

ROUGHLY EDITED TRANSCRIPT

CITY OF EUGENE
CITY COUNCIL PUBLIC HEARING
JANUARY 20, 2026
5:30 P.M.

Captioning Provided by:
LNS Captioning
www.LNSCaptioning.com
Phone: (503) 446-4555

* * *

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

* * *

¶

>> Mayor Knudson: 2026, Eugene city public hearing.

Thank you for joining us in the hybrid mat.

You can watch us on broadcast channel 21.

And follow the meetings material page of the city of Eugene website.

There are five public hearings on tonight's agenda.

Please note that members of the public who sign up to testify may speak only on the topic that is the subject of the stated hearing.

For those wishing to testify during a public hear, please fill out a request to speak form available on the city's public webcast and meetings materials web page and these

request to speak forms are used to generate the order of speakers and correctly enter speakers' names into the public record.

We will accept requests to speak forms until 5:35 p.m.

As a reminder, council's meeting rules of conduct apply to all attendees, both in the chambers and in the lobby and include no flags, signs, loud or disruptive language, noise or conduct that obstructs the business of the council.

Please keep the room quiet and respectful for all speakers and you are welcome to wave your hands in silent support.

Additionally we encourage all of those who are ill or who have close contact with others who are ill to join remotely rather than in person.

We encourage attendees to spread out within the meeting space or wear a mask if you feel comfortable doing so and we have some in the lobby if you need.

An AED is located behind staff on west side of this room and in the case of an emergency evacuation, the emergency exit doors are through the double doors located at the back of the room and the doors to the patio can also be used as needed.

And with that, I call this meeting to order.

The first public hearing on tonight's agenda is the public hearing on an ordinance providing for withdrawal of annexed properties from special districts.

Assistant city manager, would you please introduce the topic.

>> I will.

Thank you, mayor.

State law and local code require properties annexed to cities to withdraw from special service districts through a process separate from the annexation of those properties.

Withdrawals from special districts are reviewed by the city council through a public hearing process, consistent with state law and Eugene code requirements.

After the public hearing, the city council asked to determine whether the withdrawals meet the approval criterion established by state law, and Eugene code.

The only approval criterion is that the city shall determine whether the withdrawal is in the best interest of the city.

Eugene code Section 9.835.

Withdrawals of recently annexed property from special districts are routinely batch processed on an annual basis.

If they are not approved the withdrawal does not become effective until July 1, 2027, which would keep the properties on the tax roll of service districts that no longer provide service to the property.

This is the first step in a two-step process that includes city council, public -- includes the public hearing, followed by the city council action.

No action is required at this time.

Options will be provided at the time of city council action, which is scheduled for February 9th, 2026.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you, assistant city manager.

I now open the public hearing.

Staff, can you please share a list of the names of speaker on screen and announce the first speaker.

>> Thank you, mayor.

We have no speakers for this first topic.

>> Mayor Knudson: With no speakers, I now close the public hearing.

Are there any questions or comments from city council.

Seeing none, we will now move on to our second public hearing this evening.

Our second public hearing on tonight's agenda is an ordinance concerning state traffic laws, and assistant city manager, would you please introduce this topic.

>> I will.

Thank you.

The purpose of this public hearing is to consider amendments to Section 5.005 of the Eugene code, by readopting the state's statutory traffic code provisions.

The proposed ordinance updates the Eugene code to include changes made during the

2025 session by the Oregon State legislature.

Because 2025 legislative changes have already gone into effect, the ordinance provide for an immediate effective date so that the traffic laws that went into effect on January 1, 2025, or before, can be prosecuted in the Eugene municipal court.

The city council is scheduled to take action on the ordinance next week.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you, staff.

I now open the public hearing and would you please share a list of speakers on the screen and announce first speakers.

>> Thank you, mayor.

We have no speakers for this second topic.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you very much.

Give than we have no speakers, I now close this public hearing.

Are there any questions or comments from city council?

Yes?

Councilor Keating.

>> Keating: I had an ex parte conversation with judge gill about this topic.

I wanted to be transparent about that conversation.

>> Mayor Knudson: With no other questions or comments from city council, we'll move on to our third agenda item.

And our third item on tonight's agenda is our third public hearing which is regarding an ordinance concerning elections and assistant city manager, would you please introduce this topic?

>> The last substantive update to the election code was 2008, since then, key changes have been made at the state level, resulting in a need to review and make updates to the Eugene code to maintain alignment.

The proposed ordinance would align Eugene code with Oregon administrative rules, as well as provide clarity on certain city recorder processes.

>> Thank you.

I now open the public hearing.

Can you share a list of speakers on the screen and announce the first speakers.

>> No speakers for this third topic.

>> Thank you very much.

I now close the public hearing.

Are there any questions or comments.

Seeing none, we will move on to our fourth agenda item and fourth public hearing this evening.

The fourth public hearing on tonight's agenda is a public hearing regarding an ordinance amending the Fairmount/University of Oregon special area study text and diagram amending sections of Eugene code and rezoning the property to remove the E.C./east campus overlay zone.

Assistant city manager, would you please introduce the topic.

>> Yes, thank you, mayor the this is a public hearing to consider a package of land use applications submitted by University of Oregon for the east campus area, a refinement plan amendment, a code amendment, and a zone change application.

This package of applications would amend the Fairmount University of Oregon special area study, the Eugene land use code and zoning of properties in the east campus area to align with recent updates to the east campus area plan and the university's next generation housing development plan.

Tonight is a public hearing only and deliberations are scheduled for February 9th.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you.

The decision-making process for this application is quasi judicial.

So we will use a quasi judicial format for this public hearing.

And to begin, do any councilors need to disclose any bias, conflicts of interest, ex parte communications or abstentions pursuant to Eugene code 9.065.

Councilor Clark.

>> Clark: Thank you, mayor.

I had an accidental ex parte communication for half of a moment with one of the folks that I believe will testify tonight from the neighborhood, that they were going to testify about this.

And that was it.

And I don't believe that has any effect on my ability to render a fair and impartial decision.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Zelenka.

>> Zelenka: I can put aside my preconceived ideas and I will base my decisions solely on the applicable approval criteria and evidence and argument in the record.

I testified at the planning commission when this issue came up.

Not about the substance of the issue.

So it wasn't about preconceived notion of the -- of bias towards any decision, but to the process, and I ask that the planning commission take into consideration and listen to the neighborhood. And that was the potential of my potential ex parte conversation.

And then also I've had numerous people from the neighborhood who are planning to present today to ask me numerous questions about the process that we go by.

And they asked if we could -- they could testify in order of the way that they signed up, because they're testifying on the written testimony, and have it randomized to Section 9, to Section 2, and that would be very confusing to us and not very effective in terms of communication.

So I would request that we allow them to go in the order in the way that they signed up.

>> Second it, if it was a motion.

>> Zelenka: I think it's important for the --

>> Mayor Knudson: I think it's important that you make a motion.

>> Zelenka: Okay I would ask the public be allowed to how they sign up.

>> Mayor Knudson: A motion and a second.

Discussion from council.

Councilor Kashinsky.

We'll have discussion from council.

Councilor Kashinsky.

