



Equity Roundtable Meeting One Summary

Date: November 19, 2020

Time: 5:30 - 8:30 p.m.

Number of participants: 9

Organizations and communities participating: UO Longhouse, Sapsik'walá Teacher Education program, DisOrient Asian American Film Festival, Lane Independent Living Alliance, NAACP, Huerto de Familia, Chinese Benevolent Association, TransPonder

Meeting Summary

At the beginning of the meeting, Terri Harding welcomed participants and introduced city staff. Perla Alvarez discussed community agreements with participants. Alai Reyes-Santos shared how the roundtable intersects with other city-led public engagement to receive input about the implementation of House Bill 2001. Reyes-Santos further explained the advisory role of the roundtable. Each participant introduced her/him/themselves by sharing their best and worst housing experiences in Eugene. Jennifer Knapp and the city staff introduced House Bill 2001 and answered participants' questions about it. After a five-minute break, participants were split into three breakout rooms with one City Staff and one ACC consultant to discuss "what are the participants' biggest concerns or worst outcomes of allowing more housing in more places in Eugene", and "what are their biggest hopes or best outcomes of allowing more housing in more places in Eugene." After 15 minutes of small group discussion, all participants, City staff, and ACC staff shared what they discussed with the whole group. In closing, Alai and City Staff asked participants to think about three Guiding Values and Principles that they believe should guide implementation of House Bill 2001 to discuss in the following meeting.

Summary of Findings

Worst Housing Experiences in Eugene

When participants shared their worst experiences with housing in Eugene, a few themes emerged, the length of waitlists for low income housing, difficulties finding housing for families with kids, feeling that Eugene is not welcoming for people of color, and intrusive and neglectful landlords.

P1 shared that finding low-income housing and getting on the waitlist is "really tough." P1 emphasized that the length of the waitlist has been an issue for him and the people he serves in his community: including unhoused people and people with disabilities. P5 shared their experience being a minority and finding housing in Eugene, "we have so many things against us, having one income, not having good credit, and the waiting lists." P3, P5, and P6, shared their obstacles finding housing while having children. P5 shared that their worst experiences in Eugene included having children and receiving complaints from neighbors about their children making regular noises when waking up "too early" or being "too loud" during quiet hours. P6

shared that a barrier when living in an apartment with kids is noise and sound complaints. P2 is a realtor and shared two experiences helping people of color find housing in Eugene, neither chose housing in Eugene because they did not see “welcoming signs” for people like them. Two participants mentioned issues with intrusive landlords who would enter the property without permission when they were entertaining family in culturally-specific ways; and two mentioned landlords who refused to care for their property properly.

Best Housing Experiences in Eugene

P6 and P5 shared that their best housing experiences were in South Eugene. P6 shared that their best housing experience in Eugene was possible because they know people with access to different housing and rental properties in South Eugene who have been able to “open doors.” P9 shared that their best experience with housing in Eugene was being able to access NEDCO resources.

What is your biggest concern or worst outcome of allowing more housing in more places in Eugene?

Three themes emerged around participant’s concerns and worst outcomes: housing placement, access to resources, and “pushback from the neighborhoods.” Participants discussed that a big concern about new housing is that they will not have access to transportation, grocery stores, and public spaces. Participants also shared their concerns because neighborhoods can be unwelcoming and stigmatize newcomers. Another concern around placement of housing was that the new housing will be near the University of Oregon-for college students-, not throughout the city. Other concerns discussed by participants included affordability of housing and close access to transportation.

What is your biggest hope or best outcome of allowing more housing in more places?

Affordable housing, architecture that supports intergenerational households, and housing in safe neighborhoods were three major topics discussed by participants as their biggest hopes for more housing in Eugene. Affordability was mentioned by five participants. They want housing that can be afforded by low income and middle-income community members; and that can be affordable enough to rent for long periods of time or to be purchased. Participants also discussed that location for new housing should keep in mind access to grocery stores, parks, schools, etc. Housing should also be accessible for people with disabilities.

Highlights

- Affordability of housing
- Housing for families with children
- Location of housing close to new grocery stores and transportation
- Multi-generational housing
- Accessible housing for people with disabilities
- Housing in safe areas
- Addressing stigma of Middle Housing
- Addressing unwelcoming climate for people of color

Equity Roundtable Meeting Two Summary

Date: December 8, 2020

Time: 5:30 - 7:30 p.m.

Number of participants: 7

Organizations and communities participating: UO Longhouse, Sapsik'walá, DisOrient Asian American Film Festival, Lane Independent Living Alliance, NAACP, Huerto de Familia, Chinese Benevolent Association

Meeting Summary

ACC welcomed participants and went over community agreements to clarify one about confidentiality of identifying information and personal stories shared during our meetings. Participants introduce themselves by sharing share their reflections from the last meeting. Terri Harding shared examples from Healthy Democracy guiding values and principles. Alai Reyes-Santos then clarified the roundtable's role in the project and shared opportunities to speak to decision makers. Next, Sophie McGinley shared updates on House Bill 2001. After a five-minutes break, participants were split into three breakout rooms with one City Staff and one ACC consultant. In these breakout groups, participants shared potential Guiding Values and Principles. After 20 minutes of small group discussions, all participants, City Staff, and ACC shared themes and ideas for the Guiding Values and Principles with the whole group. In closing, City Staff shared next steps for the Planning Commission and City Council work sessions.

