



COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE- Summary Minutes

Zoom Webinar

January 19, 2021, 6:00 PM

CAC Members Present: Louisa de Heer, Ann Vaughn, Kate Perle, Mary Leontovich, Jon Belcher, Rick Duncan, Hans Wittig, Louie Vidmar, Ed McMahon

Community Members Present: Harry Sanger, Beth Gerot, Carleen Reilly

Staff Present: Terri Harding, Chelsea Hartman, Elena Domingo

Agenda Items

1. Standing Items

- Introductions and 1 word for 2021
 - Harry and Beth have been nominated by RRCO to fill vacancies on the CAC. They will officially become members when the Eugene Planning Commission confirms their appointments, but in the meantime, both joined the meeting/discussion.
- Public Comments
 - Carleen Reilly – River Road resident following the Neighborhood Planning process.
- Agenda Review – no changes were made.

2. Update on Action Plan Additional Details

- Chelsea shared how staff plan to add some additional details that were requested to the Action Plan document, noting that some actions will have more available information to add than others. The yearly meeting between staff and the community is meant to continue adding new and updated details as things progress.
- Elena talked about her approach to writing introductions and including background information for each topic area that will help people understand how the action items fit into the big picture of plans, projects, committees, etc. to help provide additional detail.
- Discussed how this information will be helpful as we figure out paths forward and think about implementation and helps educate residents on different agencies, funding sources, etc.

3. Discuss Changes to Topic Area Priority Actions

- Talked about the process for reviewing the new suggested priority actions and what the implications of adding priorities means for staff and CAC. Decided to review and vote on the proposed priorities.

- Talked about meeting homework deadlines, because it would give people a chance to take changes back to their working groups. The updates CAC makes tonight will still be going to RRCO and SCCO for review.

Economic Development

1.4.4 Reduce zoning barriers that preclude urban farmers from **collectively** selling produce on-site. (Mary and Jon)

- RRCO suggested adding “collectively” to this action item. Discussed the background of this action – a group of folks had previously tried to gather and sell produce, attracting people and vehicles and other neighbors weren’t happy about it and found it they were precluded from doing this by City code. Many neighbors would like to see this happen.

1.4.4 Vote: 8 thumbs up, 1 thumb sideways.

- **1.4.4 added as a priority**

1.4.6 Self-storage facilities should only be allowed in **Employment and Industrial zones**. ~~industrial-zoned areas~~ (Jon and Kate)

- Discussed not wanting to preclude storage as an accessory use, such as self-storage built with an apartment unit.
- Talked about changing the language “industrial-zoned” and if there was a better way to get at the intention. Terri suggested using E and I zones because they implement industrial plan designations.

1.4.6 Vote: 9 thumbs up.

- **1.4.6 added as a priority.**

1.4.1 Research how local permitting and regulatory processes work to encourage or discourage business activity. Address incongruities.

1.4.3 Adjust land use regulations to encourage local community investments that produce employment opportunities recognizing the importance of living and working within the neighborhood.

- Talked about how these two action items encourage business development and we should be focusing on bringing in neighborhood appropriate business, which ties in to reducing barriers for urban farming and the concept of 20-minute neighborhoods.
- Discussed how these actions might not rise to priority level because they’re such a heavy lift, they would take resources away from other actions and would take a long time to get to a place where you’d see the benefit.
- Reminder to everyone that role of CAC is to reflect what is heard from the community at large and commonly held beliefs throughout the neighborhood.
- Staff response to prioritizing difficult items: priorities can be across the board in terms of feasibility, expense, and timeframe. Just because something is difficult and long-term doesn’t mean it shouldn’t be prioritized. If they are items we’ve heard over and over again, it’s good to reflect that because it helps staff know where to focus limited resources.

1.4.1 Vote: 7 thumbs sideways, 2 thumbs down.

- 1.4.1 not added as a priority.

1.4.3 Vote: 6 thumbs sideways, 3 thumbs down.

- 1.4.3 not added as a priority.

CAC decided that an action needed one vote over half to move forward as prioritized, don't want to prioritize an action if people are feeling indecisive about it.