I know that the randomized order went in a while ago and that's been consistent in public hearings and with public forum since that went in.

Have we made exceptions to that in the past?

I know we have a number of who come to various meetings, like they have people planned to speak in a certain order.

Have we -- have we granted a request like this in the past that --

>> Mayor Knudson: I'm not familiar with a motion being made.

If there have been requests, it hasn't been made to the body of the council and a motion has been made to do it.

>> Not in the three years that I have been here have we done something like what is being requested.

>> Kashinsky: I definitely understand the desire to speak in a certain order.

I also have some desire to have fairness and consistency is -- consistency in our rules because we do get requests like this multiple times.

I feel like if we grant this, then we are going to be needing to grant every time someone asks that.

So thanks.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Clark.

>> Clark: Thank you, mayor.

I just want to say, I will probably vote no on the councilor's motion, only for the same reason as Councilor Kashinsky, that I'm -- I don't know enough and I haven't spent enough time thinking about it saying it may or may not advantage one side or the other

and it's a change in process that's extra, outside of our process and it's supposed to be quasi judicial.

And I'm not super comfortable changing it.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Council Councilor Groves.

>> Groves: I too understand why the group would want to do it this way.

I too am concerned about changing or establishing a precedent that may become awkward in other issues.

What I would suggest as an alternative, we also allow written testimony.

If you want to submit written testimony in the order that you would like, if that would make more sense, I would certainly read it and take it into consideration.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Keating.

>> The feedback that I got from some of the neighborhood groups said they did not sign up in a particular order.

She felt it important to put that forward, that they just signed up randomly.

So we could unrandomize the list, pulling the original list but they didn't sign up in a specific order.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you, staff.

Thank you, city recorder.

Councilor Keating.

>> Keating: My comment may be moot recognizing we have a little bit more information, but I -- I would just submit to my colleagues who are pointing to the process, it's an internal process, not necessarily an ordinance that would be violated, and when I see 50 persons in the audience come coming to a public hearing when we normally have five at a public hearing, I'm enthusiastic to hear what's on their mind in order that makes sense for those providing testimony.

But as Katie pointed out, it sounds as if this is in search of an answer to a problem that might not exist.

In the maker of the motion would consider withdrawing it.

It sounds like it's not needed.

>> Zelenka: I think it's needed.

The reason they didn't sign up in order, was told they couldn't and didn't make any difference.

The way they structured their testimony is to have it be in sequence so that the logic knows.

So if we vote against this, prepare to be confused which could be easily avoided.

I would also point out that we do make exceptions to this rule.

We allow commissions and neighborhood people go to the front of the queue.

So that breaks the rule.

And then -- and the reason we did this in the first place was -- was not intended for this.

The reason we did this in the first place was we were intending to have this apply to public comment.

And we randomize that because what we saw a pattern of people, coming in early, signing up and always being the first to speak.

We decided we were going to randomize that.

It carried over into the rest of these, which really doesn't make any sense to me.

And in this case it really doesn't make any sense to not allow them to do that.

In the case of quasi judicial things, which are very complex and when you read the record and you read the testimony, you will see as very complex.

So making it more confusing and more complex is something I was trying to avoid with this motion.

>> Keating: Mayor, I will be in support of the motion and I would ask my colleagues to do the same if they have requests from their ward.

>> Mayor Knudson: Any other comments before we take a vote on this motion?

None.

Councilor Clark, sorry.

>> Clark: I wanted to ask our city attorney, is doing something that's a request from those giving testimony advantaging one side or another?

And is that a quasi judicial issue?

>> So the -- I mean, this is in your operating agreements.

It's not part of the quasi judicial rules.

I think part of what is concerning is that the motion was specific just to the neighborhood negotiation.

It wasn't about randomizing all of the different groups.

And so it's specific to -- to one group.

And also, if this motion passes, I don't actually think it puts anybody in order.

So whether -- because they -- if they -- if the list was randomized, which it would have been, if the list is randomized, it just rerandomized an already randomized order.

So if you go back to the original order, there was no order to how they signed up.

>> Clark: Easily fixes, though.

>> I'm not sure how it could be fixed from a technical standpoint.

You would have to have everybody sign back up, again?

>> Zelenka: Does that answer my question about quasi judicial and advantaging one side or the other.

>> I can't okay whether it advantages one side or the other, because I don't know what the testimony is.

I do think the limitation of the randomization, just to the neighbors, perhaps could be brought up in an appeal.

I don't know if it would be successful or anything, but that -- because it's limited to just one group on randomizing them, that would be the one concern I have.

But that would be the one concern I have is that it's specific to one group.

Unrandomizing just one group and leaving everybody else randomized is the only concern I would raise.

>> Mayor Knudson: Seeing no other discussion from council, I will take a vote for this motion.

Councilors, please enter your votes into the tallies in front of you.

Councilor Evans is absent.

Councilor Groves.

>> I voted.

>> Mayor Knudson: And so we have two votes in favor, and five votes against.

And the motion fails.

We also had a queue.

We have discussion of ex parte contact and Councilor Groves, I had you third.

>> Groves: I rethought it over, and the conversation I had did not pertain to this.

We have a lot of conversations.

>> Mayor Knudson: Very true.

Councilor Kashinsky.

Thank you very much.

And I will just offer for the record, that a couple of hours ago, Councilor Zelenka asked me about the discussion of process that we just had and that seems moot, but I was asked for an opinion about that process.

Before we proceed, I also want to state that anyone who testifies has the right to address or rebut the substance of any of the ex parte communities, the discussion that was just disclosed.

Have staff received any challenges to councilors' impartiality, submitted pursuant to 9.06755? of the Eugene code?

>> No.

Thank.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you, staff.

Testimony presented at this public hearing should be directed towards the applicable approval criteria and the other criteria that the speaker believes apply to the decision.

The applicable approval criteria for this proposed refinement, code amendment and zone change are located in Eugene Code Sections 9.8424, and 9.8865 respectively.

The full text of those code sections are available in the findings attached to the AIS for this public hearing.

The failure of anyone to raise an issue accompanied by statements sufficient to afford the city council an opportunity to respond will include appeals on that issue.

For quasi judicial proceedings, the speakers are called in the following order, first the applicant and those in support of the proposal.

Second, those with a neutral position and third those opposed to the proposal.

We ask that each speaker begin their testimony by confirming whether they are in support of, neutral to, or opposed to this refinement plan amendment, code amendment and zone change request.

Because this is a quasi judicial land use hearing where the applicant bears the burden of showing at that time proposed refinement plan amendment, code amendment and zone change comply with the applicable approval criteria in the Eugene code, the applicant may speak for up to ten minutes and everyone else is limited to two and a half minutes.

If you would like to receive further notice please provide your name and mailing address along with your testimony, or provide your name and mailing address to staff, the contact staff identified in the agenda item summary for this public hearing.

And I now open the public hearing.

We are joined by the applicants, Cullen McCarthy and Michael Griffel.

They have ten minutes to speak on behalf of the applicant.

And I will leave it to you to divide that time amongst yourselves.

>> Good evening.

Thanks so much for the opportunity to speak.

Though there are a lot of headwinds facing higher education, we know and deeply believe that going to college makes a tremendous difference for many people and transforms a tremendous number of people's lives.

