

# EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



---

## Work Session: Sustainability Commission/Envision Eugene

---

Meeting Date: April 20, 2011  
Department: City Manager's Office  
[www.eugene-or.gov](http://www.eugene-or.gov)

Agenda Item Number: A  
Staff Contact: Babe O'Sullivan  
Contact Telephone Number: 541-682-5017

---

### ISSUE STATEMENT

The Eugene Sustainability Commission has completed its review of the draft proposal "Envision Eugene: A Legacy of Livability." Commission members will provide comments and recommendations to City Council on the contents of the proposal and implications for meeting the City's sustainability goals.

### BACKGROUND

In February 2007, the council established the Sustainability Commission as a policy advisory body to the Eugene City Council and City Manager to assist in the development of programs to create or enhance sustainable practices within the community. The Sustainability Commission is charged with advising on policy matters related to sustainable practices, businesses that produce sustainable products and services, City building design and infrastructure, and related issues that directly affect sustainability efforts considered by the City Council.

In August 2011, the council approved the FY11 work plan for the Sustainability Commission which emphasizes land use and transportation as a primary focus. One task called for the commission to be engaged in Envision Eugene, a process to determine how the city will accommodate growth over the next 20 years. Specifically, the commission committed to:

- *Maintain individual commissioner involvement in Envision Eugene committee work.*
- *Review and comment on final Envision Eugene policy recommendations to council.*

Several commissioners, including Josh Skov, Rusty Rexius, Shawn Boles and Councilor Zelenka, have served on the Community Resource Group and related subcommittees that supported the development of the Envision Eugene recommendations. In addition, the commission provided detailed comments to City staff on the contents of the proposal's "Plan for Climate Change and Energy Uncertainty" pillar.

### RELATED CITY POLICIES

The council has adopted numerous resolutions articulating sustainability principles and policies. In February 2000, the council adopted Resolution No. 4618, which outlined a definition and statement of intent regarding the application of sustainability principles to the City of Eugene, and affirmed the commitment of elected officials and staff to uphold these principles. The council adopted Resolution Nos. 4884 and 4887 in 2006 regarding a sustainable buildings policy for City-owned and -occupied buildings.

In November 2006, Resolution No. 4893 was adopted, committing the City to sustainable practices and to businesses that produce sustainable products and services. This was followed in February 2007, by Ordinance No. 20379 which created the Sustainability Commission.

### **TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE IMPACTS**

The Triple Bottom Line (TBL) framework is fundamental to the work of the Sustainability Commission and is reflected in the feedback provided to the council on Envision Eugene. The commission also provided input on, and participated in, a series of staff-facilitated work sessions to identify potential impacts in the areas of social equity, economic prosperity, and environmental health. The results of these work sessions were shared with the council in the documents accompanying “Envision Eugene: A Legacy of Livability.”

### **COUNCIL OPTIONS**

No action is required. The council could request additional consideration and input on Envision Eugene from the Sustainability Commission.

### **CITY MANAGER’S RECOMMENDATION**

No recommendation is necessary. This item is informational only.

### **SUGGESTED MOTION**

No motion is necessary. This item is informational only.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

A. Envision Eugene Triple Bottom Line Summary: Review of *Draft* Strategies

### **FOR MORE INFORMATION**

Staff Contact: Babe O’Sullivan  
Telephone: 541-682-5017  
Staff E-Mail: [babe.osullivan@ci.eugene.or.us](mailto:babe.osullivan@ci.eugene.or.us)

# Envision Eugene

## Triple Bottom Line Summary

### Review of *Draft Strategies*

3.4.11

---

## INTRODUCTION

The following is a summary of comments and key issues captured from community members and City staff during a series of triple bottom line discussions held on February 12, 2011. The discussions focused on a selection of draft, in-progress Envision Eugene strategies. It's important to note that the discussions did not cover ALL strategies, but focused on those that; 1) exhibited high potential for trade-offs and discussion; 2) were defined enough to lend themselves to discussion, and/or; 3) could result in an action or change with tangible impacts (i.e. not a "study" or similar activity). Since the time of the TBL discussions, some strategies may have been revised. For the latest version of the Envision Eugene Draft Proposal, please visit [www.envisioneugene.org](http://www.envisioneugene.org).

### **Triple Bottom Line Overview**

The triple bottom line tool assesses multiple values and acknowledges that actions have social, environmental, and economic impacts. The assessment is intended to support staff and community members in recognizing potential impacts, both positive and negative, across all three areas of sustainability. By providing a means of exploring issues from different perspectives, the framework informs potential impacts, benefits and trade-offs associated with important choices.

### **What is the TBL tool?**

The TBL tool is simply a set of questions and prompts to guide discussion that is specifically focused on potential impacts in three areas: economic prosperity, social equity and environmental health. While the questions typically reflect much of what is already considered in the course of work, the method of applying them deliberately and systematically helps uncover issues that might not have been otherwise considered. In the simplest terms, the TBL tool is a way to help us have a whole conversation.

### **What does the tool provide?**

- Initial output consisting of notes from multiple TBL discussions
- A summary of the ideas discussed, highlighting a few of the most prominent impacts
- A starting point to assess the need for additional analysis or research
- Diverse perspectives to consider in decision-making

### **What does the tool NOT provide?**

- A “correct” decision or policy recommendation
- Detailed analysis and research.
- A guarantee that all impacts have been identified
- An assessment of the accuracy or magnitude of statements made by participants. If that information is needed, additional research and analysis would be required.
- An assignment of priority or weight to impacts

### **Envision Eugene and the TBL Process**

As we conclude the first year of aggressively applying the TBL tool in the City of Eugene, we are adapting the tool to improve its ability to inform discussions. By applying the tool to Envision Eugene, we have discovered a number of new best practices that can be applied in future efforts.

To conduct this TBL exercise, we invited a mixed group of community members and staff with particular expertise to participate in a series of discussions covering eight of the Envision Eugene strategies. Four different groups met, each spending three hours and discussing one to three strategies each. While participants were actively recruited from diverse groups to help provide a mix of environmental, social, and economic awareness and expertise, the balance of views and level of expertise varied with each group. Participants included Sustainability Commissioners, Planning Commissioners, Human Rights Commissioners, Neighborhood Leaders Council members, and Envision Eugene Community Resource Group members. A list of participants and affiliations as well as a transcript of notes taken at each session is provided at the end of each section.

After reviewing the notes from these discussions, there appeared to be an opportunity to identify additional impacts, particularly in the area of social equity. Another round of TBL discussions was convened with small staff groups to provide more depth to the results. These discussions resulted in a list of potential impacts that are included in the summary notes.

### **Next Steps**

These discussions provided valuable information for Envision Eugene as well as new ideas about how the tool can be effectively applied. Moving forward, additional TBL discussions will be convened at a finer level of detail during which we can build on what we’ve learned. Future discussions will likely be more informative and helpful as the topics become more specific. We will continue to share these results with decision makers and the public as the work of Envision Eugene proceeds.

For more information, please contact Matt McRae, 682-5485, [matt.a.mcrae@ci.eugene.or.us](mailto:matt.a.mcrae@ci.eugene.or.us)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

PAGE	ITEM
4	Pillar: <b>Provide ample economic opportunities for all community members</b> Strategy 3: <i>Consolidate and develop or redevelop vacant (industrial) lands and developed sites (including contaminated sites) within the existing UGB.</i>
10	Pillar: <b>Provide ample economic opportunities for all community members</b> Strategy 6: <i>Additional work is being completed to determine the timing and amount of acres of industrial land to be provided outside the existing UGB, to meet the defined economic development sites portfolio.</i>
15	Pillar: <b>Provide affordable housing for all income levels</b> Strategy 1: <i>Plan for a higher proportion of new housing stock to be multi-family than the 39% of multi-family that currently exists. Increasing the proportion of multi-family housing increases the amount of housing accessible to all income ranges.</i>
22	Pillar: <b>Promote compact urban development and efficient transportation options</b> Strategy 3: <i>Protect adjacent neighborhoods and provide housing options by creating transition areas between commercial and higher density residential uses and lower-density, single family neighborhoods in accordance with the goals and recommendations of the infill compatibility standards and opportunity siting task teams.</i>
25	Pillar: <b>Promote compact urban development and efficient transportation options</b> Strategy 4: <i>Make compact urban development of core commercial areas and corridors easier</i>
31	Pillar: <b>Protect, repair, and enhance neighborhood livability</b> Strategy 1: <i>Do not increase densities in neighborhoods above those allowed by existing regulations, or undertake new strategies that impact neighborhoods unless they are in accordance with the goals and recommendations of the Infill Compatibility Standards and Opportunity Siting Task Teams.</i>
38	Pillar: <b>Protect, restore and enhance natural resources</b> Strategy 2: <i>Protect, maintain and restore high quality woodland and oak savanna habitat, high quality native upland and wetland prairie</i>
43	Pillar: <b>Protect, restore, and enhance natural resources</b> Strategy 3: <i>Preserve valuable farmland outside the UGB</i>

# Envision Eugene: TBL Analysis

---

**Pillar:** Provide ample economic opportunities for all community members

**Strategy 3:** Consolidate and develop or redevelop vacant (industrial) lands and developed sites (including contaminated sites) within the existing UGB.

## Key Points

- Planning for industrial uses should be done mindful of transportation needs, impacts on residents, and in context with industrial development in adjacent communities.
- Brownfield clean up and industrial site consolidation may increase opportunities for industrial development; however both can be expensive and may increase the cost of siting industry in Eugene.
- Providing a variety of industrial lands can help meet industrial needs, increase employment opportunities, expand the City's tax base and may increase average wages; however industry can impact residential areas so buffer zones for air, water, light, and noise pollution are necessary.

## Impacts Identified

### Social Equity

- Residential areas can be impacted by air, water, noise, light pollution. Buffers are important to mitigate this concern.
- If not done carefully, industrial sites can isolate residential populations from amenities, services, and transportation options.

