types with mixed incomes that are part of our beloved neighborhood fabric. As intentional as racially segregating housing policy was, we need to be as equally intentional about providing equitable housing outcomes for all.”

Across the country, we have a difficult history of exclusion to grapple with, and our intent with this project is to acknowledge that history, and move forward with a focus on inclusion for all, including renters, low income people, people with disabilities, young people, seniors, and Black, Indigenous, and People of Color.

The project webpage, Frequently Asked Questions, History of Residential Zoning Fact Sheet, and additional material communicate the racist and exclusive history of single-family zoning.

COVID-19 Pandemic
Public Engagement for the Middle Housing Project kicked-off in the midst of the COVID-19 Pandemic and the February outreach happened nearly a year into the pandemic. Health guidelines still prohibit large, in-person gatherings. This meant that our engagement continued to include mostly virtual opportunities to engage, including virtual Planning Commission and City Council Meetings. Efforts such as online forums, use of social media, mobile-friendly webpage design, and new creative tactics were used. Overall, the Middle Housing Project saw high participation throughout the month of February and established a presence on several new platforms.

State-Mandated Timeline for Implementation
The timeline is fast: House Bill 2001 was adopted in 2019, Oregon Administrative Rules were adopted in December 2020, and Eugene’s land use code amendments need to be finalized by June 2022. It also has a unique aspect in that if we don’t adopt code amendments in time, the state adopted model code will automatically apply. This project has moved quickly to meet this mandated deadline while gathering necessary input from community members with a focus on equity and inclusion.

State Adopted Minimum Standards and Model Code
We usually see projects that are initiated by the City Council at the local level—this one is coming from the state and is directed by Oregon Administrative Rules that establish parameters for how we comply with the house bill. This has led to an unusual project implementation and the need for clear, transparent communication with the community to explain the bill, its requirements, and the City’s approach.

February Outreach Goals
The purpose of the February outreach was to expand upon Phase 1 of the outreach and begin gathering community-wide input while continuing to share information about the requirements of the house bill. The main opportunity for input was regarding levels of implementation: Allow, Encourage, and Incentivize middle housing through code requirements. The goals for public engagement were to be meaningful, accountable, inclusive, transparent, realistic, and outcome-oriented.
Virtual Project Homebase

Webpage
The project webpage acts as the main host for project information. It contains information about the project background, fact sheets, FAQ, information about zoning and housing types, links to upcoming meetings, and more.

English Engage Eugene
The project Engage Eugene page acts as the main host for project engagement. It does not contain as much information as the project webpage and is meant to complement the project webpage. It contains high-level project information, a “quick poll,” an interactive “guest book,” a “newsfeed” for project updates, a Q&A monitored by staff, and, of course, the Middle Housing Survey.

Overall, the English Engage Eugene received 4,000 views and engaged 773 community members.

Spanish Engage Eugene
Along with the English Middle Housing Engage Eugene page, a Spanish Middle Housing Engage Eugene page was created. It contains high-level project information, links to translated fact sheets, a “quick poll,” and, of course, the Spanish Middle Housing Survey.

Overall, the Spanish Engage Eugene received 103 viewers and engaged 10 community members.

Spreading the Word

Social Media
One of the newer tools we employed was usage of Eugene Planning-specific social media channels. In 2020, existing Planning social media accounts such as Facebook were rebranded to “EUG Planning.” New accounts were also created using the same username including Instagram and Reddit. Each of the different platforms reaches a different audience and staff aimed to reach new community members, including younger community members and renters.
Instagram
The Middle Housing team used the EUGPlanning Instagram to post about upcoming meetings, share information about Healthy Democracy, event promotion, survey promotion, and more. The Instagram page was started in late 2020 and now reaches 585 followers. During the month of February there were eight posts related to the project that received over 370 engagements. The posts included survey promotion and clips from Facebook Live events.

Facebook
The EUG Planning Facebook page has 668 followers and was used to promote the survey, share information about Planning Commission meetings, and to host a series of five Facebook Live videos. A post that promoted the Middle Housing Survey received 31 likes, 12 comments, and 39 shares. There were two EUG Planning Newsletter posts with relevant Middle Housing information, one post in Spanish, and one post sharing a City Club event that hosted City Staff. During the month of February the Facebook page reached 12,820 Facebook users and post engagements increased by over 5,000% compared to past months.