Students who live on campus at u of o have better grades, stay in school at higher rates, graduate at higher rates, and graduate faster.

Students who live on campus make connections with people who are different from themselves.

Over 36% of u of o students who live on campus are domestic nonwhite, which is a very important value.

There are a few places in our communities where people from very different backgrounds, very different socioeconomic situations live to go and really have the opportunity to break down so many of the divisions, divisiveness and barriers because people are living together.

They get to really know one another.

And our living learning communities that's especially true.

Living on campus and residential communities in relatively close proximity to one another is really important.

Those who live a physical distance away from the core of the residential part of campus don't feel as connected.

As the university slowly, very slowly and incrementally grows, the east campus area is the area where the campus has planned to grow for 60 or 70 years.

As it's all been known and everybody in here knows that the university has been buying properties there for decades for the purpose of expanding housing in that area to create contiguousness with the campus.

Additionally, housing is expensive in general.

It's expensive for everybody.

Food is expensive for everybody.

Building and constructing properties in the most efficient and affordable way, though still

expensive is really, really important.

Scale matters a lot and so the location in this scale are really, really a big deal.

We really do need to slowly expand campus housing for our students to attract and retain students here, to help them grow, and thrive and be successful.

And we need to do it in a way that's efficient and affordable and thoughtful.

Cullen will talk about all the connections.

>> Thank you, honorable mayor I'm Cullen McCarthy, I represent the applicant and the applicant requests approval of a package of related land use applications to align city Eugene plans and development code with the university's long-range plans.

The proposed changes will enable the university to address the current and future need for student housing in the east campus area, while preserving the quality and the character of their surrounding neighborhood.

The proposal follows a two-year planning process in which they prepared a long-term housing plan and updated the internal plan and policy to meet the need for housing.

They identified necessary updates to city code to implement the housing plan.

As Dr. Griffel mentioned, the university has long established these campus area for future student housing, beginning in the '60s, the university began purchasing land in the east campus area for institutional expansion.

In 1982, the city of Eugene adopted the Fairmount as the neighborhood refinement plan.

The neighborhood plan was intended to be updated every ten years, and I will note that the plan planned -- the planned use section it requires reconsideration of policies.

The plan at that point contained a development policy for this campus area, although the plan has been amended several times it still maintains the same objectives relative to east campus, to provide for the expansion of institutional facilities to provide a variety of housing options for the university students, all without diminishing the quality or the character of the neighborhood.

In 2003, having maximized develop development potential in this area, the university amended the 1982 policy to allow for institutional development.

Those policies were codified in east campus overlay zone, and an amended neighborhood plan land use diagram.

Then in 2023, approximately 20 years later, the university began a process to update the development policy to allow for more residential communities.

That process culminated in the development of the next generation housing development plan.

The plan is a long-range plan to accommodate student growth, to provide all first-year housing on the east side of campus, and to provide more on campus graduate student and family housing.

The plan explores housing solutions that advance equity, sustainability, community, and student success.

In 2024, the housing plan informed updates to the east campus plan, and the campus plan itself.

Those policy changes now inform and direct the need for updates to the east campus overlay zone, and the neighborhood plan.

As part of preparing these plans, the process included extensive public engagement opportunities, including nine meetings with the university's campus planning committee, focus group meetings with the Fairmount neighborhood association, attendance at regular neighborhood association meetings, summer and other events with both the Fairmount neighbors and the south university neighbors, two community small group sessions with businesses and neighbors, and four public house events held on campus, two of which were student focused and two of which were community focused.

In response to feedback and concerns, the university has maintained and expanded the residential transitional area along the east side of university-owned land within the overlay.

It has established a residential transition along the south edge of university-owned land.

It has initiated a transportation study of Agate street and it has established circulation routes for semi trucks delivering to residence halls that do not require east of moss street.

Eugene needs to dramatically increase the housing demand.

It responds to changes in state law, calling for higher density development near major transit corridors, by amending policies to increase height, and to increase density allowances.

The limited amount of land remaining within the central academic core must be reserved for future institutional and instructional functions.

The university is well-positioned to make efficient use of its land and to develop high-quality, on-campus student housing in the east campus area.

The university's future development needs cannot be met without these changes.

This area, again, has been long planned to meet future housing needs.

It's close to academic buildings, support services, athletic and recreation facilities and open spaces.

It's well served by public transit and pedestrian infrastructure.

It's close to commercial activity along Franklin, along 19th street, and along agate.

This location is ideal for student housing and it helps Eugene meet its goals of addressing future -- existing future housing demand along with advancing transportation and environmental and sustainability objectives.

To conclude, the university has developed a housing plan for the next generation of university students taking all necessary internal steps.

The plan can be implemented entirely within the campus boundary.

New housing can be constructed on land the university owns.

Adoption of the ordinance will achieve the following.

High-quality learning-centered residential communities that are compatible with surrounding neighborhoods.

Housing development that provides a transition between higher and lower intensity uses, and housing options that serve a diverse student community.

I'm joined by a team of university representatives.

We're happy to address any questions that councilors have at this time or in our rebuttal period.

We thank you for your time tonight and your consideration to this matter.

>> Mayor Knudson: Cherish, do we have any interested parties asking to speak.

>> Thank you, mayor.

We have 17.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you.

Could you please share a list of speakers on screen?

>> I will announce two speakers' name at a time.

When you are called to speak, please state your name and your ward or neighborhood if known, before beginning your comments.

When you are announced as the next speaker, please move to the seat in the front row designated for the next speaker.

When it is your turn, you may come to the podium.

Please leave any bags you may have with you at your seat.

If you have documents to give council, please place them in the basket near the podium.

You will have two and a half minutes to speak.

The timer will flash red when you have 15 seconds remaining to speak.

Your microphone will be muted at the two and a half minute mark.

Please note that screen sharing -- that's not relevant.

Use of profanity is prohibited and any instances of profanity will result in the termination of speaker.

Our first is Bob Choket followed by Bill Philpot.

>> Thank you, I'm Bob Choket.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak in support of the amend of the east campus area of the University of Oregon.

I'm here in my capacity as the chair of the University of Oregon campus planning commission.

The C.P.C. is to advise the u of o president regarding buildings, landscaping and transportation policy.

I support the proposed land use changes related to east campus as they will

accommodate the current and future needs of on-campus student housing in the area.

On-campus housing improves student performance, reducing academic costs and adds to the overall housing supply and intentionally connects and engages student with the university.

The university has long identified the east campus area for future student housing.

The proximity to transit and commercial activity along Franklin boulevard makes this an ideal location for on campus student housing, and the proposed changes will allow the university to realize the vision established in the next generation housing development plan, to support student success, and make efficient use of limited university land.

The proposed land use changes are critical to increasing the housing supply on campus and within the community.

It's my pleasure to endorse the approval of this application.

>> Thank you.

Thank you, Bob.

Don Philpot.

He's actually in the other group.

So the other is Taliek Lopez-DuBoff followed by David Morgan.

>> Good evening, council councilors and mayor.

I'm my name is Taliek Lopez-DuBoff, I'm a member of the board of trustees and planning and design student in the college of design.