### Environmental Health

- Brownfield clean up can provide environmental benefit
- Consolidation of industrial sites, not expanding UGB for industrial, can reduce travel demand
- Done thoughtfully, industrial siting can improve transportation options.
- Industrial siting inside the UGB can impact wetlands and natural areas.

### Economic Prosperity

- Industrial lands provide jobs, are likely to increase wages, and those located within the UGB increase the tax base.
  - Brownfield clean up and industrial site consolidation can be expensive.
  - A variety of industrial sites are needed in order to meet varying industrial needs – if not, opportunities for industrial development can be lost
  - Don't plan in a vacuum – the industrial development plans of neighboring communities (Veneta, Junction City) are important to consider and may affect the need and demand in Eugene.
  - There may be industrial opportunities associated with local agriculture
- 

## Meeting Notes

**Date:** February 12, 2011 (Group 3, 1-4 PM)

**Location:** Atrium Saul Room

### **Panelists:**

Carlos Barrera	Neighborhood Leaders Council
Mike Sullivan	City of Eugene Community Development
Jason Dedrick	City of Eugene Planning
Bill Randall	Planning Commission
Lisa Arkin	Sustainability Commission
Jesse Cary-Hobbs	City of Eugene Parks and Open Space
Ann Vaughn	Community Resource Group

### **Also Present:**

Eric Wold (Facilitator) City of Eugene, Parks and Open Space

Patricia Neighbor(note taker) City of Eugene, Intern

### Social Equity

- In neighborhoods located near industrial lands, the impact of industrial emissions and sense of isolation is prevalent and important to consider (this includes lack of amenities, bike paths, parks and open space, lack of bus service).
- These issues are related to areas near the Southern Pacific Railroad. The Bethel-Danebo area is an example of an area isolated from the rest of Eugene by industrial areas. Feeling of isolation is important to address.
- We should increase employment which provides a meaningful standard of living for members of the community. Providing lands for location of these industries is important to make that

possible. Preparing property for future redevelopment will involve environmental remediation. Community (environmental) issues regarding those properties can be addressed through the process of redevelopment.

- Providing industrial sites within the UGB increases Eugene's tax base. It's important to look within the UGB to maximize industrial sites, keeping in mind minimization of neighborhood impacts.
- What are the mechanisms which would enable us to consider lands with barriers to redevelopment?
- Property consolidation is a difficult, and potentially expensive, process. Developing a trust is an organizational form which can be used to move forward. Our neighbors to the north for example—pins, urban renewal districts. Working with the EPA for brownfield assessment grants leading to capital for revolving loan funds- Eugene is not high on that list. Combination of state and local funds should also be considered.
- Time and money are developers' two big issues. Time can be minimized- assistance can be provided by the City in this regard,
- Pollution- air, water, light and noise can affect quality of life in neighborhoods. Concern about resource allocation when an industry moves in. Industries move in for incentives and tax breaks- when these run out they leave. Are there claw-back provisions in place? Industries should be a permanent resource.
- Are we making an assumption that an industrial site means medium to heavy industrial? There are other types of industries that can create the type of employment for which we are looking. Example: City of Ashland has created redevelopment with art studios, restaurants, bed and breakfasts, etc.. A second thought is, as a Lane Co. Planning Commissioner, almost every city in the county has applied for UGB expansion for industrial growth. We should be cognizant of what our neighbors are doing. (We can't do our plan in a vacuum.)
- The notion of industrial tax abatement. Enterprise zone provides a big benefit. It is important for communities to be smart about what industries come in. Example: Hynix- the tax flow that came out was huge. Payroll was 50 million. In the end they were the largest taxpayer in the community- larger than the next 6 largest combined. Case by case basis approach is appropriate.
- A piece of the industrial lands strategy says look outside the UGB.
- Re: Ashland- If you look at the components of that redevelopment, they are interesting business types (service sector) in a smaller tourist-oriented town. The service sector jobs are low wage jobs. Affordable housing is a problem in Ashland.
- Industrial Geography- There are areas that were designated industrial long before residential.
- The point about buffering is important. Redeveloping inside is important.
- Maintaining an adequate standard of living for the community. The returns to the community in terms of wages and taxes are something we must consider.
- Appreciates points made about Ashland and their difference. Mountain Rose Herbs on Steward Road is a good example of a firm.
- Quality of life comment: A number of reports have been published which emphasize that education is of increasing importance. Educating our youth is important so that they will be prepared for these jobs.



## Environmental Health

- If we are trying to attract industry, do we try to attract green/clean industry. What wages do these industries provide? If they provide higher wages, it helps the economy and the environment.
- Background: the JEOs, in regional economic development strategy talked about key issues. There are industries they seek to support. They targeted areas for growth. 1) Clean and renewable 2) software 3) healthcare 4) biomedical 5) research 6) advanced manufacturing. Advanced manufacturing: example is photovoltaics. We must be sure that industries with a clean label actually *are* clean or green as they come in.
- One area important to keep in mind as an industry is farming. This is a great resource as far as keeping it local. Agriculture is an industry, and it can impact the quality of life. Class 1 soils are important and should be preserved for farming. There are a number of areas in which recreational and agricultural lands have been combined (in land and/or in concept), and there is potential use for that.
- There are currently industrial lands which are being farmed. Outside/inside UGB is of significance in preserving farmlands.
- Wetland prairie has not been well preserved (95% gone). Protection and preservation is important. Spaces have been used for green space and recreation. Example: bike path to Meadowlark Prairie is a great amenity for all Eugeniens. As we look at consolidation of industrial lands further, industrial lands are often barriers to recreation. People who live in West Eugene have a difficult time moving through those (industrial) zones; we should figure out ways to enable people to move physically through industrial areas. We should prioritize preservation of higher quality natural spaces.
- Making property redevelopable will involve remediation. Possibility: Amazon- stormwater issues. This remediation would be value added.
- The idea of buffer zones is essential to this issue. Lisa lived near Hynix and noticed changes in the area: it changed from a thriving area to almost a dead zone. Industry and healthy environmental areas/wetlands cannot coexist. Lisa would like us to consider a different type of industry. What types of inquiry can we do into possibilities within the manufacturing sector? How can partnerships with the university be made in research? We can't continue to rely on industries that rely on old technology. We can be the site for a new kind of manufacturing sector.
- Without knowing the methods for developing industrial lands, it is difficult to know about the environmental impacts and what they would be. He is not sure about the answer to the question. If industrial lands are consolidated, will this affect human access or migration of animals or plants?
- Example of successful consolidation of industrial lands different from what existed prior: near Federal Courthouse lands were consolidated (I-2) for redevelopment.
- There are environmental benefits to cleaning up brownfields. Consolidating industrial lands within the UGB is positive for the environment, and decreases travel distance for the footprint of people traveling to work.

- Public input has emphasized local business growth. Redevelopment of existing properties can help local companies grow. Discussion occurred around the idea that attracting industries could keep in mind environmental impacts.
- Would like to amplify point made before: how property is used and new industry acts is important. Example: Renewable energy is a mixed bag. We need to see the label and also examine how an industry actually works. Redevelopment of property is an economic engine to get a property renewed. Economic, social and environmental value- added.
- Ways to get people to move through industrial lands. Example: Amazon Creek has been successfully made into valuable open space. Other channels can in the future have increased value as corridors for recreation and as an environmental/mitigation/habitat asset. The Metro Waterways study looks into this. As we consolidate, we should look at our existing resources and how we can improve upon them, at the same time people travel sustainably (especially by bike or on foot).
- An observation that the A2 channel had value, but developers were allowed to build on it; it was an opportunity lost.
- Some was farmed yet changed to land zoned industrial (i.e. Junction City). We should look to history as a precedent.
- Union Pacific rail yard question: As a chunk of land underused, what is known by the City and County about it? – This question is not going to be addressed now, but is important-- .
- It seems as if there's a no-man's zone between the city and the UGB as far as who is responsible for what.
- Would like there to be more oversight of that area, regarding building permits, air and water regulations.

### Economic Prosperity

- If we want to attract industry we need to have a variety of sites available for them. We should provide options for industry.
- Part of attracting industry is providing space for people already here to do what they need to do. (I.e. Grainmillers needed to expand; they needed to move, but due to what's available, they moved to Junction City. People who work for them now drive to Junction City, and Junction City benefits from the tax base of the business.) We should work with existing companies in Eugene to target their needs. This is essential to benefits of redevelopment.
- Is there a 'sweet spot' size for attracting industries? (Mike- No.) Determining a targeted size would help us.
- Looking at the regional economic development strategy, 50 acres has been looked at by CH2M Hill and the state.
- Lots at smaller end are those that are available currently.
- Land south of the airport is an area which we could think about. (Grainmillers jumped on an opportunity- the expansion of Junction City UGB towards Eugene due to state hospital- and was able to relocate because of it.)
- Grainmillers asked for relief in that neighborhood, but that was not possible. It's unfortunate that they left for Eugene, especially due to externalities.

- Rexus is a similar example; now they're looking to shift out. We may want to plan for industrial uses and other uses to be located within the city, together.
- Degree of negative impacts of larger or smaller (space) industries should be considered. Number of jobs per acre is important consideration; it's important to not 'waste land' (point made earlier).
- Can it be funded by grants or will it require investment on the part of the community? Grant resources should be available over time. Consolidation of resources themselves will require investment by the community; although perhaps over time it can provide income.

# Envision Eugene: TBL Analysis

---

**Pillar:** Provide ample economic opportunities for all community members

**Strategy 6:** Additional work is being completed to determine the timing and amount of acres of industrial land to be provided outside the existing UGB, to meet the defined economic development sites portfolio.