We also held a series of five Facebook Live Community Conversations with local experts, including City Staff to discuss the connection between land use and larger topics. The idea was to attract folks who care about things like transit routes, equity, sustainability, and affordability, but don’t yet know that, by caring about those things, they also care about land use. Each of the events were 30 minutes long, featured time for live, Facebook audience questions, and ended by promoting the survey. The events were as follows:

Where the Code Meets the Road: Land Use and Transportation Planning
The first of these events focused on the connections between land use and transportation. We were joined by a panel of three local experts, Reed Dunbar, AICP and Senior Transportation Planner for Eugene, Andrew Martin, Development Planner at Lane Transit District, and Shane Rhodes, Transportation Options Coordinator for Eugene. This event received 434 views.

Land Use & Equity: What are the Connections?
The second of our Facebook Live events focused on the connections between land use and equity. We were joined by a panel of two local experts, University of Oregon Law Professor Dr. Sarah Adams-Schoen and City of Eugene Human Rights and Equity Analyst Fabio Andrade. This event was our most watched and received 2,800 views.

Land Use & Climate
The third of our Facebook Live events focused on the connections between land use and sustainability. We were joined by a panel of three local experts: local private-sector planner and City of Eugene Sustainability Commissioner Kelsey Zlevor, Environmental and Climate Justice Coordinator at the Eugene-Springfield NAACP Aimee Okotie-Oyekan, and City of Eugene Sustainability Manager Chelsea Clinton. This event received 325 views.

What do you Meme? Communicating Land Use to a New Generation
The fourth of our Facebook Live events focused on the connections between land use and Gen-Z. We were joined by a panel of three University of Oregon students who participated in the Real World Eugene undergraduate class that was paired with the Middle Housing Project. The students focused on young adult engagement in developing the project’s Values and Principles and developed
recommendations for best practices to communicate planning projects to a younger generation. This event received 68 views.

*Land Use & Housing Economics: what drives the cost of house?*

The last of our Facebook Live events focused on the connections between land use and housing costs. We were joined by a panel of two local experts: Kaarin Knudson, whose involvement with land use includes teaching at the University of Oregon, principal & partner for LARCO / KNUDSON, and acting as a founding director/member of the steering committee for Better Housing Together. Our second guest speaker was Dylan Lamar, who currently serves as an Architect and Energy Consultant for Cultivate. He is also a member of numerous housing-related groups such as the Passive Housing Designers and Consultants. This event received 72 views.

*Reddit*

We went outside our comfort zone and visited Reddit: a forum-based website. Staff did an AMA: called “ask me anything” similar a Q&A, to answer questions about Eugene Planning and promote the Middle Housing Survey. It was hosted on the Eugene subreddit, which is like a discussion board, and has over 30,000 local members. Community members posed questions about the project, development in Eugene, and planning for growth. It received over 100 comments, correlated with 90 new surveys completed, and established a relationship that can be continued for future outreach and projects.

*Email Communications*

**EUG Planning Newsletter**

The EUG Planning Newsletter is sent monthly and reaches 19,000 subscribers. Two newsletter articles promoted the Middle Housing Project and included project updates, survey promotion, upcoming meetings, Facebook Live event promotion, and more.

**Email Outreach**

Additional outreach included two emails to the Neighborhood Bulletin, two emails to the Middle Housing Interested Parties List, two to RoundTable participants, Neighborhood Associations, and other targeted outreach done by project consultants Cogito.

**Student Outreach**

City of Eugene Middle Housing Planning Interns conducted nine class visits to promote the survey. They also created a GIS storymap for a Gen Z audience to use technical data paired with strategic communication to reach a part of the community we don’t usually hear from. The storymap has received 552 views.
Outreach Events

Healthy Democracy
The City of Eugene is partnering with Portland-based nonpartisan, nonprofit, Healthy Democracy, to assemble a Planning Review Panel that is composed of 29 randomly selected Eugene community members. In February, the Panel focused on providing input on the levels of implementation. Overall, they have had 12 meetings and will meet again three additional times in April. The full Healthy Democracy report can be reviewed on the Healthy Democracy webpage.

