

Neighborhood Leaders – Feedback Materials

Flip Chart Notes from Neighborhood Leaders MUPTE Outreach June 25, 2014

Outreach Meeting (Part 3):

June 25, 2014 from 7:00 – 8:30pm; Library – 100 W. 10th Ave., Tyekson Room

Community members present; Andrew Fisher (FAN), Jon Belcher (RRCO), John Jaworski (NEN), Jan Wostmann (LHVC), Tom Happy (JWN), Joanne Gross (ABC), David Saul (SEN), & David Mandelblatt (DNA)

Staff Present: Denny Braud, Carolyn Burke, Laura Hammond, Robin Hostick, & Nancy Young

Flip Chart Notes *(responding to revised concept contained in July 30 AIS)*

- Density on the corridors is critical. Needs incentive – MUPTE.
- MUPTE is tool that can be used or misused. Needs to be fixed.
- Annual competition – only best move forward – might not be enough applications?
- Equal representation from neighborhoods is great idea – good balance – neighborhoods need to select the representatives
- Turning on MUPTE zones when ready and specifically designed
- Proposed criteria are better than was and closer to what we need
- Like balance in review panel but need specifics on what panel actually does:
 - o What decision making power does it have?
 - o What happens if there is a tie vote?
 - o Can it go to Council without recommendation?
 - o Needs to be in writing
 - o Can't go to Council without panel approval
- Extra planning is good concept but what is that? Refinement Plan? Need description of process.
- Public benefit doesn't include affordable housing?
- Glad to see investment out 99/Trainsong. Needs the help.
- Concerned that this would result in low-income housing across from factories
- Neighborhood supportive of using MUPTE to reclaim brownfields
- Apply LEED or energy efficiency to Bethel
- Details matter – 1.c. Review panel integrity. Stacking neighborhood association board could happen to game system.
- Neighbors understand rhythm, are an important voice. Balanced board important, neighbors need to be listened to.
- Neighborhood refinement plans updates
- Be careful when activating new areas. Must be very well thought through and inclusive.
- With exception of density, what is benefit to immediate neighbors? Need to mitigate impacts, particularly if it's a wholesale change.
- How much is MUPTE needed? Is the tool necessary?
- What can we do differently from Capstone?
 - o Community benefits have teeth
 - o Follow through on what is promised
 - o Local workers

- Can affordable housing in project be required past 10 years?
 - o Up percentage to 15 – 20 to apply to affordable housing program
 - o Beware of gentrification of corridors
 - o Prioritize areas with adequate infrastructure
- No one at Friendly Association thought MUPTE should go away
- Current code allows too tall on south Willamette. New code needed before MUPTE.
- Cap on number of projects in neighborhood during certain time period. Too much too fast = bad.
- Involve neighborhoods from get go
- Compatible with historic character
- Parking requirements will be an issue. Right balance between need and alternative modes.
- Parallel nearby streets are affected by corridor planning. Be comprehensive in approach.
- Transitions are critical
- Don't have/need all answers now, but if neighborhoods have voice, we can work through issues
- Look at historic properties carefully for contributions to neighborhood character
- Affordable housing important to neighborhood board. Friendly Neighborhood is close to schools, good for families.
- Like emphasis on neighborhood participation but they need a say in actual decision
 - o Require approval of panel, or
 - o 2/3 majority of Council if not approved by panel
- Not sure neighborhood association represents whole neighborhood
- Tax exemption crosses boarder to encourage development – don't agree with it
- Need to be more descriptive of planning process
- Support review panel – Need majority to go to Council – address criteria or try again
- Not worried about neighborhood board being stacked – community will have more influence
- South Willamette might not be best area plan example because of cost and time
- Need refinement plan with meaning
- What's the connotation of an "opportunity site"
- North of the Willamette River on Coburg (area M): what would be purpose of MUPTE there? Or in Cal Young areas?
- Further north areas – already developed and no use for MUPTE; already built
- Wouldn't benefit NE neighbors
- Support idea that emphasis or weighted criteria are available for affordable housing
- Need to take historic homes or character into consideration to protect them
- MUPTE helped create downtown neighborhood
- Lots of process for Capstone
- Need a clawback to get what they promised

Survey #2 Feedback Neighborhood Leaders MUPTE Criteria June 25 – July 20, 2014

Survey Questions:

1. Do you have feedback on the draft concepts? (Draft concepts available via web link)
2. Do you have any questions or concerns about the draft concepts?
3. Any additional feedback on the proposed revisions to the MUPTE program?
4. What neighborhood do you represent?