Summary of Findings

Suggested Guiding Values and Principles:

- Spreading Middle Housing across Eugene
- Safety and security in building standards and architecture within the code itself
- Accessing federal funding for housing dedicated to Indigenous communities
- Create housing around and with green spaces
- Multi-family and multigenerational opportunities for housing
- Support programs for low-income renters and home buyers, and first-time home buyers
- Economic guidance
- Affordability at different income levels
- Opportunities for rent to own
- Distribution amongst different neighborhoods
- Environmentally sustainable housing
- Creating relationships with the land: in the way that houses are built, housing close to rivers and natural resources, build in conversation with Indigenous communities
- Comfortability and safety in neighborhoods
- Recognition of biased resistance from neighborhoods to Middle Housing

- Apply a decolonizing lens
- Involve local communities, businesses, and contractors to build new housing
- Prevent and address discriminatory rental practices
- Wealth building programs
- Support locals who want to buy houses
- Incentives for builders to follow the Guiding Values and Principles
- Enhance culture
- Democratic and transparent decision making
- Co-design architecture and floor plans with Grande Ronde and Siletz (work government-to-government with tribes)

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 Asain American Film Festival, Sapsik'walá, Huerto de Familia, UO Longhouse, NAACP - Eugene Springfield

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 Asain American Film Festival, Huerto de Familia, UO Longhouse, NAACP - Eugene Springfield, 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

Equity Roundtable Meeting Five Summary

Date: May, 12, 2021

Time: 5:00 - 7:00 p.m.

Number of participants: 7

Organizations and communities participating: UO Longhouse, Sapsik'walá, DisOrient Asain American Film Festival, Lane Independent Living Alliance, NAACP, Huerto de Familia, Chinese Benevolent Association

Meeting Summary

ACC welcomed participants and went over the agenda for the meeting. Participants introduced themselves by sharing their name, pronouns, and saying what they appreciate about another participant. The City of Eugene staff then spent 15 minutes sharing the impact of the RoundTables in the community engagement process, and they gave an introduction to the middle housing draft code recommendations. Participants then asked questions about the code recommendations and City of Eugene staff answered. Next the participants were split into two Zoom breakout rooms, each were led by one City of Eugene staff member. In the breakout rooms, participants provided input on the middle housing code recommendations and answered these questions: “Do the code recommendations meet the values and principles?,” “Are the recommendations furthering affordability?,” and “What are we missing?” After 10 minutes of breakout group discussion, everybody rejoined the main Zoom to share what they discussed. After a 5 minute break, Tyler Bump, from EcoNW, joined as a guest speaker. For 20 minutes, Tyler Bump shared a presentation on how affordability can impact the code packages and recommendations, and he answered questions posed by the participants. In closing, Terri Harding then shared the next steps for the City of Eugene’s middle housing and opportunities to continue participating.

Some highlights:

1. Values and Principles stand as useful ways to approach Middle Housing Code code draft and implementation.
2. Themes:
 - a. Affordability
 - i. Through incentives in real estate market, shared ownership (co-op models, shared tenancy, tenants-in-common model from Bay Area), community banks, land trusts, investments in support of low income and first-time home buyers
 - b. Middle Housing as an investment that can support people who face economic challenges, including the elderly:

- i. People can build on their existing property lot for additional income, or intergenerational living, or to support family and community care systems
 - ii. Concern that price is too high for low income communities
 - iii. Interest in row houses or similar units
 - c. Middle Housing in multiple neighborhoods; addressing stigma or resistance to newcomers
 - d. Accessible parking, specially for people with dis/abilities, no or low cost parking near units. Maybe having parking subsidies available for low income communities and people with dis/abilities.
 - e. Incentives for housing geared towards alternative transportation, inclusive age differences and needs, and mindful of people with dis/abilities
 - f. Standards that foster building using good, safe, and sustainable materials.
 - g. Access to commercial areas, schools, green areas
 - h. Access to gardening
 - i. Decolonizing design and architecture and their relationship to natural infrastructures
 - j. Drawing on federal funds to invest in housing for Native communities
 - k. Honoring historically working class, Black, Latinx, migrant communities, avoiding displacement of communities once new housing and/or amenities are built.
 - l. Discourage all middle housing from becoming short term rentals (AirBnBs)
 - m. Rethink language and word choice when discussing subsidized housing (using the term “affordable housing” causes folks to insert their own definition of “affordable”).
- 3. Reflections on Community Engagement Process:
 - a. Feeling good that the city is engaging community members
 - b. The last homework shared by request in last meeting (code draft) was too dense and long
 - c. Appreciate all the information shared, and being able to discuss community needs and experiences with housing
 - d. Being on Zoom enabled some to participate more (for example, people who are caretakers of children); while it posed technological challenges to others who were able to participate through accommodations and one-on-one consultant support.

4. Resources shared by participants in Chat:

<https://www.cultivateplace.com/c-street>; <https://www.portland.gov/phb/holte>