## Key Points

*Note: In its responses, the group discussed the expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary to provide industrial land*

- Affordable, appropriately sized industrial sites in and around Eugene are likely to encourage industrial development that creates employment opportunities, improves wages, and increases the tax base; however there are potential costs of expanding roads, utilities and other infrastructure to meet the needs of new industry; mitigating impacts to wetlands, agricultural land, or natural areas; and preventing negative impacts on residents that can arise from industrial pollutants and geographic isolation.
- Not all industries are the same - the type of industrial development has a huge influence on the type and magnitude of impacts.

## Summary of Impacts

### Social Equity

- The location of industrial sites will likely impact important transportation options for both employees and freight.
- Distances to industrial sites and available transportation options will influence the accessibility to industrial employment opportunities.
- Large industrial sites can geographically isolate residential neighborhoods by causing a transportation barrier to accessing services, commercial centers, and nearby residential neighborhoods.

- Industrial employment opportunities impact the affordability of housing (a function of the cost of housing and household income) in Eugene, by providing jobs and potentially increasing average wages.
- Industrial land uses that generate pollutants, if sited adjacent to residential neighborhoods, can have a negative impact on the physical and mental health of nearby residents.

### Environmental Health

- Industrial site development inside or outside the UGB may have impacts on wetlands, natural areas, or agricultural lands.
- Industrial uses inside or outside the UGB may generate undesirable air, water, and soil pollutants.
- Not all industries are the same - the type of industrial development has a huge influence on the impacts.

### Economic Prosperity

- Industrial land uses are likely to require investments in infrastructure including transportation, sewer, electricity, and water.
- There may be cost efficiencies to having industrial uses in close proximity to one another.
- Industrial employment opportunities are likely to increase job availability and improve overall average wages.
- Affordable industrial sites of certain sizes are necessary for industrial development to occur in Eugene.
- Agriculture-related industrial opportunities should not be overlooked, including food processing and the manufacture of value-added agricultural products.
- Industrial development located outside of Eugene may have employment benefits but will miss opportunities for increasing the tax base.
- Opportunities exist to create innovative, clean industrial development paired with high quality workforce education from Lane Community College.

## Meeting Notes

**Date:** February 12, 2011 (Group 2, 9 AM - 12 PM)

**Location:** Atrium Saul Room

**Panelists:**

Carlos Barrera	Neighborhood Leader’s Council
Mike Sullivan	City of Eugene Community Development
Jason Dedrick	City of Eugene Community Planning
Bill Randall	Planning Commission

Lisa Arkin                      Sustainability Commission  
Jesse Cary-Hobbs            City of Eugene Parks and Open Space  
Ann Vaughn                    Community Resource Group

**Also Present:**

Eric Wold (Facilitator)                      City of Eugene, Parks and Open Space  
Patricia Neighbor (note taker)            City of Eugene, Intern

Social Equity

- Transition zones could be important to social equity issues (to avoid geographic isolation issues caused by large industrial zones).
- Transportation needs for people commuting to work must be addressed to ensure equal opportunities. =>Access to those new jobs depends on location for many – access may not be equitable depending on types of jobs, recruitment strategies, etc.
- Junction City along Hwy 99 is an example. Transportation infrastructure had not been considered. Transportation must be planned simultaneously. Funding for it must be addressed.
- Affordable housing is a problem in the community. Eugene may be as much as 9,000 units short; in essence this is an income problem rather than a supply problem, due to lower than average wages. In excess of 30% of income, or 50% of income for housing is significant currently.
- Providing industrial land is an income-supporting strategy. It is a fundamental piece of social equity. Without supporting economic opportunities, every aspect of some people’s lives is in jeopardy.
- Access to healthcare for communities in West Eugene must be addressed. Working in concert with healthcare providers to provide accessibility to low-income families is important.
- Concerning mental health, intrusion of industrial of people living near industrial sites must be considered.
- Clarification: The areas with the least constraints for expansion are Northeast of town & North. Northwest also, although there are wetland issues there. Various considerations are being made currently to consider various issues.
- Putting more industrial lands on the edge of the city forces people to commute, which reduces quality of life. Alternately, additional residential and commercial space (essentially mixed use centers) could be located nearby. This should be thought about if expansion of the UBG for industrial lands should occur.
- Regarding the just-in-time concept (for industrial lands – made available as needed), Just in time doesn’t only mean being inside the UGB, it means being ready for development. Being in the UGB and zoned, served and ready to go facilitates a decision about location.
- The other strategy of redevelopment, is suited to existing companies in town. For newer industries, inner redevelopment is less suitable.
- Pushing industrial development out produces logistical transportation issues, so these should be addressed, yet also as reflected in the prior conversation inner redevelopment also may create transportation issues. Yet in order to push up wages in the community these areas must be addressed.

- Clarification: The UGB and city limit are less in concert in the Northeast. This keeps some of these areas from developing, in part due to provision of services.
- According to state law those are the areas that must be looked at first?
- Regarding quality of life and transportation needs; 30,000 increase of population over next 20 years. It makes the most sense to expand the UGB for industrial rather than other purposes to address industry needs. Some industries need larger spaces that are not available within the UGB. To improve quality of life and provide residents with living wage jobs.
- Clarification: The biggest advantage of keeping lands outside the UGB is that once land is added, it typically is not subtracted.
- Clarification: Designation of lands for industrial uses is consistent over time.
- Industrial reserves in Portland have been used—‘just in time’ property. It has been good but in other cases has been a ‘chain around the ankle’.
- Creates the potential for additional jobs to support families - Industrial jobs tend to be higher paying than retail jobs – and tend to be more stable and create opportunities for higher wages
- There are potential environmental justice issues, specifically lower income residents closer to industrial sites and possibly pollutants, depending on the nature of the industrial development.
- Location plays a big role – impacts on school kids depends on proximity to schools
- The *type* of industry added is critically important
- Eugene has a high rate of foreclosures – typically due to loss of income. Families who have lost jobs may be able to find a new job. Industrial jobs tend to pay more than service sector positions. This may reduce foreclosures and benefit neighborhoods by increasing neighborhood stability.

### Environmental Health

- The Goshen area has possibilities for industrial land: transmission lines, rail, and highway (not sure about water). UGB expansion out to the area, could have unintended consequences (i.e. sewer availability could result in development of productive farmland). There could be risks to Russell Creek and environmental damage there.
- Doesn’t know how Eugene would ever move out to Goshen because Springfield has their ‘eye’ on it. Would this create a “Hopscotch pattern?”
- Challenges around Goshen encouraged addressing the area as a regional area for industry, yet not an area to include in the Eugene UGB.
- Vehicle travel would increase with UGB expansion.
- The county has been looking at the riparian and floodplain protections. Cities should do their part. This creates constraints. Expanding the UGB puts us at peril as far as protecting our own values of protecting natural resources and natural lands. To sacrifice our wetland is not a great idea; we have been learning more about their value.
- For that reason, it is important to look at brownfields within and outside of UGB.
- Brownfield solution can work well with local companies, but very difficult with outside companies.

- Concerns should be first and foremost in consideration of areas in which to expand.
- Expansion onto potentially viable farmland could impact food security.
- Regarding transportation we could think innovatively to address issues (i.e. commuter lanes).
- There may be new options in the future over 20 years. There is a dilemma about what things will look like in the future, so we should address this periodically as things change.
- With the brownfields there is a pollution problem that we must address. Pollution from superfund sites in Eugene. Each time we expand, we are expanding the ‘balloon’ of our impact on the environment. It is our obligation to first clean up our superfund sites and the brownfield sites surrounding the “superfund sites.”

### Economic Prosperity

- Expanding the UGB alone doesn’t actually add jobs – it just creates the possibility for economic investment to occur.
- We have local industry that has outgrown its site and needs a larger site. It would be nice to have options for them to move yet still be within the UGB of Eugene.
- Food production is also an industry. We could be leaders in that way and innovators. In public testimony, farmers have said that even class 2 and 3 soils are high-yield soils.
- There is an opportunity for value-added agriculture. This is an industrial use which still needs a space (i.e. the former Agripac).
- Christmas trees are number one crop coming out of Lane County. Infrastructure could be provided to encourage value- added agriculture industries. Some of these jobs could be traded-sector in character. This could be a good route and area of potential growth.
- Potential for combining agriculture and energy production (i.e. anaerobic digesters).
- Jobs that could come out of that sector could be so fundamentally important to helping family income and average wage. It has huge impacts on people’s lives: access to food and housing. These things firstly make life tolerable, then improve quality of life.
- Increasing industrial opportunities within the UGB by expansion will increase our tax base.
- Placing industrial development outside the UGB does not as directly benefit Eugene, although it is still of benefit.
- Redeveloping smaller parcels in Eugene is important. No areas come without a tradeoff.
- Expanding UGB will increase infrastructure costs.
- Employment and training should be considered in providing opportunities for jobs and growth.
- The City and the County are involved, as well as LCC and the workforce partnership to bring young people up to speed for available jobs and jobs in growing areas.
- Also a Green Industry group has been formed to talk about training and education needs for green industry.
- There sometimes is a disconnect between the schools and community, and it is helpful for teachers to hear relation to economy, to be able to make a connection.



# Envision Eugene: TBL Analysis

---

**Pillar:** Provide affordable housing for all income levels

**Strategy 1:** Plan for a higher proportion of new housing stock to be multi-family than the 39% of multi-family that currently exists. Increasing the proportion of multi-family housing increases the amount of housing accessible to all income ranges.

## Key Points

- While it is challenging to integrate people from varied socioeconomic strata, multi-family housing and low-income housing should both be mixed in with other types of housing. If either multifamily housing or low-income housing is isolated, those areas may experience negative impacts including an increase in crime and decrease in quality of schools.
- There is not enough emphasis on emergency housing needs – for example, single room housing to provide transition housing or to shelter homeless. This need is not likely to ever be addressed by the private sector.
- High density and multifamily housing is not automatically the most environmentally friendly. While these things may decrease the use of raw land, building materials and energy, increased density may impact infrastructure such as stormwater systems, potable water delivery systems, and parks and green space.
- This type of development may require public funding and investment in infrastructure to be cost competitive in the market, but provides opportunities for innovation in the building industry and greater economic freedom for low income and multifamily residents.