Responses *(to revised concept contained in July 30 AIS)*

6/27/2014

1. Mostly positive. Definitely headed in a good direction. Still... I think that a strong partnership between neighborhood and developer would accommodate most of the concerns and be a whole lot more simple in the long run.
2. Suppose... that one of the permanent members of the review committee is from a given neighborhood, for example. And then a proposal comes from that neighborhood. Would the applying neighborhood then have three representatives on the committee? How will committee members be vetted and chosen?
3. Sadly, a lot of the proposals, as I learned the other night, are responses based on disinformation, misinformation, and no information about MUPTE or how it really works or what it really does. Staff has done an excellent job of working through that toward a reasonable, informed set of proposals. This experience sure does highlight the need for a major public information campaign prior to implementation of any new MUPTE guidelines.
4. Downtown Neighborhood Association

6/27/2014

1. The MUPTE review committee should be more than advisory. It should be a screening committee of potential applications. If a majority of the members do not feel a project meets the requirements they should be able to decline that application. This would require no further action by the city. Gives the committee some teeth and saves time and money for the City..
2. The expansion of the MUPTE boundary along Coburg Road has no impact as that area is mostly commercial and recently built multi-family. It would not be redeveloped in the immediate future. The boundary expansion of this area would most likely not be supported by the affected neighborhoods.
3. They proposed revisions did not address the ability of an application, that would not meet the criteria, to be approved by providing additional benefits. These cited additional benefits should already be part of the requirements to be eligible for MUPTE. A MUPTE project should not be approved if the affected neighborhood and City Councilor does not support the project. Affordable Housing projects or projects with a high percentage of an affordable housing component should receive more consideration in the project review. To support the policy of

increase density a minimum height/ story requirement for MUPTE should be required. Five stories should be the minimum. If you don't want to expand the UGB than you must go up.

4. Northeast Neighbors

Flip Chart Notes from Neighborhood Leaders MUPTE Outreach May 8 & 13, 2014

Outreach Meetings:

Part 1: May 8, 2014 from 7:00 – 8:30pm; Library – 100 W. 10th Ave., Tyekson Room
Approximately 15 community members present; 11 individuals completed the sign-in sheet: Andrew Fisher (FAN), Kristina Lang (FAN), Deborah Healey (WUN), Duncan Rhodes (Whiteaker), Tom Happy (WJN), David Saul (Southeast), Sam Hahn (Whiteaker), David Nickles (Whiteaker), JF Quilter (Cal Young), Ed McMahon (TRG), Rene Kane (Neighborhood Services Staff)

Staff Present: Denny Braud, Carolyn Burke, Laura Hammond, Amanda Nobel, & Rene Kane

Part 2: May 13, 2014 from 7:00 – 8:30pm; Peterson Barn Community Center, 870 Berntzen Rd.
Community members present: Deb Jones (FAN), Bill Aspegren (SUNA), and Nancy Ellen Locke (FAN)

Staff Present: Denny Braud, Carolyn Burke, Laura Hammond, & Nancy Young

Flip Chart Notes:

05-08-2014 (*Responding to April 14 draft criteria*)

- Panel appointed by City Manager is not desirable.
- Important to give neighborhood real opportunity for input. All suggestions mentioned by Denny during the meeting seem good [neighborhood representative on panel and another one based on location of project; specifying the type of contact required by the applicant with the neighborhood e.g. meeting with membership.]. Want more also.
- Density not a public benefit.
- People who benefit are people living in units and meeting the growth needs.
- Lots of cities use this tool.
- Extensive process for road repaving. Why can't that be applied to MUPTE applications? That seems reasonable.
- Could SDCs be used more to incentivize and could SDCs go to the neighborhood?
- What about claw-back when projects do better than projected?
- Surprised no mention of where the rents go. Why not looking at localness of who owns the development?
- Neighborhood contact meetings with developer (not just the architect) should mean that head of developer be there and staff from City and public works. Should require more than 1 meeting and one after the final plans are done.
- A second required meeting between the developer and the neighborhood is good because the neighborhood needs to have time to take in the info and get feedback together. 2 meetings minimum.
- Neighborhood input needs to be at beginning of process not after MUPTE approval.
- Some benefits to talking with neighborhood at initial design and close to final. Minimum of 2 meetings. 2nd meeting before MUPTE voted on by Council.
- Don't understand why exemption should apply to commercial part of project.
- Specific boundary feedback: go rectilinearly near 14th and Charnelton, west of Olive continue with rectilinear edge. Don't go along the canal.