I'm here to speak in support of the proposed land use code amendments related to the development of the University of Oregon's east campus area.

The amendment is necessary to allow phase two of the residence hall project and future identified university -- identified in the university's next generation housing development plan to move forward.

This shows just how the university and the city can work together.

Allowing on-campus student housing delivers clear benefits to students who live on campus.

They perform better academically, face lower overall costs and are more intentionally connected to the university's community.

Expanding on east campus housing capacity also relieves pressure on the Eugene's broader housing market by reducing competition for off campus rentals.

The university needs new residence halls to support the incremental growth, particularly for first-year students.

This allows first-year students to live near one another, strengthening academic and social connections at a critical point in their college experience.

Importantly this proposal is not sudden or speculative.

They have been planning for development in the east campus area for many years.

This area is an ideal location for student housing due to the proximity to transit and commercial activity, and along Franklin boulevard, making it a logical and efficient place to accommodate growth.

We -- these communities are designed to be compatible with surrounding neighborhoods, provide appropriate transitions between higher and low lower intensity use and serving -- and serve a growing and diverse student population.

Plans include a range of housing types to meet the needs first-year students, continuing undergraduates, graduate students, and families.

For that reason, on behalf of the 20,000 students I represent, I'm privileged to urge the council to support the proposed code amendment.

They enable thoughtful planning, expand housing capacity and strengthen the connection between the University of Oregon and the city of Eugene.

Thank you for your consideration.

>> Thank you, Taliek.

We have David Morgan followed by Peter Smith.

>> Councilors, mayor, my name is David Morgan and I also serve on the board of trustees of the University of Oregon.

I'm here to support the ordinance before you.

For three main reasons.

The first is that it should come as no shock that Eugene is facing a shortage of housing and what this -- so I adored the urban growth boundary or the urban growth boundary does is necessity infill for development and increase in housing stock.

And what this ordinance does is allow for higher density and infill to produce more housing in an efficient way on a specific land in the city.

And so secondly, I want to say while this land -- or housing is not affordable housing, the very keen distinction between university-owned housing and that that is in the private sector is that students can use financial aid and student loans to pay for this housing, which they cannot do in the private sector.

And so for a lot of students this is a very necessary form of housing because as any of you who have gone to college know, this is a full-time gig and so you don't necessarily have time to support yourself in that way, especially if your parents are not independently wealthy.

So this housing is very necessary.

When we were overseeing the projects that are hopefully going to be built because of this ordinance, there was -- housing had told us that they had 1,000 students on a wait list that couldn't have housing because we didn't have enough.

This is very necessary from just an affordability standard for our students.

Finally, I want to talk about how the University of Oregon is one of the best positioned institutions in this city to build this housing.

First, the university has a robust and long history of building and committing to sustainability, all of the new housing that is built on campus is either certified LEED gold or above with a couple of spaces that are lead LEED platinum.

And as someone would builds a lot of red dense halls were partnering with OSU to be on the frontier on housing construction, such as mass timber and that is how we build.

So we are innovating in this sector and allowing for other private sector developers to see the success that this can bring and improve the overall housing quality.

Finally the University of Oregon looks for long-term development so that the housing it produces is high quality that lasts for 100 years rather than what most private sector builds which is 40 to 50.

Thank you.

>> Thank you, David.

We have Peter Smith followed by Jeff Philpot.

>> Good evening, everyone.

Mayor Knudson, city council.

Thank you for the opportunity.

My name is Peter Smith.

I live at 1505 orchard street and I'm in support of this which is one block from my home.

I want to start by talking about the demographics.

87% of the census tracked is under the age of 25.

That is 8 in every 9 people who live in our neighborhood.

When you hear the people from my neighborhood speak tonight, would you say that 87% of us are under the age of 25?

When I talk to young people who live in our community, the top two issues people mention are one, the climate crisis, and two, the housing crisis.

This proposal helps young people by directly addressing both of these issues.

It increases the supply of housing and builds those homes in an amazing place to walk, bike, and bus.

Because I live here, I can walk one block to a grocery store, two blocks to the mx, and three blocks to school.

What a perfect and wonderful place to build more homes.

I know student housing isn't always the most politically popular form of housing and I want to address that concern directly.

Currently I have classmates living and driving from single family in Cal Young, friendly, southwest Eugene, Washburn, and Thurston.

They are driving to school every day, increasing congestion on our roads and competing for homes that other members in our community could live in.

My classmates want to live closer to the university, but there isn't enough housing.

I recognize some neighbors may be concerned with the character of the neighborhood changing.

Change is scary, and there will be no easy solutions to our housing crisis.

Every choice will have impacts and there might be more traffic after this development is built.

But quite frankly, I think it is more important that my generation gets to have a home.

And this development would build those homes exactly where we need it.

I ask the council to please think of the young people in our community and vote to build more homes.

Thank you.

>> Thank you, Peter.

The next speakers is Jeff Philpot, followed by Don Philpot.

>> Good evening, mayor and councilor, live at 1684 east 23rd avenue in the Fairmount neighborhood.

I'm cochair of the Fairmount speaking on behalf of the f&a board.

We generally support University of Oregon's housing goals.

We recognize the need for university to grow and do not oppose additional student housing or increased density in the east campus area.

Many of us chose to live in Fairmount because of the character and we value the university as part of the neighborhood fabric.

However, we strongly oppose the sweeping amendments proposed to the Fairmount university area refinement plan.

Before you is not a limited or technical update, but a substantial rewrite initiated by university without a legitimate opportunity for meaningful neighborhood review or input.

The applicant's materials to city staff report characterize these changes as narrow, supported by community engagement and consistent with the refinement plans and goals of neighborhood compatibility and impact mitigation.

That characterization is not supported by the record.

Taken together, these proposals would dismantle the refinement plan's purpose, goals and policies.

They would allow high-impact development, with no required impact assessments, mitigation obligations, public review opportunities or requirement to address failing and unsafe public streets.

The fact shows they extend beyond the university property, and negatively impact all the area.

It does not meet the city's approval of criteria under Eugene code.

We urge to carefully review the detailed analysis, that is included in f&a's written testimony as limited or oral testimony cannot address all criteria or shortcomings.

There will be specific concerns addressed on behalf of the f&a.

We ask that they remand and direct staff to convene a mediated work group that includes f&a, just as council did in 2003.

That resulted in updated refinement plan that has served both --

>> Thank you, Jeff.

Our next speakers is Don Philpot followed by Kay Rose.

>> My name is Don Philpot, I live at 15th and orchard street.

Excuse me, I got a frog.

And I'm a u of o graduate.

I have lived there since 1977, in my house at 15th and orchard street and I support the neighborhood's position on this issue.

And that's all.

>> Thank you, Don.

Our next speakers are Kay Rose followed by Steve Gabb.

>> Hi, mayor and council.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight.

I'm very oh, posed to the nature of this, I would like to focus on traffic, specifically agate.

When the university is not in session, agate can be relatively quiet, but when students are here, traffic is much heavier and often manageable at times but every 50 minutes during class changes.

The unregulated flow of students and other pedestrians can completely stop vehicle traffic for ten to 15 minutes at a time.

These recurring gridlocks frustrate drivers, create very dangerous conditions for cyclists and pedestrians.