## Impacts Identified

### Social Equity

- Will likely create housing opportunities for community members of all economic strata including those in need.
- Cultural diversity within communities may increase cultural tension or may increase community interaction and understanding.
- Concentrating low income populations creates social problems (teen pregnancy, crime) and may have social justice implications.
- Pushing low income housing to the periphery of the city may “ghettoize” the population.
- May ignore the needs of community members in the most dire economic situations; those looking for emergency housing.
- Paths to both single family and multifamily ownership across income levels may increase neighborhood stability, long term safety and livability for the community as a whole.
- May negatively impact existing single family housing neighborhoods with spatial and privacy concerns.
- May ignore low income home ownership opportunities.
- Decrease in homeownership will impact property taxes supporting school systems, though mixed housing neighborhoods will likely increase school stability.

### Environmental Health

- More attached housing provides the ability to use land more efficiently which in turn increases ability to protect existing green space areas.
- Increasing density will put more pressure on existing green spaces and ecosystem services.
- Increased density may impact stormwater treatment facilities but there may be reduced impervious space resulting from multifamily development.
- Fewer construction materials per capita are needed for multifamily development.
- Feasibility of public transportation and active transportation (biking and walking) increases with higher density and may attract people to these neighborhoods.
- Efficient construction methods and building patterns remain paramount in ensuring that multifamily structures are sustainable, this will require government input.
- Per capita energy use is lower for residents of multifamily housing.

### Economic Prosperity

- New multifamily construction, especially for low-income units, may require subsidies to be competitive and affordable in the market, particularly with the current supply of foreclosed housing.
- Development of multifamily housing in existing neighborhoods may require additional public infrastructure investment in transit, water/sewer, open space, sidewalks and street improvements.
- Slowing the development of large, single family homes on larger lots of land may free up existing unused land for economic development.

- Providing affordable housing may encourage stability needed for community members to invest in other aspects of their lives such as education and economic activities.
  - Builders may require different skill sets to construct multifamily housing and this may create an opportunity for new, innovative types of construction firms to develop.
  - These construction activities will require different capital resources.
  - Existing regulations may create economic barriers to new development projects.
  - Housing density developed alongside small scale commercial activities may encourage the success of small businesses.
- 

## Meeting Notes

**Date:** February 12, 2011 (Group 1, 9 AM-12 PM)

**Location:** Atrium Sloat Room

**Panelists:**

Pat Farr	Community Resource Group
Josh Bruce	Sustainability Commission
Heidi Beierle	Planning Commission
Sara Palmer	Community Resource Group
Linda Hamilton	Human Rights Commission
Milo Mecham	Lane Council of Governments
Stephanie Jennings	City of Eugene, Community Development
Heather O'Donnell	City of Eugene, Land Use Planning
Trevor Taylor	City of Eugene, Parks and Open Space

**Also Present:**

Terrie Monroe (Facilitator)	City of Eugene, City Manager's Office
Leisha McParland (note taker)	City of Eugene, Intern

Social Equity

- Increase in multifamily housing may increase single family housing availability
- Limitations on urban growth boundary may artificially raise cost of housing
- Increase access to housing for those in need
- Positive impact on both single family and multifamily market
- Serve the growing need for student housing in campus area
- Better serve lower income community in access to housing
- Increase availability of daily needs within community area
- Resources will be easier to access for community with disabilities
- By making housing more affordable for low income residents, you will encourage financial autonomy
- 20 minute communities will create richer communities, increase food accessibility

- Culturally rich communities
- Resisting infill is prohibitive of 20 minute communities in existing communities
- Higher density will require services for long-term livability
- Ecosystem services will be important in higher density neighborhoods
- Residential intensification in areas with existing problems in transportation access will create social justice concerns (w. 11th, hwy. 99)
- Commercial resistance to the creation of low income housing neighborhoods
- Concentration of low income populations create social problems (teen pregnancy, crime) social justice implications
- Tying affordability to multifamily may perpetuate the idea that affordability means rental only
- May ignore low income home ownership opportunities
- Creates opportunity to correct existing problems with corridors
- Address the issue of school stability
- Increasing multifamily renting availability may decrease the pressure to seek homeownership
- Increasing multifamily renting creates more options for community members in economic distress
- Decrease in homeownership will impact property taxes supporting school systems
- Mixed housing neighborhoods will create school stability
- Path to both single family and multifamily ownership across income levels will encourage neighborhood stability
- Decrease the environmental impact of housing
- Provide people with housing of different “foot print” sizes
- Mixed housing communities may encourage greater cultural diversity
- Cultural diversity within communities may increase either greater community interaction and understanding or cultural tension
- Cultural and social amenities may lag behind population growth in such a way that diminishes livability
- This lag may discourage community members from moving into newly developed neighborhoods
- Providing affordable housing for all income levels ignores the priority population which is the 20 percent of the city who are in most need
- Is the periphery of the city the appropriate place to encourage lower to moderate housing development
- Pushing low income housing to the periphery of the city may “ghettoize” the population
- Cultural tension may arise by integrating income levels within neighborhoods
- By diversifying neighborhoods you avoid both ghettoizing and creating unsafe and unhealthy neighborhoods
- City should encourage developers to move high income housing into all areas of Eugene to diversify populations
- Possibility of creating multifamily minimums for developing neighborhoods
- Would removing the idea of affordable and replacing it with mixed address the issues of gentrification, cultural tensions, etc.

- Avoid the mistakes of the past of limiting housing options and segregating neighborhoods by financial markers
- We need to think beyond current boundaries of neighborhoods and city limits
- Opportunities for new low income housing need to be taken advantage of
- Long term land bank planning
- Community members need to be encouraged to welcome diversification in housing and community
- Conversations in neighborhood associations will need to address the changing economic demographics
- Flexibility in terms of development, zoning, Whiteaker neighborhood is great example
- Peripheral city development may encourage greater vehicle traffic
- Single family subdivisions in north and west Eugene will likely demand commercial and environmental redevelopment in the future
- Accessory dwelling unit limitations create inefficiency of land use
- Lot size limitations negatively impact density opportunities
- CC&R's demand review
- Encourage neighborhood collaboration to review zoning limitations and forward looking, TBL-inspired changes
- Does this proposal affect the physical or mental health of individuals, or the status of public health in our community?
- May negatively impact existing single family housing communities with spatial and privacy preferences
- Will create housing opportunities for community members of all economic strata
- Higher income community members will find greater options outside of larger-scale single family housing
- May ignore the needs of community members in the most dire economic situations; those looking for emergency housing
- May not account for single room occupancy
- By increasing pathways to housing for those in emergency housing needs we will invest in long term safety and livability for the community as a whole
- Relying on for-profit housing developers will likely ignore the needs of those in economic emergencies
- For-profit zoning ignores the role of government in providing subsidized housing for community members in need
- May be ignoring the needs of Latino immigrant communities
- Recognizes the growing Latino population and need for lower income accommodations

### Environmental Health

- Adding more multifamily housing stock may result in the tearing down or under-use of existing houses
- It may be useful to address possible use of existing housing in creating affordable options

- More attached housing provides the ability to use land more efficiently which would in turn allow for protection of existing green space areas
- Increasing density while maintaining or increasing park space
- Existing green spaces and eco services will be taxed by increasing density
- Storm water treatment will be challenged by increased density
- Greater need for preservation and restoration of existing stock of housing
- Public infrastructure has opportunity to reintroduce ecological value, green space
- Natural systems can be increased by building “up” rather than out
- A reduction of need for impervious space for multifamily development
- Fewer construction materials are needed for multifamily development
- Different resources will be allocated to multifamily structures
- Feasibility of public transportation increases with higher density
- Biking and pedestrian activities may be better served by higher density
- Efficient construction methods remain paramount in ensuring that multifamily structures are sustainable, this will require government input
- Transportation amenities will be necessary to attract people towards high density neighborhoods
- Analysis will be needed to determine energy use between multifamily and single family housing, likely less for the former
- Efficiency in building patterns remains the key determinant in environmental impact of housing
- Subsidizing multifamily units will be more efficient use of public funds towards environmental end
- Public outreach efforts towards environmental stewardship in the community may be more efficient in multifamily communities
- Greater sense of community in maintaining environment
- Social pressure of committing to eco-friendly activities
- Reduction of energy use by residents of multifamily housing
- Multifamily is not inherently more eco-friendly without intentional planning
- Infill without environmentally friendly building and resource use planning is not less impactful on the open space and storm water

### Economic Prosperity

- Slowing the development of large, single family housing on larger lots of land will free up existing unused land for economic development
- Home builders may require collaboration with city to provide new opportunities in the future
- Innovative, new construction style businesses will flourish
- New economic opportunities are needed in conjunction with affordable housing directed at low income community members
- If existing land bank space is allocated disproportionately to housing it may be to the detriment of economic development, perpetuating economic stratification
- Providing affordable housing may encourage stability needed for community members to invest in other aspects of their lives i.e. Education, economic activities

- Multifamily, higher density neighborhoods will likely decrease transportation
- Lower fossil fuel use in “20 minute” neighborhoods
- Multifamily housing neighborhoods will likely develop in areas with existing services
- Existing multifamily neighborhoods are already underserved with pedestrian accessibility i.e. W. 11<sup>th</sup>
- Speed humps and increased sidewalk access will be necessary to connect neighborhoods to commercial activities
- Building companies will require different skill sets to provide multifamily housing
- These construction activities will require different capital resources
- New development faces competition with existing housing supply
- New multifamily construction may require subsidies to be competitive on the market
- Cost of new development may exceed the return from what community members can afford
- Existing regulations may create economic barriers to new development projects
- The oversupply of foreclosed housing may discourage new multifamily housing developments
- Low income developments will likely require increase public funding in the way of grants
- New developments may increase the demand of public services such as sewage treatment, sidewalk access, street etc.
- Greater neighborhood density will increase usage of public space and services, likely increasing the demand for servicing and upkeep
- The creation of more affordable housing opportunities may free up the economic resources of community members for entrepreneurial activities
- Housing density developed alongside small scale commercial activities will encourage the success of small businesses
- By encouraging small business activities local neighborhoods are more livable and sustainable
- Small businesses operating out of homes will require services as well

# Envision Eugene: TBL Analysis

---

**Pillar:** Promote compact urban development and efficient transportation options.

**Strategy 3:** Protect adjacent neighborhoods and provide housing options by creating transition areas between commercial and higher density residential uses and lower-density, single family neighborhoods in accordance with the goals and recommendations of the infill compatibility standards and opportunity siting task teams.