Healthy Democracy Recommendation
Parking: Encourage
Lot Coverage: Incentivize
Design Standards: Incentivize
Overall: Encourage/Incentivize

Equity RoundTable
The Equity RoundTable is comprised of representatives from organizations representing underserved communities and serves to provide an equity lens to the project. The RoundTable is staffed by Alai Community Consulting. Overall, they have had six meetings and will meet again one additional time in April. Attachment 2 includes the full meeting summaries.

Equity RoundTable Recommendation
Parking: Encourage
Lot Coverage: Incentivize
Design Standards: Incentivize
Overall: Encourage/Incentivize

Local Partners and Board and Commissions RoundTables
In Fall of 2020, we met with the Boards and Commissions and Local Partners RoundTables to receive input that informed the creation of the Values and Principles for the project. At the February meetings the RoundTables served as a Triple Bottom Line Sounding Board to discuss the social, environmental, and economic tradeoffs around choices for middle housing code standards.

The RoundTable participants were asked the question: Which implementation option (allow, encourage, incentivize) best promotes social equity, environmental health, and economic prosperity? And do your answers differ across the topics of parking, lot coverage, and design standards? Attachments 3 and 4 include the full meeting summaries.
Local Partners and Boards and Commissions RoundTable Recommendation

Parking: Encourage

Lot Coverage: Incentivize

Design Standards: Incentivize

Overall: Encourage/Incentivize

Middle Housing Survey

The Middle Housing Survey was open on the English version of the Engage Eugene page from February 5 to March 8 2021 and received 730 responses. A Spanish Engage Eugene page and survey were published from February 19 to March 19, 2021 and received 11 responses. In total, we received 741 survey responses. Although the survey is not statistically valid, it provides a snapshot of community perspectives.

The questions in the survey were based on levels of implementing House Bill 2001. The state adopted minimum standards in the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) that serve as a baseline for complying with the bill. The questions asked community members whether we should do the minimum required to comply with the OARs, referred to as the “Allow” option, or go beyond the minimum required, referred to as the “Encourage” and “Incentivize” options. There were three main areas of focus: parking requirements, lot size, and design standards. Community members were also asked to prioritize Values and Principles and share additional input.

Who We Heard From

The Middle Housing Survey reached community members in all wards, homeowners, people who rent their homes, and people of all ages. Representation by City Ward is listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward 1</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 2</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 6</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 7</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 8</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of City Limits</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Middle Housing Recommendation

Parking: Encourage/Incentivize

Lot Coverage: Encourage/Incentivize

Design Standards: Encourage/Incentivize

Overall: Incentivize

Full Middle Housing Survey information can be found in Attachment 1.

Meeting In a Box

Staff also wanted to create materials that folks could use in groups, which resulted in the creation of Meeting in a Box: printable materials that enable community groups such as neighborhood associations to host their own meetings, conduct middle housing walking tours, and provide feedback to staff. They include a Discussion Guide, Several Neighborhood Walking Tours, and Feedback Forms.

Conclusion

Overall, community engagement was overwhelmingly supportive of going beyond the minimum standards required by the state and implement a hybrid of the Encourage and Incentivize options.

Now that we've heard from the community, the project team is in the process of developing draft code language. One of the recurring themes we've heard throughout our outreach is to explore ways to encourage middle housing affordability. Our next round of engagement in April with the Healthy Democracy Panel, Equity RoundTable, Boards and Commissions RoundTable, and Local Partners RoundTable will focus on affordability strategies within the Land Use Code amendments.

Attachments

1. Middle Housing Survey Summary
2. Equity RoundTable Summary
3. Local Partners RoundTable Summary
4. Boards and Commissions RoundTable Summary
**Middle Housing Survey Summary**

**February 2021**

**Structure of Survey**

The Middle Housing Survey was open on Engage Eugene from February 5th to March 8th 2021 and received 730 responses. A Spanish Engage Eugene page and survey were published from February 19th to March 19th and received 11 responses. In total, we received 741 survey responses. Although the survey is not statistically valid, it provides a snapshot of community perspectives.