I mean coming here tonight with the u of o basketball game, I witnessed a few.

Traffic volumes completely miss this reality, these flash flood traffic impasses are happening now would you the intensive new development being proposed, ignoring them will make the problems worse.

The transportation planning rule analysis for this application is deeply flawed and has, I feel, inadequate.

Parameters provided by city staff fail to account for agates and instead rely on assumptions that predict things will be okay.

The conclusion that four new dormitories, a parking structure and multiple institutional buildings and no traffic problems during a typical workweek is just -- it's just flawed.

This dismisses the real and dangerous 10 and 15-minute gridlocks, near misses that we all, who live in the area, see every day.

It appears to exclude event traffic from Hayward field and Matthew Knight Arena where major congestion already occurs.

The university's desire to close moss street and 15th avenue will further increase the congestions and we'll have vehicles idling and cut through traffic in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Everyone agrees the current neighborhood traffic management plan is outdated yet the applicant asks you to approve major development now and maybe study traffic later.

That is backwards.

Traffic analysis and mitigation should guide development and not follow it.

An update to the Fairmount agate traffic plan is urgently needed just to catch up to the 15 years of growth.

Private developers are required to mitigate their growth.

It's reasonable to effect meaningful traffic mitigation.

>> Thank you, Kay.

Our next speakers are Steve Gabb followed by Susan McEnson.

>> Steve Gabb, we are opposed with the ordinance.

I'm frustrated and I will be direct.

The application is full of errors and misleading claims and the process is fatally flawed to this point.

You can change that.

I agreed to focus on the code changes for the transition zone.

For over a year our neighborhood was effectively ghosted by our councilor.

We later learned it was because he was told he couldn't talk to us about these proposals.

That's simply wrong.

I tried to follow the university's internal process but was repeatedly dropped from mailing lists.

When we got the assistant planner's attention last summer, we were told that the dorm behind us, right behind us was already designed and couldn't change much.

They showed us sketches with some articulation on the south edge, presumably to make us feel better but they wouldn't let us keep or photograph those because they were preliminary, of course.

We asked the planning commission to slow down long enough to understand what they were approving, they didn't.

Several commissioners admitted the proposal was too complicated and yet they

approved it.

Today they were prevented from showing a 3d model to show you what's happening on our block.

That's wrong.

It immediately reveals the critical errors and misrepresentations in the applicant's record.

The model is outside.

I ask that the model be entered into the record.

The east campus hear has evolved.

Intensive university development near campus, single-family homes along Villard and 19th as the graceful edge and a transition zone meant to buffer the two.

This proposal makes a mockery of that concept.

Buries in hundreds of pages is a potential for a 375-foot long, 85-foot high wall in the transition area.

One corner is within 20 feet of r1 homes.

Not the 75 feet their language even claims.

Residence halls were explicitly prohibited in this area, for one reason, they are fundamentally incompatible in a transition buffer zone.

Our model is outside.

I will stay after the hearing to answer questions.

Thank you.

>> Thank you, Steve.

Our next speakers is Susan McEmson followed by Mary Jaqua.

>> I'm Susan McEmson, I'm speaking on behalf of the Fairmount neighborhood.

They say that the proposed refinement plan amendments are limited to university-owned properties within the east campus plan, this is not the case.

Their proposal would change the refinement plan, affecting low density residential properties in this area, the applicant proposes to amend the refinement plan diagram map 6 by redefining the low density residential or l areas to r for residential.

This does not mean the criteria of approval in EC-98424, this amendment would change the land use designation of 216 residential properties, 187 of which are outside the east campus plan and not owned by the university.

First, the council cannot find proposal consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan as required in EC-98424.

The comprehensive plan does not recognize r which is undefined in both the plan and the city code.

It only recognizes three residential designations, LDR, MDR and HDR.

Each defined by allowed density.

A proposed r is a vague unique to the university, undermining the citywide framework and eliminating LDR density limits in our neighborhood.

Second the proposal is not consistent with other portions of the refinement plan.

As required, EC-98424, the plan's goal are preserve the character -- the single family areas while the neighborhood understands the policies, encouraging increased density may change the area over time, redefining all LDR areas as R exceeds the applicant's scope, violates the plan's core, goals and policies.

Third, the council cannot find the proposal consistent with EC-98424.

U of o and city staff state the amendment aims at simplification, but simplification is not a condition listed in EC-98424.

>> Thank you, Susan.

Our next speakers are Mary Jaqua, followed by Susie Smith.

>> Mayor and councilors, my name is Mary Jaqua, I have lived at 1755 orchard street since 1989.

I'm here to ask the council to recognize that the scope and complexity of these proposed amendments combined with serious shortcomings in the review process warrant more time and careful consideration by council before final action is taken.

Four of the five planning commissioners present at their deliberations stated on the

record that the issues were too complex, and that they relied on the staff report.

One commissioner abstained from voting because the materials were overwhelming and difficult to evaluate.

Unfortunately, the staff report itself largely restated the applicant's narrative, rather than providing a critical analysis against the approval criteria.

It glossed over key issues and failed to provide consistency findings for many of the proposed changes.

The agenda item summary provided to the council similarly oversimplifies the proposals and omits discussion of changes with significant neighborhood impacts.

Community open houses hosted by the applicant focused on east campus plan and the next generation housing strategy.

There was no meaningful engagement around the full scope of the refinement plan changes and our concerns about conflicting statements, inconsistencies and factual inaccuracies remain unaddressed.

The proposed edits, taken together these changes effectively gut the intent of this plan.

A document that would become part of the community policy for decades to come.

Why would the city allow this?

Our neighborhood deserves meaningful input as equal stakeholders to the plan, independence from the staff, due diligence from the planning commission and real representation from the city council.

Our request is straightforward, please pause this process, and convene a committee that includes Fairmount neighborhood representatives to ensure the refinement plans, goals, policies are upheld alongside the university's development objectives.

We ask that the council honor envision Eugene's comprehensive plan, especially pillar five, protect, repair and enhance neighborhood livability.

>> Thank you, Mary.

The next speakers are Susie Smith, followed by Hillary Kaia Blue.

>> Good evening, my name is Susie Smith and I have lived at 1659 orchard street since 1988.

I'm speaking on behalf of the Fairmount neighbors as the chair of our land use committee.

Tonight, and I'm the summary speaker.

So I'm out of order.

Tonight, you're hearing from several neighbors present -- present serious objections to the applicant's proposed rewrite of our neighborhood refinement plan.

We ask that you carefully review the full body from the Fairmount neighbors which provides clear, factual reasons why these proposed amendments fail to meet the applicable approval criteria.

We also ask that you leave the record open to allow additional written submittals.

What we have seen so far amounts to a railroad job, one built on non-foundational information.

We ask you to put it back on proper course and remand the matter back to staff and directing them to convene a mediated process.

Through that process, representatives from the neighborhood, the city and the university can work together to develop a legitimate fact-based refinement plan update that will meet the application approval criteria.

Let me be clear, we are not objecting to the u of o's housing goals.

We believe with meaningful stakeholder input and participation, the refinement plan and city code can be revised to support next generation of the u of o housing and preserving the core intentions to uphold the goals and policies of the refinement plan, expanded building permissions cannot be unfettered as currently proposed.