05/13/2014 *(Responding to April 14 draft criteria)*

- Some have exemptions (some value) but seems to defeat purpose.
- Support LEED criteria – pays for itself helps upgrade for everyone.
- Jury may be out on LEED – mixed reviews.
- Energy efficiency (really important) over LEED.
- Areas near Willard school and Cascade manor look like good places for multi-family.
- Concern about multi-story buildings on Willamette – shade, views, impacts
- Concern about MUPTE in place before South Willamette Plan / Code. Get plan done first, then designate for MUPTE.
- Lucia Townhouse project came to Friendly Association – presented and expected - know what's coming, let them know about changes, more than one meeting.
- Current proposal doesn't really have neighborhood involvement.
- Need neighbors on panel and heavily weigh their input – need big voice.
- Should be with Council and staff to present both sides – too important to let go.
- Bicycle and pedestrians not represented on proposed review panel.
- All need Traffic Impact Analysis – threshold for public improvements.
- Concerned with additional criteria – might et games, have to be careful.
- Length of MUPTE should be up to panel – subjective no point system.
- Area C (6th/7th Trainsong Highway 99 Corridor) looks very big.
- What's the percentage of City of the proposed boundary?
- Might need to narrow down to get action.

Survey #1 Feedback Neighborhood Leaders MUPTE Criteria

May 10 - 25, 2014

Survey Questions:

1. What input or feedback do you have about the proposed boundaries? (Map available)
2. How would you change any of the proposed criteria? (Criteria available)
3. Are there any missing criteria?
4. Any additional feedback on the proposed revisions to the MUPTE program?
5. What neighborhood do you represent?

Responses *(to April 14 draft criteria)*

05/10/2014

1. Stay out of Whiteaker and we won't have any problems... In truth, there could be a handful of properties in Whiteaker that would be of some benefit to redevelop, but we are already facing a parking/transportation crisis with the haphazard new commercial/industrial developments. Wish we had been included earlier in the process with more time for specific inputs. It seems like the neighborhoods are always last on the list.
2. The 'additional public benefit' criteria is a joke. The criteria are vague and largely irrelevant. The neighborhoods themselves should be allowed to determine any additional public benefits, as these will likely vary by neighborhood. In Whiteaker we have a shortage of affordable retail/commercial space due to the land rush from the 'Fermentation District' bullshit and small independent local businesses have nowhere to open up shop. Whiteaker has always supported entrepreneurship due to the lower entry cost for opening businesses but those days are tragically over. If there is new commercial/retail space built along the 6th/7th corridor we would like local businesses and entrepreneurs to get the first shot at it. We would like to be able to negotiate with developers to ensure that the chain stores and restaurants stay the hell out of our neighborhood.
3. skipped
4. The neighborhoods need to be involved sooner. If this goes to Council without a vastly expanded role for neighborhood groups we will be forced to mobilize in opposition to it. It seems like the public is only consulted as a mere formality in the planning and development process, and that needs to change promptly. When you conduct a poll of developers, construction firms, and construction unions, is it any surprise that they will enthusiastically support tax breaks for development? The neighborhoods actually have to live with the consequences and it should be the PUBLIC that determines the PUBLIC benefit criteria, not a cartel of moneyed interests. Just my two cents. Second, there was not an adequate explanation of what would happen if we were to fail to meet the OR state criteria for housing based on projections of 20-year need. What would the real consequences be? Is it that drastic that we have to make a gift of millions in tax breaks to developers to build things that we may or may not actually need or want? Without a detailed and accurate answer to this question and a

suitable explanation I have to question the validity of rushing this MUPTE plan through with such limited time for public input. This is the message I will be bringing to my neighborhood council general membership. Additionally we would like to see targeted use of SDCs to alleviate any impacts caused by large new developments in the areas affected. I was not satisfied with the response of city staff to the SDC questions posed last night and would like to see this specifically addressed in the public forums and program plans.