The questions in the survey were based on levels of implementing House Bill 2001. The state adopted minimum standards in the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) that serve as a baseline for complying with the bill. The questions asked community members whether we should do the minimum required to comply with the OARs, referred to as the “Allow” option, or go beyond the minimum required, referred to as the “Encourage” and “Incentivize” options. There were 3 main areas of focus: parking requirements, lot size, and design standards. Community members were also asked to prioritize Guiding Values and Principles and share additional input.

All levels of implementation questions were required, however all short answer questions were optional. The survey also asked optional demographic questions. This helped staff understand who the survey was and was not reaching.
Who Took the survey
The Middle Housing Survey reached community members in all wards, homeowners, people that rent their homes, and people of all ages. Ward 1 has the most representation with 24%, Ward 2 has 12%, Ward 3 has 14%, Ward 4 has 6%, Ward 5 has 6%, Ward 6 has 8%, Ward 7 has 20%, Ward 8 has 7%, and outside of city limits has 7%.

Residency Status
Overall, 90% of survey respondents live in Eugene, 56% work in Eugene, 13% own a business in Eugene, and 12% attend school or university in Eugene. *This question was optional.*

Homeowners and Renters
Overall, 60% of survey respondents own the residence in which they live, 38% rent the residence in which they live, 2% do not own or rent, and are sheltered, and .1% do not own or rent and are unsheltered. With Census data showing that more than half of Eugene Community members rent their homes, the renter perspective is underrepresented in this survey. Additionally, 58% of renters were under the age of 35 and 88% of homeowners were over the age of 35. *This question was optional.*
Age

Overall, .6% of survey respondents are under 17, 7% are between 18-24, 22% are between 25-34, 23% are between 35-44, 16% are between 45-54, 13% are between 55-64, 15% are between 65-74, and 4% are over 75. 30% of survey respondents are under the age of 35 and 70% of survey respondents are over the age of 35. Notably, 1 survey respondent is under 12 and 3 are between 12-17. This question was optional.
Race and Ethnicity

Overall, 17% of survey respondents identify as Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color (BIPOC) and 83% identify as white. With Census data showing that 83% of Eugene community identifies as white, the survey data generally reflects existing demographics. *This question was optional.*
Guiding Values and Principles
The first phase of outreach produced 8 Guiding Values and Principles. The survey asked respondents to prioritize their top 3 Guiding Values and Principles. The most prioritized Guiding Value and Principle is “Equity and Access to Housing”, followed by “Housing Options of All Shapes and Sizes”, and “Vibrant Neighborhoods”.

Parking
Participants were asked “When someone builds middle housing in these “R-1” zoned areas, how much space should be dedicated to parking?”. 39% of respondents selected “Allow”, 31% selected “Encourage”, and 30% selected “Incentivize”. Overall, 61% of survey respondents indicated preference for the City to require less on-site parking than the minimum standards require.
Additional Parking Comments

- Minimize parking
- If less parking is required, explore permitting solutions
- Safety should be considered
- Coordinate with transit
- Make future thinking policies
- Reduce carbon emissions from cars
- Require bicycle parking
- Consider alley access and parking
- Depends on location
- Space for cars should not be prioritized over space for homes
- Allow for a variety of options
- Consider incentives for electric vehicles
- Concern about heavy use of existing on-street parking
- Consider folks with disabilities

Lot Coverage

Participants were asked “When building new middle housing, how much of the lot should be covered with homes?”. 17% of respondents selected “Allow”, 41% selected “Encourage”, and 42% selected “Incentivize”. Overall, 83% of survey respondents indicated preference for the City to allow more lot coverage than the minimum standards allow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question options</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALLOW: Allow the largest amount of open area possible</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCOURAGE: Allow for lots to develop with a balance between open area and housing</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCENTIVIZE: Allow most of the lot to have housing if it is near transit or provides affordable units</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Lot Coverage comments

- Access to green space is important
- Some folks don’t want to maintain yards
- Consider families and children
- Consider stormwater infrastructure
- Smaller yards are a good compromise
- Encourage more communal space
- Consider the tree canopy
- Provide flexibility and choice
- Encourage community gardens
- Space for housing is most important
- Regulate bulk
- Allow taller units as an alternative
- Concern over privacy
Design Standards
Participants were asked “What level of design standards should the City use for middle housing?”. 18% of respondents selected “Allow”, 42% selected “Encourage”, and 40% selected “Incentivize”. Overall, 82% of survey respondents indicated preference for the City to require fewer design standards for Middle Housing.