Neighborhood impact mitigation, such as conditional use permits, building setbacks, step back height limits and traffic items are standard land use tools.

You have both the authority and the responsibility to ensure that the refinement plan fulfills its purpose of guiding the future development and the university and the neighborhood.

City staff and the planning commission are effectively asking you to hand over the land use and transportation policy to a single large property own owner at the expense of hundreds of residential neighborhoods whose quality of life, safety and property values this plan is meant to protect.

This approach is fundamentally at odds --

>> Thank you, Susie.

Our next speakers are Hillary Kaia Blue, followed by Nathan Markowitz.

>> Councilors, my name is Hillary Kaia Blue, Steve and I have lived at 1818 Villard Street for nearly 40 years.

We're in the east campus plan area, right next to where the applicant's refined and code amendments would allow a massive dormitory.

The refinement plan and code amendments violate so many sections of Eugene city code it would take all my time to read them.

So please take the time to read the written testimony from the Fairmount neighborhood association for important legal citations.

The proposed amendments also ignore policies one, two, four, and six of the east campus overlay zone and directly conflict with envisioned Eugene planning pillar five and several statewide planning goals.

Despite this, the applicant would like you to believe they are simply making a few minor changes to heights and seeking permission to build a dorm.

The refinement plan and the east campus overlay zones establish this area for less intensive uses creating a transition between high intensity university uses, like seven-story dorms and our adjacent single family residential area.

The retirement -- the refinement plan and east campus overlay area -- I read that, sorry.

The proposal would eliminate these longstanding community policies and allow intense development with major negative neighborhood impact without any meaningful land use review to address those impacts.

The applicant's polished, colorful ring drinks and elevation draws shown at a very small scale are deeply misleading.

And do not convey the true scale of what is proposed.

So we built a scale model of our block so you could have an honest deliberation but we were not allowed to bring it and we have been told that there's no way we could share it with you.

It's so frustrating.

We are desperately trying to communicate with our elected officials, but we are barred from talking to you, before you make such a devastating decision.

Please help us.

>> Thank you, Hillary.

The next speakers are Nathan Markowitz followed by Susan Jakubowski.

>> I stand in opposition to the sweeping changes.

My name is Nathan Markowitz and I'm a 30-year resident of Fairmount.

We are the current caretakers of the Susan B. Campbell home, built by Campbell church in 1926 as part of the original treetops estate.

I serve as board historic committee chair.

Fairmount as one of the Eugene's few remaining concentrations including Washburn and medical more than and other historic structures dating from the earliest part of the last century and mid-modern architecture.

Originally, we enjoyed numerous city parks including the jewel of Hendricks park and we have the terrific University of Oregon as our neighborhood and we clearly understand their need to build on campus housing for their student population.

Indeed, I personally lived on campus all four years of my undergraduate education in the Midwest.

Nonetheless, unlike the collaboration between the neighborhood and the university in past negotiations, this application to expand institutional uses has largely ignored the neighbors' concerns arguing that the amendments will preserve the character of the neighborhood, the current request torpedoed the extensive agreements negotiated in good faith many years ago to preserve the character of Fairmount.

As a member also the city of Eugene historic review board, I find this approach concerning.

I respectfully request that the city council defer approval of all requested changes and to send the matter back to the neighborhood and University of Oregon to work out in good faith and agreement which considers both parties' concerns.

We need to preserve a part of the past to help us understand where we are today and to plan for the future in a responsible fashion.

Councilors, please do not approve these requests as written.

We have enough conflict nationally.

Let us bring collaboration to our great city.

Thank you.

>> Thank you, Nathan.

Our next speakers are Susan Jakubowski, followed by John Borofski.

>> My name -- I think I'm a little short.

My name is Sue Jakubowski at 2018 orchard street, and I have since 1987.

I speak tonight as opposed to this ordinance as a long-time resident of the Fairmount neighborhood who has been involved for more than 25 years in the major land use planning decisions that affect our community.

It's deeply frustrating and frankly unbelievable that I have to be here again.

Repeat the same history, time and again the university has attempted to push forward major development by eliminating the policies that require them to address neighborhood impacts, and time and again it has taken neighborhood outrage before the city council, or costly appeals to LUBA.

Just to ensure our issues are addressed.

We are not opposed to development.

We simply expect the city to apply standard land use regulations to assess and mitigate impacts.

That should not be too much to ask of you.

We have been here before in the late 1990s and early 2000s.

City staff proposed the walnut station mixed use plan, which would have allowed high-rise development directly adjacent to the Fairmount neighborhood.

Very similar to what is now being proposed along Villard and 19th street.

After neighbors spoke out, the city council sent staff back to the drawing board, the

result was a collaborative plan with step back building heights and landscaping and other mitigation measures.

That was adopted without opposition.

We ask for the same thoughtful approach here.

History repeated itself in 2003, when the university updated its east campus plan and attempted to eliminate the substance of the refinement plan that requires meaningful transitions and mitigation between campus development and surrounding neighborhoods.

Once again, it took a neighborhood uprising for city council to send it back and require a mediated work group.

That process worked again.

The refinement plan we have today was adopted without opposition.

And then again in 2008, the same thing happened with the Matthew knight arena.

We did not oppose the arena.

We insisted that it required a conditional use permit to mitigate impacts but the city didn't listen.

Unfortunately it took a successful appeal to LUBA to make that happen.

>> Thank you, Susan.

Next is John Borofski followed by David Wade.

>> Good evening, mayor and city council, my name is John Borofski and I'm a resident, business owner and board member of the Fairmount neighborhood association.

When I moved here, I was excited to be close to a world-class university, the University of Oregon.

I also understand the challenges that come from living adjacent to a large institution.

Before you tonight is an ordinance that would transform part of our city.

I believe it can produce many positive outcomes.

It can support the university's planned growth, help address the city's need for more

housing and protect the neighborhood's safety and character.

The neighborhood association has identified several criteria we believe are out of compliance with the proposal.

Whether those claims are accurate remains to be determined.

Speaking as a former chair of the planning commission, I have seen similar disputes proceed in ways that were not constructive.

This ordinance is passed -- if this ordinance is passed without further coordination, the likely next step for any aggrieved party would be an appeal to the land use board of appeals.

In my experience, those appeals produce no real winners.

They are costly, time consuming and can derail projects entirely.

The proposal already generated a large record at the planning commission, hundreds of pages.

After watching that hearing, I felt more time to review the record and allow staff, the university and neighbors to work together would have helped many of issues before us tonight.

My request is simple.

Please return this ordinance to staff and direct them to collaborate with the University of Oregon, neighborhood representatives and let them refine the proposals so that at the next public hearing, the university, the neighbors, and the city can all encourage you to pass it.

Thank you.

>> Thank you, John.

Our next speakers are David Wade, followed by Tom Jordan.

>> What a beautiful place to watch democracy work.

Thank you for your patience.

I'm speaking on my own behalf and on behalf of the Fairmount neighbors.

My wife and I have lived at 1673 Villard street for 30 years.

During that time, the Fairmount neighbors, myself included, have worked with the city and with the University of Oregon to resolve numerous land use issues like these, and we've always succeeded except the one time we had to take them to LUBA where we prevailed.