## Key Points

- Transition areas provide greater range of housing types and affordability and as a result, more access and benefits to a broader range of socio-economic groups. Residents in these areas, however, may carry a greater burden for the impacts of commercial development (noise, air quality, etc.) than the residents of the adjacent single-family neighborhood.
- Transition zones could serve as an important incubator for home-based, small businesses and provide additional customer base for the adjacent commercial core areas.

## Impacts Identified

### Social Equity

- More options for housing (type, affordability).
- Possibility of stigma of residing in or around commercial areas relative to single family neighborhoods.
- Residents in transition zones may have lower livability, e.g. increased traffic, reduced parking, noise and “view” of commercial buildings/activities.

### Environmental Health

- Act as buffer between commercial and residential zones. May need landscaping or other open space to improve visual impacts of commercial development and to provide access to natural resources.
- Lower environmental impact generally than dense commercial zones, especially if they include businesses/services and encourage 20-minute neighborhood walking/biking/transit in neighboring residential areas.



### Economic Prosperity

- Higher density in transition zone may benefit commercial zones because of increased customer base.
- Types of businesses may differ between commercial zones and transition zones, enabling more viability of different businesses (e.g. start-ups, home-based or home offices).

---

## Meeting Notes

**Date:** February 12, 2011 (Group 3, 1-4 PM)

**Location:** Atrium Sloat Room

**Panelists:**

Ed McMahon	President, Lane County Homebuilders Association
Milo Mecham	Lane Council of Governments
Will Shaver	Sustainability Commission
Therese Walch	City of Eugene, Water Resource Manager
Carolyn Weiss	City of Eugene, Metro/Community Planning Manager

**Also Present:**

Babe O'Sullivan (Facilitator)	City of Eugene, Office of Sustainability
Andrew Bartshire (note taker)	City of Eugene, Intern

### Social Equity

- Transition zones imply social differences for people living there compared to non transition zones.
- Design matters on transition zones in order to increase appeal for surrounding neighbors.
- More options for housing (type, affordability)
- Options for something between an apartment and a house.
- Protecting livability of single family residential neighborhoods.
- Transition zones need to maintain livability.
- Changes the image of the community, from "west coast" single family home concept, to more "east coast" row housing.
- Demand for housing in the future may be for single family housing instead of other types of residential.
- Possibility of stigma around location of housing relative to single family.
- Transition zones will buffer single family residents from commercial and high traffic areas
- This will maintain neighborhood character of single family neighborhoods
- For those who own homes in these areas, this protects the value of the home; however, for those who are looking for a space to own or rent a home, this may limit options.

- Such a specific vision for how development is to occur may make implementation challenging if market forces don't support this prescription – too specific means we may not make it easier for compact development to occur – could backfire
- This strategy may require more incentives in order to achieve this goal
- Depending on how wide the transition zone is, in order to achieve the “stair step” transition, the transition zone may create less dense housing along corridor because of need for space - or may overflow into single family areas
- Density of the housing along the corridor will ultimately be determined by the market demand along that corridor.
- Living right on major corridors may not be the best living environment – noise (note Excessive Noise can prevent the use of federal funds for affordable housing projects), air quality, access to open space, cost of land is higher along corridor (harder to subsidize multifamily or affordable housing); however there is likely better access to transportation options. Locating housing one block off corridors is more livable for residents but still allows immediate access to transportation and services.
- Filling the ground floor w/ retail or other commercial is currently cost prohibitive in many locations. Not every building needs to be mixed use. It may be better to provide a mix of uses among the buildings in compact development areas.

#### Environmental Health

- Transition zones may have minimal impact of environment, but are enable the commercial corridors to exist.
- Parking concerns for transition zones and increased traffic.
- More efficient use of open space because increased density.
- Transition zones can actually be open space.

#### Economic Prosperity

- Transition zones may offer different types of mixed used businesses to exist in small capacity.
- Types of businesses may differ between commercial zones and transition zones enable more viability of different businesses.
- Transition zones may add to 20 MN concepts by making businesses closer to residential neighborhoods, than commercial areas.
- Transition zones could have increased landscaping options (green zone).
- Will requirements for transition zones affect economic viability of commercial businesses?
- Higher density in transition zone may benefit commercial zones because of increased customer base.
- Less infrastructure costs because of denser growth in transition zones, versus expanding growth.

# Envision Eugene: TBL Analysis

---

**Pillar:** Promote compact urban development and efficient transportation options.

**Strategy 4:** Make compact urban development of core commercial areas and corridors easier.

## Key Points

*Note: In its responses, the group compared growth in core commercial areas and corridors to growth in lower density, non-urban areas.*

- While compact development that includes mixed use (and multifamily housing) provides greater access to services, more connectedness and vibrant lifestyle, there is a risk of gentrification and displacement of existing residents unless affordable housing is explicitly addressed.
- Compact development preserves outlying natural resources and reduces auto travel and fuel consumption; however it may also create other environmental challenges such as stormwater controls, urban heat island effect and exposure to air pollution/noise/congestion.
- Concentrating business in commercial core areas should reduce infrastructure costs but may have unintended consequences such as high land values and rents, greater congestion and transportation costs and generally discourage local small businesses.

## Impacts Identified

### Social Equity

- Compact transportation corridors will likely make it easier to access needs and services.
- *(Some participants spoke to 20-min neighborhoods as synonymous with compact development and urban corridors)* 20-minute neighborhoods may improve social connections within the community.
- Gentrification may displace existing residents, where influx of new residents coming to urban areas and driving up housing prices.
- Increased congestion and parking problems for nearby residents from influx of retail customers.
- Tipping point as transportation systems may not be efficient enough to keep up with higher density, causing decrease in social livability (more congestion, traffic and parking problems, more travel time).

- Increased density and congestion makes safety of residents an issue, need more traffic restrictions, parks, sidewalks.
- Multifamily housing should not be concentrated in areas with existing poverty. That concentration can lead to exponential increases in crime, teen pregnancy, lower school achievement, etc.

Environmental Health

- By promoting urban growth, other natural environments (e.g. wetlands, open space, ag lands) are preserved.
- The closer people are to the necessary amenities reduces fuel consumption and produces smaller carbon footprint. More resilience in terms of climate change and rising fuel prices.
- There is a trade off in creating denser urban areas and ability to provide sufficient stormwater facilities/infrastructure for additional impervious surfaces.
- If strip malls develop instead of mixed use corridors, this could increase auto traffic, green house gas emissions.

Economic Prosperity

- By creating preferred commercial areas, and if growth is discouraged elsewhere, it may drive commercial land prices up in compact urban areas. May lead to larger proportion of franchised businesses and inhibit development of small local businesses.
- Trade-off between incentives for certain developments (lower SDCs) and reduced funding available for infrastructure.
- Compact urban development, impact on freight and deliveries, just in time delivery, need daily or weekly freight deliveries. Businesses must increase inventory, or move. May destroy dense developments.

**Meeting Notes**

**Date:** February 12, 2011 (Group 3, 1-4 PM)

**Location:** Atrium Sloat Room

**Panelists:**

Ed McMahon	President, Lane County Homebuilders Association
Milo Mecham	Lane Council of Governments
Will Shaver	Sustainability Commission
Therese Walch	City of Eugene, Water Resource Manager
Carolyn Weiss	City of Eugene, Metro/Community Planning Manager

**Also Present:**

Babe O’Sullivan (Facilitator)	City of Eugene, Office of Sustainability
Andrew Bartshire (note taker)	City of Eugene, Intern

## Social Equity

- Compact transportation corridors will make access to needs easier.
- Nodal development, stores and services easily accessible by transportation making social value higher.
- Recreational opportunities need to be remembered, open space still accessible, vs. urban rec.
- Communities in urban areas need to have accessibility to all services, including recreation, shopping, and groceries in “walkable” areas.
- 20 minute neighborhood may pose conflict within existing neighborhoods who don’t want to change the way they currently are. Neighborhoods need density of people to support small businesses, etc.
- 20 minute neighborhoods may not be sustainable in remote commercial zones.
- Larger franchised “7-11, etc” replacing small stores, but with more density larger stores might be sustainable.
- How to make mixed use developments “affordable”
- Tipping point as transportation systems will not be efficient to maintain social livability.
- By walking or biking people will improve physical health, maybe mental too.
- What about the people who choose not to use “transportation” who live in transit corridors, but choose to walk? “Walkable amenities”
- Where are the 20 minute neighborhoods that focus on walkable amenities?
- 20 minute neighborhoods improve social connections inside the community.
- Avoid gentrification; using Portland as example, outside residents coming to urban areas and displacing residents.
- People living in dense areas may get an unequal amount of the pollution.
- This action would likely provide more multifamily housing opportunities
- If not done carefully, these new areas could provide a narrow range of housing opportunities for a narrow group of residents. Done thoughtfully, these areas could serve a mix of housing creating access for a mix of incomes
- May or may not have an impact on the value of land locally or citywide
- Creating compact development could make businesses geared toward automobiles (auto parts stores, for example) feel threatened or disadvantaged
- Local restaurants and other businesses in compact areas may benefit from an increase in business
- In order to gain community support, property owners need to be included in visioning of these areas as they are redeveloped
- Important to make sure multifamily development (and affordable housing) is not too concentrated in areas that already have a significant proportion of people living in poverty. When you have a significant concentration of poverty in one area, that area can experience exponential increases in crime, teen pregnancy, lower school achievement, etc.