Additional Design Standards comments
- Provide high quality housing
- Affordability should be prioritized
- Encourage accessibility
- Reduce design regulation
- Encourage pedestrian-scale design
- Design is subjective
- Provide flexibility
- Promote creativity
- Refrain from restricting style
- Concern over neighborhood character
Overall
Participants were asked “In general, what direction do you feel is best for the Eugene community?”. 17% of respondents selected “Allow”, 36% selected “Encourage”, and 46% selected “Incentivize”. Overall, 82% of survey respondents indicated preference for the City to go beyond the minimum standards required by the state for implementation.

Table: Question options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCOURAGE</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCENTIVIZE</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Themes
- Go beyond the minimum standards
- Focus on equity
- Encourage affordability
- Increase housing options
- Enthusiasm for the project
- Continue affordability work past the Middle Housing project
- Consider the relationship between housing and transportation policies
- Promote efficient use of land
- Plan for the future
- Consider climate goals and sustainability
- Encourage flexibility
- Prioritize safety
- Create opportunities for home ownership
- Discourage car-centric development
- Avoid sprawl
- Promote high quality construction
- Act sooner rather than later
- Remove code barriers
- Overcoming the housing crisis is paramount
- Concern over potential impacts on existing neighborhoods
- Consider infrastructure
- Create inclusive neighborhoods
- Encourage walkability and transit
Equity Roundtable Meeting Three

Summary

Date: February, 17, 2021
Time: 3:00 - 5:00 pm
Number of participants: 6
Organization and communities participating: Lane Independent Living Alliance, DisOrient Asian American Film Festival, Sapsik'wáälá, Huerto de Familia, UO Longhouse, NAACP - Eugene Springfielld

Meeting Summary

ACC welcomed participants and shared a Land Acknowledgment. Participants introduced themselves by sharing their name, pronouns, organizations they represent, showing one item near them that says something about them. ACC reviewed the community agreements and the purpose and scope of the roundtable. Next, Terri Hariding shared how this roundtable’s input is being used for the project’s purpose. Sophie McGinley and Jennifer Knapp presented on Planning 101 on Rules and Model Code. After a five-minute break, ACC presented the Guiding Principles and Values from the City of Eugene’s Middle Housing Survey and asked participants to choose the most important principle to them and then choose the second most important principle. Next, participants were split into two breakout rooms with one City Staff and one ACC consultant. In these breakout groups, participants discussed the example codes on “Onsite Parking,” “Lot Coverage,” and “Design Standards” pulled from the City of Eugene’s Middle Housing Survey. After 25 minutes of small group discussion, all participants, City Staff, and ACC joined in group discussion to share what both groups discussed. In closing, City Staff shared the next steps for the upcoming Planning Commission and City Council work sessions and forecasted the next discussion around the Triple Bottom Line framework.

Summary of Findings

First Most Important Guiding Principle
- Equity and Access to Housing (chosen by two participants)
- Broad Dispersal of Middle Housing
- Opportunities to Build Wealth
- Interconnectedness of Housing Solutions (chosen by two participants)
- Sense of Belonging

Second Most Important Guiding Principle
- Equity and Access to Housing (chosen by two participants)
- Compact Efficient Housing
- Housing Options of All Shapes and Sizes
- Interconnectedness of Housing Solutions
- Opportunities to Build Wealth
Onsite Parking Comments
- If onsite parking or parking garages are not provided, they should provide permits
- Onsite parking is critical
- Currently, there is not enough parking in Eugene
- If the lot is near transit, then offer less parking
- Accessible safe parking is important - participants worry about break-ins
- Participants with children discussed how their kids have to take turns having friends over due to limited parking

Lot Coverage Comments
- Need access to green spaces
- Need safe spaces for children to play - develop proximity to other public green spaces
- Lots should leave a space for green space
- Gardens are important
- Want to be able to see children playing outside their windows - children need to have a safe place to play and run
- Participants discussed the struggle between parking spaces and green spaces
- Error on the side of allowing more density and lessening open area
- Need incentivising for developers to make lots more affordable