Transportation

4.1.2 Implement protected pedestrian and bike lanes that address evolving neighborhood needs and increase access to services for all.

a. Adopt new street standards using context sensitive design that allow for more flexible sidewalk and bike lane design, and natural swales that clean stormwater, provide wildlife habitat, and ensure longevity. (Jon and Kate)

- Expressed desire to see this as a priority, especially developing new facilities with context sensitive design. CAC asked if there was any staff concerns about prioritizing this item. Chelsea responded that this is related to work in-progress with the Complete Streets Design and would make sense to highlight as a priority.

c. Local Streets: Use pavement markings and signage to identify walking, bicycling, and driving spaces on local streets, where appropriate. (Kate)

- Talked about how if there are streets where physical buildout isn't an option, markings and signage can help create safer options.

4.1.2(a) Vote: 9 thumbs up.

- **4.1.2(a) added as a priority.**

4.1.2(c) Vote: 9 thumbs up.

- **4.1.2(c) added as a priority.**

6.4.1 Prohibit allowance of private streets in new developments. (Jon)

6.4.1 Vote: 6 thumbs up, 2 thumbs sideways, 1 thumbs down.

- **6.4.1 added as a priority.**

5.3.2 Provide safe access from **Division to Fred Meyer and Santa Clara Shopping Center** to make access effective and safe for all modes of transportation. (Mary)

- Discussed the importance of safety at these intersections.

5.3.2 Vote: 9 thumbs up.

- **5.3.2 added as a priority.**

5.4.4 Increase functionality of Northwest Expressway by improving entrance and exit access and appropriate traffic control devices. (Mary)

- Talked about the serious safety issues and concerns here.

5.4.4 Vote: 8 thumbs up, 1 thumb sideways.

- **5.4.4 added as a priority.**

Parks and Natural Resources

8.1.3 Encourage the inclusion of natural areas in neighborhood parks. (Mary)

- Talked about neighbors wanting more natural areas vs. swings, etc. Concerns about how this might get implemented, but then talked about how the action just speaks to encouraging natural areas when neighborhood parks are planned.

8.1.3 Vote: 9 thumbs up.

- **8.1.3 added as a priority.**

8.1.6 Purchase and develop urban plazas in both River Road and Santa Clara. Consider siting one at the new Lane Transit District transfer station site. (Mary and Kate)

8.1.6 Vote: 8 thumbs up, 1 thumb sideways.

- **8.1.6 added as a priority.**

8.2.1 Pursue opportunities for purchase of land, easements, or other agreements for connectivity. (Mary)

- A lot of people talked about how neighborhoods aren't connected to parks and they're not connected to each other, with the ultimate goal of connectivity.

8.2.1 Vote: 8 thumbs up, 1 thumb sideways.

- **8.2.1 added as a priority.**

8.2.2 Continue the West Bank Multi Use Path northward through Santa Clara and beyond. (Mary)

- Work on this is already being done by the City and the County.

8.2.2 Vote: 9 thumbs up.

- **8.2.2 added as a priority.**

8.3.2 Promote the creation of a community center in Santa Clara including a multi-use swimming pool to provide recreation, social, and educational opportunities available to everyone ~~and preserve a community center in River Road.~~ (Ann, Mary, and Kate)

- The "preserve a community center in River Road" language was not part of this action language.
- Talked about special parks districts and whether people will be willing to tax themselves at the same level they have been for River Road Parks District. Thinking about the uncertainty of what future services are going to be the most important.
- Discussed how annexations leave smaller amount of County property owners responsible for funding the parks district, which is why there's a need for a more coordinated system.
- This action is more specific, but similar to "17.3.2 Realize the development of the planned community park and community center in Santa Clara and continue provision of a community park and community center in River Road, currently being filled by the River Road Parks and Recreation District."
- Talked about how even though the Santa Clara community center is planned for way into the future, it's been a high priority for the community and want to elevate to a priority so it is highlighted.

8.3.2 Vote: 8 thumbs up, 2 thumbs sideways.

- **8.3.2 added as a priority.**

8.3.3 Provide facilities and programming for all ages and abilities of residents. (Kate)

8.3.2 Vote: 9 thumbs up.

- **8.3.3 added as a priority.**

9.2.2 Support efforts to maintain the Greenway as a riparian area and wildlife corridor, identify the high value areas for ecosystem management, and work to enlarge the Water Resources Conservation areas to enhance high value areas. (Mary and Jon)

- Discussed how there currently is no mechanism for questioning the wildlife impact of a project and the desire to make this a factor in discussions.
- Talked about how the intent of this action isn't so much about physically enlarging the conservation areas, but about changing the criteria for evaluation to better protect wildlife in riparian areas.