5. Whiteaker

05/10/2014

1. skipped
2. Neighborhood Association involvement & approval is a must on MUPTE projects. There must be multiple public meetings hosted by the City, & involving the developers, architects & engineers, & the potentially affected citizens before any MUPTE project approval. Effects on sight lines, motor vehicle traffic, pedestrian & bike traffic must be explained & remediated.
3. Relevant City Councilor involvement & approval is a must on MUPTE projects.
4. skipped
5. skipped

05/11/2014

1. Eliminate any intensification of land use resulting from MUPTE on the South Willamette Street corridor unless you intend to eminent domain additional street right of way for the entire four block distance to provide better bicycle, pedestrian and vehicle travel on this vital arterial street.
2. Please see separate e mail to Amanda Nobel Flannery
3. Please see separate e mail to Amanda Nobel Flannery
4. Please see separate e mail to Amanda Nobel Flannery
5. Resident of Cal Young neighborhood

05/11/2014

1. The idea that you need MUPTE to spur development anywhere in the Downtown corridor is absurd. You are giving away the shop, selling Prime real estate down the river, and failing to protect our most valuable assets - vis a vis, the heart of our city. As per the Capstone development, we have an ugly building that - even before completion, has already generated resentment and indignation amongst residents.
2. "neighborhood association support is not required for MUPTE approval". WHY NOT? Why should neighborhoods such as SUNA and WUN have to put up with poorly-managed development such as has occurred along 19th Avenue between downtown and the university? Why shouldn't NAs be given the right of refusal in their neighborhoods when an outside developer wants to capitalize on the unrealized potential in our midst? Do you want to continue the process of costly and lengthy appeals to LUBA? If so, you are pointed in the right direction, but if NOT, your impacts need to be thought out in a more deliberative manner.

3. You do not seem to provide an annual cap on MUPTE grants for the City, as per Portland model. You are missing the point of offering development, and depriving Eugeniens of tax-based revenue! It's foolish practices such as this which has led to our current Budget debacle, and which must not be allowed to recur.
4. Guidelines that the City Manager "may provide further clarification of" are completely worthless. Put them in your proposal, or remove the wishy-washy, non-committal language. No one trusts the City Manager in Eugene to do the right thing when it comes to implementing development with sound design and economic principles.
5. JWN

05/12/2014

1. The south side of W. 7th Ave. is designated in the 1987 Westside Neighborhood Plan as the "West 7th Avenue Commercial Area" and zoned C-2 and S-C/C-2. Before MUPTE is allowed for this area, there should be a _neighborhood-community-based_ refinement plan amendment process to update the plan policies. See the description in the WNP for how the Planning Team was appointed and developed recommendations. Similarly, MUPTE should NOT be allowed until the area has an updated refinement plan. Please educate yourselves about State Planning Goal 1 and the essential roles of refinement plans and neighborhood organizations in local planning.
2. If you actually have any intention of making the substantial changes that are necessary, please carefully read the document at:
<https://www.dropbox.com/s/tziysid11560r7y/MUPTE%20Ordinance%20Recommendations%20June%202014.pdf> Before approving any MUPTE it must be found to conform with the policies of the applicable and updated neighborhood refinement plan. (See response to Q1.)
3. Seriously? There are too many to enumerate here.
See: <https://www.dropbox.com/s/tziysid11560r7y/MUPTE%20Ordinance%20Recommendations%20June%202014.pdf>
4. This is really disingenuous that you would put up such a slapped-together, flimsy survey, so late in the game; do so little to help people become adequately informed before responding; and then expect people to believe their participation will actually make any significant difference.
5. I'm a JWN member (resident & home owner)

05/12/2014

1. Boundaries OK but irrelevant
2. MUPTE should only be given for low income housing
3. skipped
4. I personally believe it should be abolished. It has been so perverted and misused in the past I no longer have faith in Eugene's ability to manage such a program. If we must have it, it should only be used for low income housing
5. Fairmount