Design Standards Comments
- Need more flexibility when it comes to design standards
- Look at different neighborhoods and proximity to schools to coordinate with school capacity
- Safety - don't want housing built differently based on affordability or loan access (thinking about materials, safety, and design standards)
- Design standards can come with good intentions but they are subjective and could prevent really good building
- Participants discussed the positives around cottage clusters
- An advantage of Middle Housing is scale
- Equity issue: only those who can afford design standards are the ones who build them
Equity Roundtable Meeting Four

Summary

Date: February 22, 2021
Time: 5:30-7:30 pm
Number of participants: 8
Organization and communities participating: Lane Independent Living Alliance, DisOrient Asian American Film Festival, Huerto de Familia, UO Longhouse, NAACP - Eugene Springfirld, Chinese American Benevolent Association, TransPonder

Meeting Summary
ACC welcomed participants and shared a Land Acknowledgment. Participants introduced themselves by sharing their name, pronouns, organizations they represent, where they have lived in Eugene, and their favorite food in Eugene. ACC reviewed the community agreements. Next, ACC shared their reflections on individual and group feedback. Jennifer Knapp and Sophie McGinley presented the background on the work at the local and state level that informed the middle housing project. Terri Harding also provided an update on other roundtables and Healthy Democracy discussions. After a five minute break, ACC presented the Triple Bottom Line framework and reviewed the Social Equity pillar and questions. For the next 25 minutes, participants shared stories from their everyday life that policy makers must keep in mind when creating middle housing policy. Participants then discussed repeated themes. Next, Terri Harding led a discussion about the format of the next meeting and what the participants want to talk about. ACC prompted the participants to share a theme from the meeting they found interesting and important. After sharing, ACC lead closing and goodbyes.

Roundtable Feedback
- Positives: Appreciate the open environment, well organized and thoughtfully designed agendas, good pace, appreciate the expertise of all participants, enjoy the group discussion, understandable content, one-on-one conversations are a good idea
- Opportunities to Improve: Less staff and more participant ratio in break out groups: want to hear a report back from other groups, be mindful of extrovert and introvert participation, the pace is too slow, send the powerpoint ahead of the meetings ahead of time, want to know what other middle housing groups are doing, want to know more about the City of Eugene process

Themes Discussed Related to the Triple Bottom Line’s Social Equity Pillar
- It is hard, confusing, and can take a long time to receive a Section 8 housing voucher and it is easy to lose
- Participants discussed not having enough money to live on even with assistance
- Discrimination and evictions due to gender indtification, having a non-tradtional family, legal stuats, and race
● 72 hour eviction notices are common
● Need affordable parking
● Landlords have a lot of power: most assistance goes to landlords, patio restrictions, not having smoking restrictions, and common evictions
● Including people with disabilities and individuals who are non-binary or transgender who are often neglected from conversations

New Themes Discussed
● Gardens and open spaces
● Housing near transportation and grocery stores is important
● Adequate middle housing for families
● Ways for homeowners to help middle housing: building on their property to rent
● Education and resource sharing is needed
● Worries of students and parties in some neighborhoods
● Smaller homes for people to afford with safe outdoor space
● Mixed use space: multiple types of income, family types and housing on one lot

Places Where Participants Have Lived: Friendly neighborhood, South Eugene, Downtown Eugene, University area, West Eugene, City View area, Fairgrounds, Churchill, Sheldon, West 11th and Chamber, Southeast Eugene, Southwest Eugene, Santa Clara area, Ferry Bridge area

Topics that Interest Participants for Future Meetings
● Draft codes and outlines for codes
● How to stay involved in the next steps
● Discussions with experts and stakeholders
● Discussions around affordability
● How to incentivize development: thinking about permit costs

Topics that Participants Found Most Interesting From this Meeting
● Sharing personal experiences and stories
● Ways to be creative with different land use
● Mixed housing styles
● Mixed income housing
● Gender diversity
● Having a variety of stories was very helpful
● Affordable housing
● Excited that this consulting process could be applied and duplicated in other city processes
Middle Housing Code Changes Local Partners RoundTable

Attendees
Kaarin (Better Housing Together), Brittany (Eugene Chamber of Commerce), Mike (Better Eugene-Springfield Transportation), Alexis (1000 Friends of Oregon), Seth (WECAN), Dan (Lane County Homebuilders Association), Carmel (AARP), Jon (Neighborhood Leaders Council)

Purpose
Representatives of City of Eugene Local Partners met March 1st, 2021 to discuss three implementation options and how they connect to our triple bottom line. Participants were asked three questions:

1. Which implementation option (allow, encourage, incentivize) best promotes social equity?
2. Which implementation option (allow, encourage, incentivize) best promotes environmental health?
3. Which implementation option (allow, encourage, incentivize) best promotes economic prosperity?