9.2.2 Vote: 8 thumbs up, 1 thumb sideways.

- **9.2.2 added as a priority.**

9.2.3 Work with ~~Delta Sand and Gravel~~ **relevant stakeholders** to transfer ownership or easement to City of Eugene and/or Lane County for short term multi-use path extension **along the Willamette River in Santa Clara now** and long-term eventual park/natural area possibility. (Ann, Mary, Jon, and Kate)

- Talked about why the multi-use path is meant to be short-term, intended to be part of a phased approach – add the word “now” to make that clearer.
- Talked about how there are other partners/landowners besides Delta Sand and Gravel that may need to be a part of the conversation – add “relevant stakeholders” instead of limiting.
- Concerns that people reading this action might not know where this path is located, add the language “along the Willamette River in Santa Clara” to clarify.
- 5.1.3 defines where the bike path is intended to be, suggested adding this language:
 - “5.1.3 Create bike/pedestrian paths to give access to the Willamette River in Santa Clara to connect them to the rest of the path system throughout the city.
 - a. Complete the connection of the West Bank Bike Path through Santa Clara from Beltline north to the UGB and beyond.
 - b. Implement redesign of Beaver-Hunsaker to ensure safety for all modes of transportation.”

9.2.3 Vote: 9 thumbs up.

- **9.2.3 added as a priority.**

10.1.1 Incorporate agricultural land preservation into all long range planning at municipal and county levels. (Mary)

10.1.2 Investigate potential changes to state law and Lane County code to limit non-agricultural development on Class 1 and 2 soils to preserve its agricultural potential. (Mary)

10.1.3 Investigate feasibility of amending Lane County code zoning regulations to limit non-agricultural development to rural densities, uses and development patterns in order to reduce conflict with existing farm uses. (Mary)

10.1.4 Investigate the creation and funding of a farmland preservation program centered around the transfer of development rights and conservation easements. (Mary)

10.1.5 Develop local incentives to support small farm owners in order to preserve a buffer between land zoned for exclusive farm use (EFU) and land within the UGB. (Mary)

10.1.6 Pursue creation of land classification that permanently protects prime farmland (class 1 and 2 soils) adjacent to the current UGB i.e. rural reserves. (Mary and Kate)

- A big question for the community has been what are we doing with agriculture while also dealing with development pressures. These actions address changing how we deal with agriculture/agricultural lands and that's why they're suggested as priorities.
- Talked about how the proposed Urban Reserves area is the 27-year option which excludes Class 1 and adjacent Class 2 soils outside the UGB.
- Discussed if these actions are even possible or legal, Chelsea said that the County could answer that better and most of them are difficult, but that doesn't mean they shouldn't be prioritized by the community.
- 10.1.4 could be people, such as conservation organization, talking to property owners about how to conserve land and shouldn't be as difficult or involve City or County.
- 10.1.6 could be approached different, possibly a statewide land classification and trying to build a movement to permanently protect agricultural land outside the UGB, so the financial impact wouldn't land on the County.

Vote on 10.1.1-10.1.6: 9 thumbs up.

- **10.1.1-10.1.6 added as a priorities.**

10.2.2 Identify parcels of privately-owned open space valued by community as open space currently and target for future public acquisition. (Kate)

- Talked about how public acquisition is possible and gave examples of when the community has interceded to let the City know that parcels are coming up for sale and would make a great park and how it's worked well for the neighborhood so far.

Vote on 10.2.2: 7 thumbs up, 2 thumbs sideways.

- **10.2.2 added as a priority.**

10.3.3 Amend zoning to permit small scale collective sale of neighborhood grown produce. (Jon)

- Talked about how even though this is redundant after adding the "collectively" language to 1.4.4, it just strengthens and reinforces the desire for this action as a priority.

Vote on 10.3.3: 9 thumbs up.

- **10.3.3 added as a priority.**

Land Use

14.1.4 Develop transitions between R-1 properties ~~as part of implementation of House Bill 2001.~~ (Mary)

- Discussed how this has been a concern of neighbors when giant houses built next to smaller houses.