05/12/2014

1. skipped
2. Mandatory minimum of two meetings with the affected neighborhood. The meetings should be attended by the decision makers within the ownership / development team. This should not be a symbolic gesture. It should be viewed as a good neighbor policy.
3. There are no performance penalties no reduction in benefits, no termination of benefits should material quality, and or construction promises not be met.
4. The panel review board should not be hand picked by the City Manager it should be applied for. One member of the affected neighborhood should be on the panel. The chair or a board member would be an appropriate pick. The panel oversight review information, and recommendations should go directly to the City Council not filtered thru the City Managers Office
5. North East Neighborhood Association

05/12/2014

1. skipped
2. skipped
3. skipped
4. "Before we get started with suggestions for changes to MUPTE, the WCC would just like to say that we ARE supportive of MUPTE as a concept but if put into practice with the current set of guidelines, the program will be met with some resistance from the WCC. In the past, the WCC has taken a fairly combative stance on growth and development in general. We are looking to turn over a new leaf. As a neighborhood, we are starting to except the realities of growth but of course our primary goals are to protect our neighborhood and all that we love about it. With our brand new board, it is our wish to start a new relationship with the city. We would like to be more involved and we realize that in many ways, this just means more cooks in the kitchen for you guys. It is not our intention to make your efforts more difficult. We simply want to expand the depth of your work and research so that programs like MUPTE can include the desires of the citizens it will actually affect. I believe you will find us completely reasonable and even fun to work with. If we feel our voices are heard and effective, we may even be of some use in gaining citywide support for this program and others like it in the future. -The Biggest hole we see in the new proposal is the definition, or lack there of, of "public benefit". This should be defined at least in part by the neighborhood of the site in question. Every neighborhood has its own set of needs and to make a blanket list of benefits for the whole city lacks understanding of just how large and diverse our city really is. As it relates specifically to the whiteaker, in many cases, there is only so much public benefit to be gained on the properties in question. Would there be a way that neighborhood could apply fees that would go towards things like parking lots and quiet train crossings? We realize SDC fees are "spoken for" but some portion of the money that the city collects should be allocated to the neighborhood in question. -It would be our preference that developers need to present plans to neighborhoods EARLY in the process. At a minimum, plans should be presented to neighborhoods LONG before permits are issued and

ideally before they are even applied for. We would like to see a scenario where developers hear from the neighborhoods so that ideas can be incorporated into initial plans rather than it being an after thought. It is essential that this step is NOT just ornamental. A 2nd presentation should be made to neighborhoods with revised plans based on needs from the neighborhoods, city, and developers themselves. It would be our preference that the developers themselves, their architects as well as representatives of applicable departments from the city i.e. public works and planning and development are present at said presentations. It is important that developers know that they need to do more than just appease the neighborhoods in one presentation. They need to know that accountability is not just enforced by the city. - Members of the neighborhoods, or at least representatives appointed BY neighborhoods should occupy 30%-40% of the MUPTTE application board. The neighborhood representation on the board shall be determined by the neighborhood in question for EACH INDIVIDUAL application. Many neighborhoods won't have the ability to find 3 or 4 folks to represent and thus we suggest creating a list of potential representatives for the various neighborhoods to choose from who represent the interests of the neighbors. This list should be generated by the neighborhoods, NOT the city manager. -We do not feel it is necessary to lower the standards of building quality on any of the prospective MUPTTE zones. In the Whiteaker, the "green" standards in particular should be a requirement, not an option. We realize that the 6th and 7th corridor isn't the most desirable area to develop now, but it would be a shame to watch Eugene expand the way it is projected and have a row of ugly buildings in an area that we all hope becomes "desirable". - While we appreciate that the length of time for the exemption is determined by the board, we would advocate that the percentage of the exemption is also a negotiable variable. For instance, you could either have a 5 year 100% exemption or a 10 year 50% exemption. We believe this would provide a smoother transition for investors when they have to start paying property taxes when the exemption period has expired. In some cases, we would even advocate for the exemptions to be prolonged beyond ten years in the interest of the original investors keeping their properties instead of bailing as soon as the exemption is over, or perhaps developers should be obligated to keep their properties for a certain period of time after their exemption period has expired. This will weed out people who plan to use to exemption as a profit margin for a "flip"."