The neighborhood's involvement works because we include an architect, and a retired general contractor who have 9 expertise to reach mutually acceptable ways to increasing housing density, which we favor while mitigating the effects on the neighborhood.

For example, in 2004, after Fairmount neighbors objections, the city directed that a technical advisory with representatives from the u of o, the city and the neighbor to hammer out the refinement plan.

That allowed more intensive uses and preserving the historic character of the neighborhood.

It can be done.

We did it.

Without invoking that process, the u of o has now unilaterally proposed major changes to the refinement plan that undermine the plan's agreed policies and goals.

And threatens the livability of the neighborhood.

To me, clear violations of Eugene code.

U the -- the U of O claims that they engaged the public and the neighborhood.

I went to all the open houses.

My comments and those of other neighbors who attended were ignored and nowhere reflected.

And the applicant's materials presented to you or at the planning commission.

>> Thank you, David.

Our next speakers are Tom Jordan, followed by Katherine Bryce.

>> Good evening.

My name is Tom Jordan and I live at 2110 Fairmount boulevard and I'm speaking on

behalf of the Fairmount neighbors board as chair of its transportation committee.

Transportation and traffic impacts from the University of Oregon developments aren't new.

But they're getting worse and demand immediate attention.

The city's Fairmount refinement plan last updated in 2004, recognized these impacts and required studies to maintain safe and functional streets.

These studies are now outdated and no longer reflect current conditions or future development plans.

Over the past 20 years, cumulative u of o development has dramatically changed and intensified traffic in this area.

New residence halls, Hayward field, Matthew knight arena, and continued east campus expansion are examples.

We're seeing increased traffic cutting through the Fairmount neighborhood.

University-related truck traffic on neighborhood streets, damaged to pavement and infrastructure, and inability for residents to park because no driveways.

Yet no comprehensive assessment of how all this development affects the Fairmount neighborhood and how impacts will be mitigated has been required.

The applicant's TPR analysis performed by consultants beholden to the client's interest is fundamentally flawed.

It fails to measure existing cut through traffic and misrepresents agate street's conditions.

Mitigations that have been discussed like raised platform intersections, will not improve traffic flow on agate which by city classification must function as a minor arterial.

Instead, they will increase driver frustration, intensify unsafe pedestrian crossings and push traffic into Villard, orchard and walnut streets directly violating state planning goal 12 and not meeting approval criteria ec9.8424.

Let's get this together with the city, the university and the Fairmount neighbors.

Thank you.

>> Thank you, Tom.

Our next and final speaker is Katherine Bryce.

>> Good evening.

My name is Kate Bryce and I live at 1812 Villard street and I'm speaking as a neighborhood resident and a student and opposed to this proposed plan.

My roommates and I were thrilled to have a house a stone's throw to campus.

What is proposed directly behind our house is directly displaying and no transition from between it and our home.

Compounding these concerns is the university's internal planning process.

This final proposal lacks collaboration as well as these key neighborhood protections that were described as remaining, and in place have been removed from the local documents.

Because of this, I'm asking the city to pause this project and require a conditional use permit process.

The same process that was used for Matthew knight resulting in traffic management plans and reduced impacts on the neighboring communities.

Without any level of scrutiny, conditions would have been far worse.

This east campus proposal will increase traffic and parking pressures and altering the character and the livability of this neighborhood.

Changes that deserve project-specific review.

On the note of traffic concern, the problem lies in unpredictable traffic patterns, the proposed raised intersection on agate may increase frustration and reduce safety.

By contrast, traffic signals indicating the turns of drivers, cyclists and pedestrians and making intersections -- it will make intersections safer.

And more efficient.

The lights on Franklin boulevard protect student residents and it's important that the university meet the same standards in.

Freshman year, I fell in love with Fairmount and that's how families are born and raised here.

When you plan to build such a large structure, that charm begins to fade.

I want to be clear I'm not opposed to on-campus housing as a concept, but I think it is clear today that the majority of people here are asking for fair, transparent and collaborative process that helps the university in minimizing harm to their neighbors.

City council has stepped in before to demand that kind of honesty and rigor.

I hope you will do so again.

>> Thank you, Katherine.

That was our final speaker for this topic.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you, cherish.

Is there a staff response?

Thank you.

Does the applicant wish to rebut any of the offered testimony?

Oh, thank you.

Sorry, Jeff.

I thought the answer was no.

>> Jeff capper, principal planner Eugene's planning division.

Sorry, I was hiding behind the pillar.

We do have a request to hold the record open.

We can talk about that a little bit later during these proceedings, but for that reason, staff will have an opportunity to provide you with a lot of answers in writing and respond to a lot of the great testimony that we have heard this evening.

And so two things that I do just want to address really quickly, one is about the model, the really cool model that's outside.

Sorry, I totally respect that.

Really neat.

And upon staff -- planning staff finding out about that, we did talk to them, and we are working with them to find a way to put that into the record.

So just so you know, we'll let you know that will probably end up in the council offices so that you can review it and I think we'll have some photos and stuff in the record as well.

I think what was being referred to as the fact that they weren't allowed to bring it into the building today.

So just to clarify that.

That will be part of the record.

Second, in terms of process, as has been discussed kind of at length tonight, this is a quasi judicial land use process.

Unlike a lot of legislative processes that you are all involved with, with us, things like housing, the climate equitable land use, those changes to the land use code it may be that proposal doesn't work, planning commission, please go review this and bring us back something different.

This is a specific proposal from an applicant.

This isn't the city proposing these changes.

And so for that reason, I don't believe that we are necessarily able to send back the proposal to the planning commission, or necessarily defer on this decision.

Staff is planning to dig into that question a little bit more and also respond to that during the open record.

And with that I just want to thank everyone for their testimony tonight and say that there's a lot of great questions and we'll be providing a detailed response.

So thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you, Jeff.

Does the applicant wish to rebut any of the offered testimony or make a final statement this evening?

>> Thank you, mayor and councilors, I would like to use the rebuttal time address assertions, claims, misconceptions regarding the proposal.

First of all, there may be confusion around refinement plans.

We have a number of them, and that they should remain static and unchanged.

However, the requirements for changing a refinement plan that it may be changed in response to newer amended community policies, and a change in circumstances and a substantial manner that was not anticipated.

Among other criteria.

The neighborhood plan was adopted in 1982.

It was changed in 2004, to the EC overlay zone, it was changed in 2010 for the adoption of the station and now it's proposed to include a housing plan.

Circumstances have changed drastically since 1982, especially regarding critical need for more housing in our communities.

There have been some claims that the applicant is gutting the goals, policies, rewriting sweeping changes to the plan that intended to preserve the single family character the neighborhood.

We don't find those claims to be substantial -- substantiated, the terminology is minor.

The policy changes remove the items and preferences and the policies largely remain in tack.

This have been some requests for subjecting development to further review processes.

We're concerned about this, and about the impacts on projects and delays.

We also find it to be unnecessary.

The university uses a structured policy-driven internal review process to evaluate and approve the campus developments.

This process is grounded in the campus plan itself, it's administered by campus planning and facilities development staff, and all developments must establish consistency with the campus plan.