- Talked about how and why this action related to HB 2001. Chelsea suggested people get involved in the HB 2001 input and the outreach survey in February, there are limitations on what will be possible, but there may be flexibility as we work on this project. Chelsea will send out more information about how to get neighborhood voices heard as part of that outreach.
- Suggested getting rid of the “as part of implementation of House Bill 2001” so that it makes it a priority, without qualifying as part of this process, if there are other future opportunities to make changes. Can still include HB 2001 as a related project in the matrix.

14.1.4 Vote: 6 thumbs up, 1 thumb sideways, 1 thumb down. (Ed left the meeting).

- **14.1.4 added as a priority.**

Community

15.3.3 Work with the city and county to identify housing first options, and advocate **for temporary and transitional solutions** ~~rest stop or car camping sites~~ and network with other neighborhoods and learn from their successes. (Mary)

15.3.4 Working with non-profits and faith-based organizations in the neighborhood ~~on~~ **to serving** the unhoused community. (Mary)

- Talked about the range of feelings from neighbors on this issue. Though these temporary shelter options aren't a long-term solution, they do give people a safe place to sleep.
- Talked about how RRCO and SCCO will need to have champions to make these action items priorities and help move them forward. The neighborhood organizations have already been doing work with the City and nonprofits around homelessness and these action items help provide the opportunity to continue those discussions.
- Took out language specifically referencing rest stops or car camping because programs change, added “for temporary and transitional solutions.”

15.3.3 Vote: 6 thumbs up, 2 thumbs sideways.

- **15.3.3 added as a priority.**

15.3.4 Vote: 8 thumbs up.

- **15.3.4 added as a priority.**

16.5.1 Develop a mapping system for neighbors to identify their resources and neighbors in need. Publish ideas for community building activities and empower neighborhood associations to broaden their outreach. (Kate)

16.5.1 Vote: 2 thumbs up, 4 thumbs sideways, 2 thumbs down.

- 16.5.1 not added as a priority.

17.1.1 Educate residents about what agencies are serving them and how they are funded. Publish and make available a compendium of service agencies in River Road and Santa Clara and their contact information. (Kate)

17.1.1 Vote: 7 thumbs up, 1 thumb sideways.

- **17.1.1 added as a priority.**

17.2.3 Review essential service levels as they currently exist and ascertain what public services are missing or deficient; and create a path to mitigating these deficiencies (example: no service by Cahoots for unincorporated residents). (Kate)

17.2.3 Vote: 8 thumbs up.

- **17.2.3 added as a priority.**

18.1.5 Ensure that each neighborhood has sufficient FEMA drop off sites, water access points, and at least one sheltering location per neighborhood according to disaster planning. (Mary)

- Discussed how our bigger community isn't as prepared as it needs to be for the big earthquake, but Santa Clara is especially not ready.

18.1.5 Vote: 8 thumbs up

- **18.1.5 added as a priority.**

18.4.3 Provide water purification options and hand pumps for accessible wells at identified locations. (Kate)

- EWEB just sent out information with the locations of emergency water sources. Howard Elementary is the closest in the area, but neighbors will likely need to rely on private wells, which will take a lot of organizing and will need to consider health/safety and pollution concerns.

18.4.3 Vote: 4 thumbs up, 4 thumbs sideways.

- 18.4.3 not added as a priority.

5. Wrap Up/Next Steps

- Elena will send out an email with minutes and follow-up assignments for CAC.

Follow-Ups

- Staff will continue working on Action Plan details.
- Staff will update matrix documents with new priorities and updated language.
- Staff will send out information about how to engage with the HB 2001 outreach.

Priorities Added:

Economic Development: 1.4.4, 1.4.6

Transportation: 4.1.2(a) and (c), 5.3.2, 5.4.4, 6.4.1

Parks and Natural Resources: 8.1.3, 8.1.6, 8.2.1, 8.2.2, 8.3.2, 8.3.3, 9.2.2, 9.2.3, 10.1.1, 10.1.2, 10.1.3, 10.1.4, 10.1.5, 10.1.6, 10.2.2, 10.3.3

Land Use: 14.1.4

Community: 15.3.3, 15.3.4, 17.1.1, 17.2.3, 18.1.5