5. Whiteaker

05/12/2014

1. It's good to see some development investment being put into west Eugene. I hope it will help invigorate the W11th and 99/Trainsong corridors as well as redevelop brownfields.
2. skipped
3. skipped
4. skipped
5. Active Bethel Citizens

05/13/2014

1. The South Willamette area should not be included until the South Willamette Concept Plan has been finalized and the dust has settled.
2. Include neighborhood leaders and immediate neighbors in the review board. Increase green building standard to at least LEED gold.
3. skipped
4. skipped
5. FAN board member, not a chair.

05/14/2014

1. Do NOT implement MUPTE in the South Willamette St area until the South Willamette St Concept Plan zoning is implemented. At that time, restrict the boundaries further to encourage development in key areas first (eg south of 24th and only along willamette rather than in the established College Hill and FAN residential neighborhood)
2. Prioritize MUPTE areas. Eg the downtown should have first priority for increased density. Tailor criteria for each area.
3. Provide clear requirement to protect existing adjacent single family neighborhoods - demonstrate compatible design and traffic calming etc to direct traffic to the corridor/arterial, not the residential streets.
4. Provide more opportunity for neighborhood AND neighbors feedback. If those involved in neighborhood organizations have just become aware of the proposed changes, then it is clear that affected residents do not know yet.
5. FAN

05/14/2014

1. Extending the boundaries to include the 6th/7th Corridor makes good sense-- it is reasonable, incremental growth based on the current concept. Expanding to the south makes less than no sense. The other proposed expansions are premature and best saved for another time. Especially given recent experience, it is better to go slowly.
2. Some vague words, such as "encourage" should be defined more clearly. Green space accessible to the "nearby community"-- does that mean residents and owners, or does it mean the neighborhood? There is no need to limit building height in most of Downtown, especially if increased density in the urban core is a goal.
3. Requirement for an on-site property manager, at least for the duration of the MUPTE. This would reduce the possibility of a quick property flip turning into an ill-kept problem for the city and the neighborhood. 2. Definition of the make-up of the MUPTE committee, which should represent all stakeholders, including the neighborhood and applicable labor unions.
4. I wish it were clear about the type of retail that would be acceptable: is this an arts and entertainment district? Can residents get daily needs met-- grocery, hardware, etc.? How does a proposal fit with the goals of Envision Eugene? Doesn't it seem redundant to require that the

law be followed? What are the consequences for failure to adhere to the law-- or other explicit or implicit promises?

5. Downtown Neighborhood Association

05/25/2014

1. The program should not be expanded to include areas A & B
2. Only affordable housing should be eligible - affordability should be a minimum requirement.
The criteria for neighborhood involvement should be strengthened so that the tax exemption can only be granted when the neighborhood association approves the project.
3. skipped
4. skipped
5. Southeast Eugene

NOBEL FLANNERY Amanda

From: John Quilter <jquilter@peoplepc.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 10, 2014 8:33 PM
To: NOBEL FLANNERY Amanda
Cc: CLARK Mike
Subject: RE: Neighborhood Leaders MUPTE Feedback

Amanda,

I have looked over the survey form but the questions posed assume I am in agreement with the principal that underlies MUPTE. That is not the case. I am philosophically in disagreement with MUPTE. Such a program ultimately forces those not taking advantage of MUPTE to shoulder the taxes that are collectively deemed necessary to support agreed upon city services. I do not believe in such unfairness or the government picking and choosing winners and losers in taxation.

Furthermore, I see MUPTE only as a mechanism to counteract high land values resulting from the impacts of a restrictive land use scheme in the form of the artificial urban growth boundary. By limiting the land that can be developed you drive up the cost of the developable land thus requiring MUPTE to subsidize the economics of new development. The inflexibility of the urban growth boundary is a self-imposed land development restriction that drives the price of residential, commercial, retail, and industrial land higher than necessary.