Meeting Notes: social equity outcomes of encouraging or incentivizing

Worst Outcomes
- HB 2001’s minimums don’t improve anything in Eugene
- Mature neighborhoods have their character changed
- Standards become more restrictive rather than less restrictive
- Incentives are only focused on low impact portions of the code
- Builders aren’t given profitable options
- Less desirable neighborhoods experiencing gentrification
- Open space becomes limited in supply
- Car owners struggle to find units with suitable parking
- Affordable Housing incentives create barriers for other ranges of affordability
- Demolition and rising construction costs make development unfeasible for developers

Best Outcomes
- Social equity lens is prioritized
- Developers are able to decide about parking on their own, but incentives are there for those that want them
- Parking incentivizes add to our community walkability and character
- Economic and racial segregation are prioritized over concerns like parking
- Things that have larger cost factors are the ones that are more incentivized
- Large varieties of neighborhoods have incentivized middle housing
- Standards aren’t a ‘rubber stamp’ and have a range of flexibility to make them work in a variety of neighborhoods
Meeting Notes: environmental health outcomes of encouraging or incentivizing

Worst Outcomes
- Incentives result in fewer trees and less access to sunlight
- Stormwater systems become stressed
- More people join “bedroom communities” increasing their overall carbon footprint
- Affordable Housing aimed standards make development unreasonable for developers

Best Outcomes
- More people live in the core of the city, reducing the overall impact of growth
- Building height helps offset worst outcome issues
- Incentives are templates that can be applied to changing environmental standards for years to come
- People travel less throughout their average day
- Policies or incentives are built to preserve open space or trees
- New development results in fewer impervious spaces
- Long term environmental impacts of the units are smaller
Meeting Notes: economic prosperity outcomes of encouraging or incentivizing

**Worst Outcomes**

- Residential and commercial zones remain separated, and neighborhoods aren’t walkable
- Our incentives are too small to handle the large migration continuing to come to Oregon
- Housing prices continue to rise at fast rates
- There are limited information resources for single lot owners that want to split their lot
- Incentives don’t impact the people that struggle the most with finding housing
- Employees still need to commute long distances to work everyday
- Building a driveway to a second unit on a lot brings in costs of permits and insurance

**Best Outcomes**

- A wider range of people are allowed to take advantage of the financial benefits of home ownership
- Housing options are present for people of all ages
- Home ownership opportunities promote long term workforce retention in Eugene
- There are neighborhood centers of activity and access
- A wider range of neighborhoods are accessible for people to move into
- Economic prosperity helps people prioritize spending at local businesses
- People are able to save more money for future retirement and less on housing
- The process is simple enough for a homeowner to navigate through it
Key Takeaways

The input from the meeting, above, was synthesized by staff to inform the following takeaways:

- Affordable Housing should be **balanced** so the incentives don’t discourage a range of housing types for diverse income levels.
- **Trees and sunlight access** should be considered to prevent degradation of neighborhood environments.
- Single home developers need **guidance** to help them navigate the complex requirements for development.
- Incentives help the **most vulnerable** populations gain access to homes across the spectrum of costs.
- **Flexible incentives** prevent a one-size-fits-all model and help the code adapt to changing situations in the future.
- Housing development is incentivized **alongside commercial development** to improve walkability and neighborhood cohesion.
- Incentives exist and developers can **choose** if they’d like to pursue them or not.
- The highest impact standards are the ones that are **prioritized** in the code.
- Neighborhood Associations **play a part** in the evaluation of design standards and other parts of the code.
- **All neighborhoods** experience the new options to prevent gentrification and provide access to all different income levels throughout the whole of Eugene.
Middle Housing Code Changes Boards & Commissions RoundTable

Attendees
Julia (Housing Policy Board), Dan (Historic Preservation Board), Daniel (Planning Commission), Kelsey (Sustainability Commission), Ibrahim (Human Rights Commission), Kristen (Planning Commission)

Purpose
Representatives of City of Eugene Boards and Commissions met February 25, 2021 to discuss three implementation options and how they connect to our Triple Bottom Line. Participants were asked three questions:

1. Which implementation option (allow, encourage, incentivize) best promotes social equity?
2. Which implementation option (allow, encourage, incentivize) best promotes environmental health?
3. Which implementation option (allow, encourage, incentivize) best promotes economic prosperity?