- If multifamily units are sited only along corridors, this restricts access for variety/mix of people and may reduce mixing of people from a variety of socioeconomic backgrounds. Areas just off corridors are better living environments than right on corridors. Multifamily development can provide a good buffer between
- Adding more units to overall supply of housing should help ease overcrowding and create more choice. Eugene currently has low rental vacancy rates.
- Multifamily housing opportunities further away from the university will support more non-student residents w/ multifamily housing options
- Redevelopment or compact development may displace existing commercial buildings and businesses as well as residential buildings including mobile homes and/or older, smaller single family homes that may have low rents. Need to consider impacts and ways to transition residents and business owners to new locations.
- If greater concentration of residents – more demand for local businesses.
- Residents in multifamily development may be more likely to be willing to walk because a higher number of services are likely to be closer by.

If making compact development easier means using incentives:

- Incentives such as extending MUPTE could facilitate development of more housing, but would lower City's tax revenue and compromise ability to support other programs
- Zoning or other process incentives (e.g. form based codes) would have impacts of their own – unique to each commercial area and the incentives used – planning staff could provide examples.

Impact to schools:

- If compact development concentrates too many lower income families – there are impacts to school performance. Districts where a majority of students receive free or reduced lunches typically have a harder time meeting performance standards.
- Schools with a high percentage of low income students typically see higher demand for special services –providing these extra services may negatively impact “higher achieving” students and average students
- The demographics of new renters or buyers in new will impact schools – if families have student age kids this adds to enrollment and increases revenue received by school districts. If residents are seniors or if families have no kids, impact on enrollment is less.

### Environmental Health

- The closer people are to the necessary amenities the less amount of fuel is used.
- Dense areas may also increase focused pollution in the dense areas.
- By promoting urban growth, the growth is not happening in natural environments.

- By redeveloping infrastructure in a green manner may limit overall impact on environment.
- Building up (as opposed to out) may decrease the relative amount of impervious surface, decrease overall storm water runoff and improve water quality.
- There is a trade off in creating denser urban areas limiting the amount of pervious infrastructure able to be used.
- Vacant parking lots and buildings have same net impervious affect.
- Limited connection between people and wildlife in dense urban areas.
- Reducing travel time, will reduce greenhouse gas contributions.
- If strip malls develop instead of mixed use corridors, could increase green house gas contributions.
- Dense growth may increase GHG emissions because of vertical growth on same size lots (higher heating, cooling loads per sq ft)
- Consolidating commercial buildings maximizes efficiency of building materials and population density.
- Heat island effect in urban areas increases need for cooling.
- More severe precipitation events will increase storm runoff.
- Less pervious surfaces will also increase runoff.
- Climate refugees, may increase the population expectations over the next 20 years.
- Redevelopment may preserve land resources.
- Area specific, butterfly migration across w 11th, buildings are too tall to enable natural passage.
- Focused storm water runoff may be detrimental to the environmental.
- Less air pollution because of less vehicle miles travelled.
- Infrastructure (storm water, sewer) able to handle denser growth?
- All the required material equipment required to maintain single family house. Shared services in urban areas, will have a positive effect.
- Increased density will enable more options and efficiency for recycling and waste

### Economic Prosperity

- Less vehicle miles, may lower costs for freight, and lower costs for dense communities.
- Resourceful freight: bikes, smaller vehicles.
- Changing systems developments charges may change ability to build in urban areas.
- Trade-off between incentives for certain developments may reduce funding available for infrastructure.
- Short term money in core, to increase overall tax base.
- Whole community pitching in funds to help build urban development.
- Limit constraints on building. Let it happen naturally, tax base will enable other improvements.
- By creating preferred commercial areas, by discouraging growth elsewhere, drive commercial land prices up in desired areas. May lead to larger proportion of franchised businesses instead of small local businesses.
- Increased office jobs may increase high paying jobs.
- May recruit high end business to the area, from outside cities/regions.
- W Eugene area may create more retail jobs in that area.

- Need the jobs first.
- Small business may be helped by changing home occupancy requirements enabling.
- Redevelopment business may be required to be built green.
- If green jobs are “promoted”
- Compact development will lower costs by lowering fuel prices to businesses.
- If incentives are given this could have positive impact, especially in certain areas, downtown.
- Redevelopment may be focused more in sustainable
- Reduced carbon impacts on employees and customers.
- Depends if businesses are able to benefit from sustainable practices.
- Eugene does a good job of promoting sustainable growth.
- Funding sources available to cover sustainable building, above and beyond the cost of normal building. Appraisal values will not reflect sustainability building practices.
- “Green” building costs are expensive.
- Taking advantage of local opportunities (UO, parks, open space) attracting “green” businesses. Incubator opportunities due to proximity to the university.
- Density is a key part of local economic development strategy.
- Reclaiming brownfields, may fall along commercial corridors.
- Compact urban development, impact on freight and deliveries, just on time delivery, need daily or weekly freight deliveries. Businesses must increase inventory, or move. May destroy dense developments.



# Envision Eugene: TBL Analysis

---

**Pillar:** Protect, repair, and enhance neighborhood livability

**Strategy 1:** Do not increase densities in neighborhoods above those allowed by existing regulations, or undertake new strategies that impact neighborhoods unless they are in accordance with the goals and recommendations of the Infill Compatibility Standards and Opportunity Siting Task Teams.

## Key Points

- *How* increased density is accomplished is very important. Because poor design can lead to negative impacts on residents and neighborhoods, Eugene should aim for high quality home, neighborhood, and urban design - whether or not density is increased.
- Increasing density will likely improve walkability, transit efficiency, and access to services but will also likely put pressure on infrastructure including parks, parking, and stormwater systems.
- Increased density may create privacy, noise, and aesthetic concerns for existing residents. Depending on the type and design of infill, home (and land) values could increase or decrease. While increased home values may be a positive for land and home owners, it would tend to reduce affordability for those not owning a home or land.
- Lower density in existing neighborhoods may lead to a greater portion of housing at the edge of town (in expansion areas) or in bedroom communities. This is likely to increase driving and reduce access to services for those residents, as well as raise per capita cost for road, sewer, and other infrastructure.
- Not all community members have equal access to land use discussions and decision making.

## Impacts Identified

### Social Equity

- It is unclear if increasing density tends to increase or decrease crime rates
- Increasing density increases walkability, efficiency of transit, and access to services

- Increasing density may put pressure on parks, parking, stormwater systems, and backyard gardens.
- Eugene should be aiming for high-quality design (as is outlined in the Infill Compatibility Standards) regardless of whether or not density is increased
- Some cultures may prefer dense neighborhoods more than others;
- Increasing density, done poorly, can create negative impacts on residents in existing neighborhoods (privacy concerns, looming walls and windows, increased noise, decreased social interactions)
- Housing added on the edge of town (in expansion areas) or in bedroom communities may cause reduce access to services
- Increasing density may encourage a greater mix of housing types.
- Lower income families may not have time to participate in discussions about compatibility in their neighborhoods – and standards may reflect this absence.
- Compatibility standards may not be equally applied across town as some residents may have more time to devote to enforcing standards than do others.
- Proactive education efforts may be necessary to ensure concerns of disadvantaged populations are represented in land use decisions.

#### Environmental Health

- Lower density may encourage people to reside out of town in bedroom communities.
- Housing added on the edge of town (in expansion areas) or in bedroom communities will likely increase driving.
- Land use decisions alone will not be sufficient to deal with climate change goals, changes to building codes will also be necessary.

#### Economic Prosperity

- Increasing density will likely increase home and land values (for owners) and costs (for purchasers) overall.
- The cost of construction is likely to be higher in areas with increased density
- Increased density may help provide critical mass to support businesses and services
- Adding housing at the edge of town (in expansion areas) is likely to increase per capita cost for road, sewer, and other infrastructure

---

## Meeting Notes

**Date:** February 12, 2011 (Group 4, 1-4 PM)

**Location:** Atrium Saul Room

**Panelists:**

Felicity Fahy	EWEB
Bill Aspegren	Community Resource Group
Carlos Barrera	Neighborhood Leaders Council
Ethan Nelson	City of Eugene Solid Waste and Green Building program
Robin Hostick	City of Eugene planning
Josh Bruce	Sustainability Commission
Jeff Mills	Planning Commission

**Also Present:**

LaVena Nohrenberg (Facilitator)	City of Eugene, Office of Sustainability
Matt McRae (note taker)	City of Eugene

Social Equity

- Shelter is basic need – Protecting housing helps meet basic human needs
- ICS standards may impact basic human needs – may not preserve neighborhood character – ex: ICS strategy around parking
- Increasing density that promotes walkability, transit, access to health care, nearness to parks may increase access to basic human needs.
- Increasing density may increase costs (of housing, land)
- If density isn't increased, people may move to Veneta or further out and increase vehicle miles traveled
- Increasing density may impact open space and livability
- If density is driven up through scarcity, there are likely to be negative social impacts, costs will increase
- If density is increased,(and done well) there may be more opportunities for lower income residents, transportation accessibility may improve and there may be improvements to the amount and variety of shelter available to variety of people.
- Not increasing density inside UGB means adding more housing opportunities toward the edge means new housing has less access to services.
- Perhaps the language of the strategy is misleading – makes people feel more protected than they are?
- The way the language is phrased is not inclusive. Perhaps the language could be stated more positively to “how do we maintain character of neighborhoods while incorporating allowable increases in density”

- Clarification: The state requires the City of Eugene to look at efficiency measures – can increase density thru land use code and other tools. If we allowable minimum density is raised for all new development or minimum lot size is decreased, we would increase overall density.
- There is a 20 minute neighborhoods (Opportunity Siting) pilot project in Friendly N’hood – a location where the neighborhood is in favor of increasing density
- Creating alley access lots may violate ADA standards unless there is paved access to a paved road or the alley itself is paved. (Noting that right of way is currently required between alley access lots and paved street.)
- It is important to include diverse perspectives when looking at opportunities to increase density. Some cultures may have alternative perspectives and may prefer a mix of housing types and increased densities.
- Increasing density, if done wrong, can increase crime, cause people to move out, increase vandalism.
- Possible tension from overcrowding.
- Possible impacts of “looming walls and windows”
- We should be pursuing ICS standards (aesthetically pleasing, compatible with existing buildings) regardless of density
- There is “hidden density” of additional people when a large house is converted from one family, low numbers, to multiple families and higher numbers
- Emphasis on keeping density low emphasizes the status quo of “white” Eugene and the status of many of the “dream home”.
- Other communities/cultures may want to live near extended families and that may be more possible with increased density.
- More people in the street (due to higher density) tends to discourage crime
- Higher densities may encourage renters – may be bringing in criminal elements
- Unintended consequences – compatibility in neighborhoods today vs. long term.
- Some of desire of compatibility may have negative impacts on transportation access
- Avoiding density in neighborhood, parking requirements, for example, increases parking – disincentive to use alternative modes of transportation.
- Good design from ICS has positive impacts on safety, safe sidewalks, crossings,
- Lower density is disincentive for services, businesses – grocery stores, for example – limits ability to create “20 minute neighborhoods”.
- Lack of housing diversity (types, costs) creates more segregated neighborhood
- Single demographic neighborhoods provides disincentive for neighborhood Schools
- There tends to be more “social cohesion” in diverse (housing type ) neighborhoods
- Increasing density in W. University (that “type” of density) increases crime rates (going up when students are out of town for example)
- Monoculture of student housing (particularly in University student housing areas) can increase crime rates – theft is common during periods when students are away on vacation
- impacts of Seasonal density (students) vs. condominium owners and other multifamily occupants may be different

- Wording of strategy: Focus shouldn't be on density – should be on promoting mix of housing types, socioeconomic backgrounds, economic opportunities. This strategy does not ensure this type of mix.
- There is likely to be inconsistent neighborhood representation across the community – therefore maintaining compatibility may be unequally upheld in different parts of town
- What is considered “compatible” may be defined differently by different people
- It is important to Involve people in discussions – being clear in communication – and proactively educating about what density means to them and how they can influence land use planning
- Increasing density may impact privacy for some residents
- Increasing density may impact home values (positively or negatively) depending on how development is done (need to address the concern that poorly designed development next door may decrease my home value)
- Those residents who are uninformed may be vulnerable to unexpected impacts (of development in their neighborhoods), may lose their ability to have a say/provide input
- Both housing *and* transportation costs are important to consider. Increasing density may reduce transportation costs.
- Residents in denser areas may see economic benefits of being closer to services and urban “hub”
- Buffers between areas of higher density and lower density are important – in order to reduce negative impacts.
- If in the process of increasing density the percentage of (short term) renters is increased, there may be reduced social and financial investment in the neighborhood and neighborhood stability or social cohesion could suffer
- If ground floor of multifamily buildings are commercial office space, as opposed to more social uses (restaurants, cafés), or recreational (i.e. courtyard) there may be reduced interactions between residents of the multifamily building and residents in the surrounding areas.
- Eugene has a lack of affordable housing. If we inhibit adding density in neighborhoods, there may be reduced opportunities for creating multifamily and affordable housing. (Single people need access to affordable housing, as do larger families)
- Opportunity Siting opportunities for increasing density may increase available housing but not necessarily affordable housing. Which developer does the project is important: If the developer is interested in Affordable Housing (like St. Vincent DePaul) they will likely maintain affordability after legally required to do so...however a developer who is primarily interested in the tax credits offered to build Affordable Housing, may revert to renting housing at market rate once period of affordability has ended.
- In some cases, existing regulations may allow development that can have negative impacts on open space and privacy. (ex: by current code, if developers build to a certain density threshold,

they are not required to pay for open space) (this particular code is up for review during the Infill Compatibility Standards process)

### Environmental Stewardship

- Increasing density – may limit ability to do natural stormwater treatment – lose pervious surfaces within UGB
- Increasing density increases pervious surface at site scale, but decreases pervious surface at City scale
- Increasing housing opportunities within UGB may prevent more pervious surfaces outside of UGB
- Less energy, fossil fuels used ??
- Increase density – less opportunity to grow vegetable gardens in backyards but reduces pressure on farmland outside of the UGB
- Increasing density may cause loss of open space
- There are many factors that influence pervious surfaces, vehicle miles traveled, etc. it is unclear what increasing density will do to these factors
- Smaller footprint of multistory housing likely reduces stormwater runoff
- ICS – standards are different neighborhood by neighborhood –
- Policy choices are being made by ICS – perhaps a TBL for ICS would be useful.
  - Example – parking standards in SUNA; Noise, traffic, pollution and many other impacts.
- Increasing required parking spaces increases ability of people to use single occupant vehicle and increases environmental impact
- Students will always come with cars – City and University have little impact on student habits.
- Developers may not be willing to build residential buildings without parking
- Limiting density has potential to cause people to move outside to neighboring communities if they can't find the homes they want in Eugene
- Survey indicated that younger generation is not interested in single family homes – perhaps there is a change in preferences toward multifamily housing
- Boomers moving out of single family and into multifamily housing may make more single family homes available
- There may be more interest in multifamily homes over time?
- Opportunity siting efforts do not yet have “green building” standards and focus on land use code, density, etc.
- Not reasonable to assume that building code alone will handle climate change concerns
- Opportunity siting identifies incentives for higher densities – not currently incentivizing green building
- We can have increased density (land use) but won't meet climate goals if we don't also address building code

## Economic Prosperity

- Increasing density could lead to employment opportunities for builders
- Not increasing density would lead to increasing sprawl – extending services outward from City center will add costs for infrastructure – roads, etc.
- Not increasing density can drive the price of housing up
- Increasing density w/ some ICS strategies can increase cost of construction
- Public infrastructure for lower density is more costly per unit (from utility provider perspective, higher density can decrease cost per unit – but can make some infrastructure need retrofitting increasing need for upgrade)
- It is uncertain where costs will be – at household level or City level, neighborhood level, etc.
- Transportation infrastructure – adding housing at edge can increase costs
- Infrastructure Costs are different site by site, over time,
- Cottage industries may crop up around infill – specialized contractors, innovations in home building,
- Increase in multifamily will cause competition in market for multifamily pushing prices down, allowing more discretionary income to be spent in the community ??
- Increasing density thru scarcity of land can increase cost of housing – land is at a higher cost and increases costs. Redevelopment of lands within UGB also increases cost of land/buildings
- Owners of land will benefit from increasing land/home values
- Critical mass of people to support commercial
- Critical mass of commerce to generate wealth to spend in community
- Without enough density, there's less support for services, entertainment, - people have to travel farther to get to those services
- To build to higher density, we will need to plan thoughtfully (codes, etc.) to allow mix of commercial, residential if we are going to have 20 minute neighborhoods.
- Planning is important to make services economically viable
- This strategy doesn't address a lot of the things that perhaps it should.
- Drop ICS and OS from the strategy? – and speak about the things that we want to see with development?
- There's an opportunity to tie strategy statement with “green building” standards
- Both ICS and OS are relevant but not yet proven.
- If ICS and OS are referenced throughout Eugene, and there's a lack of clarity around them, how much do they help to define what kind of community we want?
- OS incentives are still unclear

# Envision Eugene: TBL Analysis

---

**Pillar:** Protect, restore, and enhance natural resources

**Strategy 2:** Protect, maintain and restore high quality woodland and oak savanna habitat, high quality native upland and wetland prairie

## Key Points

- There may be an increase in the value and price of land for developers and land owners if land was removed or made unavailable. This may lead to higher housing costs and loss of housing affordability and access for all income groups.
- Protection of these habitats has a variety of positive social and cultural impacts including: providing educational opportunities, providing residents with access to nature, aesthetic values and improved livability. These natural features should be broadly distributed to provide equitable access.
- Intact habitats provide numerous environmental and ecosystem benefits including improved wildlife habitats, stormwater filtration, flood control, improving air quality, etc. There may be, however, a minimum size/scale of parcels to capture these benefits.

## Impacts Identified

### Social Equity

- If accessible to the public, these lands provide increased recreational, cultural and educational opportunities, along with positive impacts on mental and physical health.
- If these lands are made undevelopable (through City ownership or regulation), this may reduce opportunities to develop single family residential housing, or could increase the need to expand UGB.
- Protecting habitats promotes the community value of environmental stewardship and sense of community identity.
- Contiguous habitats have greater social and recreational value than fragmented habitats, but at what scale? The size and connectivity of these habitats is an important factor.
- Community safety: concern from current neighbors about crime in these areas.



- Preserving habitats may increase property values for residents next to open spaces – impacting affordability for some.
- Equity will depend on distribution - inequity can occur if conservation activity is concentrated in wealthier neighborhoods

### Environmental Health

- With diminishing supplies of these types of lands and habitats, there is environmental value in their preservation as they are a non-renewable resource.
- Habitat fragmentation reduces value for wildlife compared to contiguous habitat. Need to identify scale at which ecosystem functions are maintained.
- Protecting these types of habitats provides stormwater management, air quality improvement, wildfire prevention and other ecosystem services.