As one attendee in our workshop so accurately stated "densification is NOT a community benefit". I do not know if the new building at 1162 Willamette Street is a MUPTE creation or not, but in any case it is a sad example of what we can look forward to. Consider the pleasant open space and wide sidewalk provided by the Chase Bank facility only a block away, versus the right on the sidewalk construction of 1162. This is the Manhattanization of Eugene and it is most unwelcome.

As an additional note, I see that the South Willamette corridor is slated for inclusion in MUPTE. That, given the existing controversy over the inadequacy of the street, is sheer lunacy. If anything, the density and intensity of use of the land in this corridor should be reduced, not increased as MUPTE would do.

My solution: If you must build for population growth, relax the urban growth boundary, and zone for individual self-contained, stand-alone new neighborhoods that reduce the need for frequent cross town travel by residents, thus reducing congestion.

Feel free to include my comments in the record.

John F. Quilter
1450 Russet Drive
Eugene, OR 97401

-----Original Message-----

From: NOBEL FLANNERY Amanda [mailto:Amanda.NobelFlannery@ci.eugene.or.us]
Sent: Friday, May 9, 2014 4:22 PM
To: 'abcdonella@aol.com'; 'joannegross@ymail.com'; PRINCE Randy (SMTP); 'davidmandelblatt@gmail.com'; 'ajf541@yahoo.com'; CLARKE Robert (SMTP); 'chair@jwneugene.org'; 'dkjones3388@gmail.com'; 'prknox@gmail.com'; 'kevin@dkreedinvestments.com'; BELCHER Jon (SMTP); 'michael@dreamteammedia.com'; FINIGAN Jerry (SMTP);

'sielicki@gmail.com'; MUSSELWHITE Tom (SMTP); 'prknox@gmail.com'; 'hmpwr@yahoo.com';
'jenniferyeh@ymail.com'; KOLB David (SMTP); 'calyoung2014@gmail.com'; BUCK Alan (SMTP);
'rachael.anne.young@gmail.com'; 'steven@asburydesign.net'; 'betty9758@comcast.net'; 'gunnars@clearwire.net';
ASPEGREN Bill (SMTP); JACOBS Carolyn (SMTP); SONNICHSEN David (SMTP); 'info@ajfisherdesign.com';
'kristinalang@hotmail.com'; HEALEY Deborah (UO); 'duncan.rhodes@cerrillas.net'; 'tomhappy@aol.com';
'davidmsaul@gmail.com'; 'sam@redbananaproductions.com'; 'nickles.david@gmail.com'; 'jqulter@peoplepc.com';
BROWN George R
Cc: HAMMOND Laura A; YOUNG Nancy A; KANE Rene C; KINNISON Michael J; BURKE Carolyn J; BRAUD Denny
Subject: Neighborhood Leaders MUPTE Feedback

Hello,

Thank you to everyone who was able to attend last night's meeting regarding potential changes to the MUPTE program. We appreciate your time and thoughtfulness on this topic.

Materials presented at the meeting are now available on the City's website at www.eugene-or.gov/MUPTEneighborhoods<<http://www.eugene-or.gov/MUPTEneighborhoods>>, including the handout of the proposed criteria, slides from the presentation, and the proposed boundary maps. A compilation of past MUPTE projects was requested at last night's meeting and that has also been posted. The video of the Envision Eugene Technical Resource Group presentation will be posted soon.

We have also posted a link to a short survey to help collect your feedback at <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/MUPTEcriteria>. The survey includes three general questions:

- * What input or feedback do you have about the proposed boundaries?
- * How would you change any of the proposed criteria?
- * Are there any missing criteria?

There is also a place to provide additional comments or feedback. Again, please feel free to contact us if you have questions or need additional information. If you were not able to attend the meetings or would just like more information, we would be happy to schedule a time to meet with you - please contact us at:

Nancy Young,
nancy.a.young@ci.eugene.or.us<<mailto:nancy.a.young@ci.eugene.or.us>>,
541-682-6849

The City Council's next work session on MUPTE is scheduled for June 9. There will also be a public hearing scheduled to collect input as the revision process moves forward.

Thank you again and we look forward to getting your feedback.

Amanda

Amanda Nobel Flannery
Loan Analyst
Community Development Division
City of Eugene
(541) 682-5535
I am in the office on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays.