

MINUTES

**Eugene City Council
Harris Hall, 125 East 8th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon 97401**

**October 15, 2018
5:30 p.m.**

Councilors Present: Emily Semple, Betty Taylor, Alan Zelenka, Jennifer Yeh, Mike Clark, Greg Evans, Claire Syrett, Chris Pyror

Mayor Vinis opened the October 15, 2018, Work Session of the Eugene City Council.

1. WORK SESSION: Modifications to the Transportation System Development Charge

Methodology

Public Works Director Sarah Medary and City Engineer Mark Schoening provided background on systems development charges including legislative history, public hearing comments and an overview of the proposed amendments to the TSDC methodology.

Council Discussion

- Clarification requested about the proposed annual caps for non-Accessory Dwelling Units and how they would be applied each year.
- Support expressed for the staff recommendations because they are a rational response to a complex challenge.
- Interest expressed in reducing the cost of building and removing barriers as a way to provide more housing.
- Consider moving forward with the staff recommendations and see what it does to the building landscape, then review and discuss further.
- Question asked about whether there was a timeline that council is locked into to make this decision.
- Interest shared in waiting on making the TSDC decision until after there is more information about how they will affect the affordable housing conversation.
- Concern expressed that the caps would be too low to make a difference in ADU numbers and would be applied indiscriminately if they were first-come, first-serve.
- Interested in seeing what this looks like in context of making housing more affordable in the community.
- More inclined to start with no cap and then revisit in a few years.
- Concerned about any increase in SDCs; don't want to negatively affect builders until other potential impacts are identified and understood.
- There is a widely shared opinion that it should be easier to build an accessory dwelling unit.
- The purpose of SDCs is to cover the cost of growth.
- This proposal sends the message that it's going to be more expensive to build in this area now.
- Request made for a list of building projects that would not move forward if changes are made.
- The risk of removing the cap is fairly small in terms of council's ability to regroup.
- Even after proposed increase, the local rates are substantially lower than most cities in Oregon.
- The imposition of a cap is a good idea because it creates certainty for budgeting issues.
- If this is a big concern for developers, consider other ways to incentivize or offset SDC costs.
- The first and second motions move the City forward and in the right direction.
- By taking this action, the council is increasing the cost of building homes.

MOTION AND VOTE: Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to direct the City Manager to revise the TSDC amendments that will be proposed for Council action by: imposing the increase in the SDC rate in two steps, charging ½ of the proposed increase for the first 12 months, then charging the full rate after 12 months. **PASSED 5:3**, Councilors Clark, Evans and Semple opposed.

MOTION AND VOTE (*including friendly amendment*): Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to direct the City Manager to revise the TSDC amendments that will be proposed for Council action by: reducing the TSDC for accessory dwelling units by 100 percent, instead of the 50 percent initially proposed by staff, including the reference that it affects homes 800 square feet or less. **PASSED 7:1**, Councilor Taylor opposed.

MOTION: Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to direct the City Manager to revise the TSDC amendments that will be proposed for Council action by: imposing an annual cap of \$20,000 on the total amount of TSDCs waived for ADUs.

MOTION TO SUBSTITUTE: Councilor Semple, seconded by Councilor Zelenka, moved to substitute \$40,000 for \$20,000 in this motion.

Council Discussion

- Council agrees that more ADUs are desired; would not want to put a cap on that type of development.

VOTE ON SUBSTITUTE MOTION: PASSED 5:3, councilors Taylor, Syrett, and Yeh opposed.

VOTE ON MAIN MOTION AS SUBSTITUTED: PASSED 5:3, councilors Clark, Yeh, and Syrett opposed.

MOTION: Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to direct the City Manager to revise the TSDC amendments that will be proposed for Council action by: imposing an annual cap of \$130,000 on the total amount of TSDCs waived under the City's location-based, transit proximity, and transportation demand management incentive programs, combined.

Council Discussion

Question asked whether staff would forecast the idea that the City might lose the ability to facilitate projects that it has already committed to. if there is no cap and incentives to development lead to a surplus of building projects.

MOVE TO SUBSTITUTE and VOTE: Councilor Semple, seconded by Councilor Clark, moved to substitute \$260,000 for \$130,000 as the cap. **FAILED 2:6**, councilors Semple and Clark in favor.

VOTE ON ORIGINAL MOTION: PASSED 5:4, councilors Clark, Semple, Yeh and Syrett opposed; Mayor Vinis broke tie in support.

2. WORK SESSION: Transit Tomorrow

Transportation Planning Manager Rob Inerfeld and Lane Transit District's Planning and Development Director Tom Schwetz gave an update about Transit Tomorrow and the effort to

identify the best way to move people in the community to the destinations that are important to them.

MOTION AND VOTE: Councilor Clark, seconded by Councilor Taylor, moved to extend for 10 minutes. **PASSED 5-3**, councilors Syrett, Semple, and Clark opposed.

Council Discussion

- Questions asked about mobility on demand and whether it considers the use of taxis or TNC companies.
- Decisions and issues are difficult; will result in improvements for some and challenges for others.
- Community is interested in and supportive of increasing transit access for more people.
- Transit needs to be reliable regardless of your work schedule.
- Consider how transit can support affordable housing whenever possible.
- Transit is important to the City's Climate Recovery Ordinance; better transit is needed to meet expectation that people will leave their cars at home.
- Late night service would be helpful for people who are out drinking or out at events.
- Permitting dogs on buses would help increase ridership.
- Efforts should appeal to all types of users, not just frequent riders.
- Consider apprenticeship for bus drivers, using smaller buses and vans to provide services.
- If transit is easy to access and convenient, people will use it.
- If an emphasis is placed on shorter wait times, consider the impacts on those whose service is reduced.
- Question asked about the estimate on taxes LTD will receive with the transportation package.
- Questions asked about the pedestrian network analysis.
- Consideration must be given to how we serve those people who can't walk longer distances to access more frequent service.
- Night and weekend service is important and a long unmet need.
- Important to consider how Transit Tomorrow will be aligned with or take into account initiatives that come out of the MovingAhead project.
- Invite LTD to return to council after next round of public comments with alternatives.

The meeting adjourned at 7:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Elena Domingo
Deputy City Recorder

Link to the webcast of this City Council meeting: [here](#).