### Economic Prosperity

- Negative economic impacts from reduced buildable land supply, higher cost of development, higher home prices.
- Intact habitats may generate income from tourism.
- Economic value to ecosystem services that are provided by intact habitats: stormwater management, air quality, carbon sequestration, nutrient addition to soil, wildlife value, and others.
- There may be a cost to City (and taxpayers) to own land, regulate habitats, and/or assist with habitat management strategies. The City needs to partner with developers, neighbors through design review, etc. in order to make this work.
- May take land out of tax base – may be offset by increased value of individual lands.
- There are employment and internship opportunities conducting habitat restoration work.
- Community that has more intact natural areas and stronger “identity” as an outdoor destination, natural values, may be more attractive to businesses looking to relocate.
- Promotes healthy lifestyle, reducing health care costs.

## Meeting Notes

**Date:** February 12, 2011 (Group 4, 1-4 PM)

**Location:** Atrium Saul Room

**Panelists:**

Felicity Fahy	EWEB
Ethan Nelson	City of Eugene, Waste Prevention and Green Building
Josh Bruce	Sustainability Commission
Jeff Mills	Planning Commission
Carlos Barrera	Neighborhood Leadership Council
Bill Aspergren	Community Resource Group

**Also Present:**

LaVena Nohrenberg (facilitator) City of Eugene, Office of Sustainability

Matt McRae (note taker) City of Eugene, Climate and Energy Analyst

Social Equity

- If accessible to the public, increased recreational and educational opportunities
- Increased employment if restoring habitats (it's unclear if this is offset by loss of development employment)
- If we take these lands out of developable lands, will probably reduce single family residential opportunities or increase need to expand UGB
- For segments of the population this would have positive impacts on mental and physical health
- Will have positive cultural impact for populations who appreciate these areas.
- People move to Oregon for these natural area values – preserving these areas provides a positive value for many
- Protecting habitats supports community identity and mental health
- More than just appreciation of areas, access by native peoples to cultural foods, plants, etc.
- Youth: supports youth understanding of habitat value – school group educational opportunities, understanding of natural world
- Fragmented vs. contiguous habitats – different values, social, recreational, etc.
- Greater benefits of contiguous habitats – but at what scale?
- Community safety: concern from current neighbors about crime in these areas
- Fire safety: Potential for wildfire is reduced in oak habitat – if managed properly
- Positive impact on property values for residents next to open spaces
- Preserving wetland, prairie, savanna creates atmosphere of stewardship. Analogy to “broken window syndrome”. Maintaining environmental standard encourages others to do likewise.
- promotes healthy lifestyle – people can get outdoors and be active, interact with nature
- In some cases, existing regulations may allow development that can have negative impacts on open space, privacy. (ex: with a certain density threshold, open space may not be required)
- Open space, habitats, and restoration sites may be more accessible for the privileged and higher income residents. In order to benefit a wider variety of residents, increase affordable housing opportunities adjacent to these preserved areas and make open spaces accessible to low income residents – this may include recreational programs, park design elements, etc.
- Inequity can occur if conservation activity is concentrated in wealthier neighborhoods

Environmental Health

- Habitat fragmentation reduces value for wildlife compared to contiguous habitat
- Scale and connectivity is not addressed in language of strategy – what is the ecosystem function that we're trying to maintain? What is the necessary size in order to maintain those “services”? Fragmentation may devalue restoration effort

- Because there is relatively little of these habitat types left, there is value to preservation
- Adverse environmental impacts may take place if we don't take preservation action.
- May see additional auto trips due to land preservation – through expanding the land area of the City – this may be offset by value of habitat
- Habitat is a non-renewable resource – rare habitat types are an important value – statewide model for how municipalities lead by example
- Protecting this land provide more pervious surface – reduce runoff
- Protecting habitat has positive value on air quality – pollutants removed from air – amount relates to how much, how big, how contiguous habitat is
- If maintained, protected habitats may have wildfire prevention value

### Economic Prosperity

- Negative economic impacts on business for developers; taking land off the table will increase cost of land.
- Increase cost of land likely to increase prices of homes benefitting those who are already homeowners – making home ownership challenging for those who are not
- Tourism – economic opportunity: intact habitats may create a tourist attraction: for example, migratory songbird and wildlife viewers visiting wetlands, buttes, and oak habitats
- Protecting lands may create potential for grant funding opportunities, agency partnerships, and user fees.
- Potential economic benefits: there may be risk reduction benefit and possible reduction on some insurance. For example, community rating system regarding flooding – those areas managed to reduce flooding receive discount on flood insurance – this and similar economic incentives may be available now or in the future
- Intact Habitats nearby may enhance value of property – if mixed into neighborhood
- Regulations may create “takings” of land that eats into profit for developer. If land is removed from buildable inventory, it will/may increase value/cost/buildability of remaining lands. May be positive, may be negative.
- What happens if land is not taken out of buildable lands inventory but has increased regulations – may be more costly to develop, may require more creativity
- If City is going to regulate, City needs to actively participate in management of protected lands and/or help with creative solutions for management. If city regulates protection but doesn't support protection, product may not be desirable
- There may be a cost to City (and taxpayers) to own land, regulate habitats, and/or assist with habitat management strategies. The City needs to partner with developers, neighbors through design review, etc. in order to make this work.
- Adjacency to open space can increase value AND cost of homes – impact on affordability – impact on homeowner
- Oak savannah areas – occur in high cost residential – decreases mix of housing
- May take land out of tax base – may be offset by increased value of individual lands
- If protections displace residential property, there's a cost of building
- If land is taken out of buildable lands, there's pressure to expand UGB
- There is a “Takings” concern if land is not developable and not owned by City

- There are employment and internship opportunities conducting habitat restoration work
- Preserving these spaces may create tourism opportunities for mountain bike riders for example
- The cost of mitigating wetlands for example may make lands unaffordable to develop and effectively remove them from buildable lands
- Community that has more intact natural areas and stronger “identity” as an outdoor destination, natural values, may be more attractive to businesses looking to relocate
- Promotes healthy lifestyle
- There are no dollars assigned but there are ecosystem services that are provided by intact habitats: stormwater management, air quality, carbon sequestration, nutrient addition to soil, wildlife value, and others.
- Educational opportunities for botany, ecology, microbiology, mycology,
- If land is purchased and managed with public funds there is cost to community, tax payers

# Envision Eugene: TBL Analysis

---

**Pillar:** Protect, restore, and enhance natural resources

**Strategy 3:** Preserve valuable farmland outside the UGB

## Key Points

- Food security is of great importance to the community now and into the future
- There are economic impacts of crop choice and agricultural jobs (grass vs. vegetables, food processing, etc.)
- There is a community value of agricultural heritage
- Not expanding the UGB could create scarcity of land and increase land costs and values

## Impacts Identified

### Social Equity

- Food security is an issue now and may become more significant in the future as population increases, and climate change and rising energy prices impact our region
- Cultural heritage of agriculture is important to our community
- Farmland provides an opportunity to connect youth to the source of food and the importance of agricultural lands and lifestyle.
- If preserving farmland outside the UGB increases land value inside the UGB, this will affect the value of land and housing for owners and the cost of land and housing for purchasers and renters
- Locally grown foods may not be as affordable or accessible to all socioeconomic levels

### Environmental Health

- Soil, once built upon, may be difficult or impossible to recover
- Locally produced food may have a lower carbon footprint

### Economic Prosperity

- Many food dollars are currently leaving the local economy

- There may be big economic opportunities in locally growing, processing, and marketing food
  - There may be an economic opportunity to expand regional agricultural tourism (wineries for example)
- 

## Meeting Notes

**Date:** February 12, 2011 (Group 4, 1-4 PM)

**Location:** Atrium Saul Room

**Panelists:**

Felicity Fahy	EWEB
Ethan Nelson	City of Eugene, Waste Prevention and Green Building
Josh Bruce	Sustainability Commission
Jeff Mills	Planning Commission
Carlos Barrera	Neighborhood Leadership Council
Bill Aspergren	Community Resource Group
Robin Hostick	City of Eugene, Planning

**Also Present:**

LaVena Nohrenberg (facilitator)	City of Eugene, Office of Sustainability
Matt McRae (note taker)	City of Eugene, Climate and Energy Analyst

Social Equity

- Preserving farmland may be critical for future residents – depending on future climate
- With more people here – we may need more food
- Interruption in transportation may create food security concerns
- Local food production may be critical for survival
- Preserving farmlands preserves heritage, cultural values, community identity
- Social equity of preserving land outside UGB: do we increase land values inside UGB? Impact cost/value of land and housing within UGB?
- Educational value of children understanding where their food comes from  
Farming is a lifestyle – preserving farmland preserves that lifestyle

Environmental Health

- Transportation – saving transportation dollars, reduced fossil fuel use if food is produced locally – even more important in the future
- (Counter argument) Local food does not necessarily equal low carbon food
- Soil is non-renewable resource

## Economic Prosperity

- Economic opportunity around high value crops (sold locally or distributed widely)
- Agro-tourism opportunities (Italy as a model) wineries as an example
- \$1b in food industry – if more of that is local, there is more economic opportunity
- Plant varieties and species – opportunity to learn to grow crops suitable to this climate
- local food networks and markets create economic opportunity
- Just because land is in grass seed right now doesn't mean it will remain in grass seed – opportunity to grow food crops
- Preserve for grass seed production vs. high end vegetables – food security issue for high cost “boutique” markets (prices not accessible to many members of the community)
- Is there an economic opportunity for migrant workers?
- Jobs per acre in agriculture are lower than commercial uses – however, benefit of food production outweighs this factor
- looking in terms of a broader system – food processing, canning, etc. food production process – creates many more jobs than just those of the farmer