Meeting Notes: social equity outcomes of encouraging or incentivizing

Worst Outcomes

- Persons with disabilities may be presented barriers if parking is reduced
- Disabled or older persons have difficulties with on street parking
- Transportation infrastructure lagging behind housing development
- Limited options for people who commute outside public transit
- Limited parking as a source of many neighborhood conflicts
- Street parking comes with anxieties of tickets, fines, towing, etc.
- Parking permits enforcing exclusionary practices
- Design standard templates becoming biased in who they serve
- Permit parking becoming an anti-homeless regulatory arm

Best Outcomes

- Allows more flexibility of the housing units
- Incentivizing overall makes it cheaper to build and more available to more people
- Parking flexibility could allow for more ADU’s or denser structures to be built
- Incentivizing as a tool to address the inherent housing inequities
- Incentivizing design standards would decrease costs
- Encouraging or incentivizing comes from our Guiding Values
- Providing template designs to keep our neighborhood character while lowering costs
Meeting Notes: environmental health outcomes of encouraging or incentivizing

**Worst Outcomes**
- Encouraging or incentivizing giving fewer people access to green space
- Giving only socioeconomically privileged people access to environmentally friendly options
- People become “packed in” to a dense and unfriendly environment

**Best Outcomes**
- People who formerly couldn’t afford homes can now gain more environmentally friendly living spaces
- Incentivizing the use of environmentally friendly building materials
- Incentivizing housing that shares walls and is more environmentally efficient
- Environmental incentives make it overall more affordable to live here
- Developers have the tools to be successful
- Green buildings don’t add more cost burden to develop or own
Meeting Notes: economic prosperity outcomes of encouraging or incentivizing

Worst Outcomes

- The transition to us being less dependent on fossil fuels is too far off to expect large shifts to non-automobile transportation
- Units that are affordable are built with cheap materials and aren’t built to last
- People’s route to prosperity, or their job, is still their car but now they wouldn’t have a parking spot
- Standards of durability may make it impossible for families or small developers to afford them
- Multifamily developments with parking spots up the rent as fewer developments have designated parking
- Standards impact families and homeowners different than developers
- Developers who can build more structures prey on homeowners with large enough lots to build more units
- Parking “wars” make a neighborhood less appealing
- Property tax increases force single family homeowners to move out of neighborhoods
- Building a driveway to a second unit on a lot brings in costs of permits and insurance

Best Outcomes

- Allow more families to build wealth through adding a second unit
- Housing is less expensive but still quality design and structure
- Our multifamily standards change to allow for a different variety of outcomes
- Standards allow some flexibility in key areas
- There are more options for first time home buyers through the added variety of housing stock
- Economic prosperity is spread out throughout the community
- More families can remain living together and move into their own house
- There are fewer barriers to wealth building
- People aren’t pressured into selling their house just so it can be redeveloped
- The process is simple enough for a homeowner to navigate through it
Key Takeaways
The input from the meeting, above, was synthesized by staff to inform the following key takeaways:

- **Incentivize** lot coverage and design standards to reduce overall costs of building and owning housing.
- Ensure that parking takes into consideration the **qualities and needs** of Eugene communities to address inherent inequities.
- Use incentives to create more **opportunities to build wealth** for families.
- **Expand** neighborhood amenities like parks and transportation options to keep up with new developments.
- Use our encouraging or incentivizing options intentionally to address the **inherent housing inequities** that exist in our community.
- Ensure new developments are affordable but **still quality structures**.
- Provide opportunities for **green space** for people on all portions of the socioeconomic spectrum.
- **Protect** current homeowners from being taken advantage of by large developers or rising property taxes.
- Prioritize getting **all kinds of people** into houses over the smaller concerns.