They are reviewed and evaluated by the campus planning committee.

Staff conducted internal res for consistency with campus policies.

They involve stakeholders and they communicate with neighborhoods and coordinate

with other departments and the process ensures that all development preserves u of o's core campus design principles and long-term campus vision.

I want to speak to the process that we have been through.

We submitted our application in spring.

It was reviewed by staff over the summer.

We did prepare a transportation analysis consistent with the state's planning rules.

The scoping for that was reviewed by public works and ultimately, public works and planning staff concurred with the findings of that study, that the proposed development would not have a significant impact on that, on the system.

Planning staff reviewed our proposal, and recommended approval of the proposal without any conditions: That proposal went before the city of Eugene planning commission in the fall.

The planning commission also conducted a hearing to took rounds of written and oral company, and again approved the proposal without any conditions.

We have waited until this point to how get a hearing with city council, and there is urgency with this request, and with this process.

There's an immediate need for more housing on campus for students and families and in that respect, this is a housing plan and we would encourage the council to take swift and judicious action but do not delay in implementing the plan and moving it forward.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you to staff and the applicant.

Are there any questions that council would like to ask staff?

I see Councilor Groves in the queue.

>> Groves: Thank you, mayor and thank you, everybody, who testified tonight.

My first question was: Is this a way to get that model into the record.

And I understand from Jeff that that's going to be something he is working on.

My second question is, when does the record close?

>> That is something that we will discuss prior to the conclusion of today's public hearing.

We will talk about that date and time and the open record period.

>> Groves: I'm hoping we can give the Fairmount members to put their speaking into the proper order so that we can read something that cogently walks through how you were seeing this.

That would be helpful for me.

Thank you, mayor.

>> Mayor Knudson: Any other questions.

Councilor Zelenka.

>> Zelenka: Impressive testimony on both sides.

Thank you for coming this evening.

I hope the council reads the record in preparation for the February 8th meeting.

My testimony at the planning commission was to encourage them to be open to what the neighbors have to say and encourage all of us to do the same.

It does change the refinement plan as I have come to understand it, on the entire area around the University of Oregon and the Fairmount neighborhood.

This is a very complex issue.

One of the P.C.s voted no because it was too complex in the short time they had in order to move this forward.

And to assess the -- all the implications of the amendments and yet the staff pressed forward.

Others noted that they will just rely on the staff work.

I doubt you will be able to point to what I have seen of it, the input of the neighborhood.

I think that you will see it's essentially just a cut and paste of what the u of o proposed and doesn't include a lot of concerns of the neighborhood.

The problem with all of this is that this is deja vu all over again as Yogi Berra said.

Most recently several years ago people pointed out in the testimony today that u of o proposed the Matt Knight Arena.

Then as now, the neighbors' concerns were ignored and that forced the neighborhood to spend their own money and time to appeal this to LUBA and the result was the city lost and u of o lost and it was remanded back and overturned and all the neighborhood's concerns were required to be taken into consideration.

So I think we find ourselves in exactly the same circumstance.

And this can be easily avoided.

Again, the neighborhood is not opposing the amendments per se, nor the need for more housing.

We can send this back for further consideration by the staff and the PC to work collaboratively with the neighborhood and the neighbors as the council has done before on several occasions.

A no vote would do exactly the same thing.

There's no imminent deadline for this amendment to occur.

So we can save everybody a lot of time, a lot of money, a lot of effort, and ask them to try again and bring back the plan that everybody can support and address the neighborhood concerns, and -- or we can ignore that and walk through that process again.

So I encourage us to move forward in a thoughtful fashion.

Question, when are we going to talk about the record will be open.

I didn't understand your answer.

>> Sorry, thanks.

I had to consult the city attorney.

So for the open record period, it's standard practice to have open record periods occur in three phases.

And so what that means is that the first phase is a period where, you know, anybody can submit anything into the -- or they can submit materials into the record.

So things like the model can be brought into the record.

The second period is a time when anyone can respond to those materials that have been in the record, and then -- and we have a whole document that we provide to everyone that outlines these rules.

So this is not the only time that you will hear it.

And then the final phase is the applicant's rebuttal period.

And so similar to tonight, like, you know, the applicant got to rebut and they are not limited in time during the rebuttal.

Similarly, at the end of this process, it's the applicant's right under state law that they get a rebuttal period.

And so that's three he phases.

Our typical process is seven, seven, seven, seven days for the first period, seven days for the second and seven days for the third.

In doing so, we would need to change the scheduled action date, obviously, because that would take us right up to our action date of February 9th.

It's likely that that would push the action date out to March 9th.

I don't think that we can make the February 23rd city council meeting based on those factors.

And so what staff does is we actually put online a document -- a one-pager that says these are the dates you need to submit your testimony, about I this date, this time, and this is what you can submit and we provide that for the three phases of that open record period.

So that would take us out a week from today and then a week after that and then a week after that.

That's what the seven, seven, seven.

I apologize, I'm not doing the math in my head.

>> Zelenka: Obviously, it's a complicated issue and given the complexity of it, I would hope that council would extend the open period and keep the record open.

>> When you get to it, after you have had -- after the folks have commented, you will

have a motion to extend the record and do all of that, and I think you have that in injure script.

>> Mayor Knudson: I was going to ask you, and thank you for exactly that.

Councilor Kashinsky.

>> Kashinsky: I have kind of a technical question.

I know that there are state laws that govern the process when we have housing development.

Do dorms count as housing development?

Or are they not considered housing?

They are considered institutional use?

For the purposes of things like clear and objective standards.

>> Thanks for the question, councilor Kashinsky.

I'm going to get back to you on that and as part of the open record period, I just -- I think I know the answer but I want to make sure that I know the answer before I answer.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Councilor Groves.

>> Groves: A legal question.

If we look at model before it's entered into the record does that create an ex parte communication?

>> I was going to be like no, but I will let her answer.

>> I mean that is the answer.

No.

The -- the -- the model has already been entered into the record.

It was requested that it be entered into the record and so it has been.

At this point, it's pardon of the record before the council.

Anybody can take a look at it.

It's not ex parte contact.

>> Thank you, mayor.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you, staff, for that communication.

I think we're all really interested to see it and I'm happy that we can take a look.

Seeing no other questions from councilor to ask of staff, I will now close the public hearing, unless there's any objections from council.

And we did have a discussion of keeping the record open.

To a particular date and we would need a motion to do that.

I need a clarification on the target date from staff.

I heard February 9th, but I'm -- I need more.

>> I'm happy to provide that.

The end of the first open record period would be January 27th, at 5:00 p.m.

The end of the second open record period would be February 3rd, at 5:00 p.m. and the end of the final open record period would be February 10th at 5:00 p.m.

>> Mayor Knudson: So I believe that we would have a motion to extend the public record until February 10th at 5 p.m.

>> So moved.

>> Mayor Knudson: Clarification.

>> The first period to January 27th, the second period to February 3rd and the third period and final to February 10th at 5 p.m.

>> So moved.

>> Mayor Knudson: And a second?

>> Second.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you.

Any further discussion from council?

Seeing none, I will take a vote for this motion.

And the motion passes with a vote of 7-0.

Thank you all very much.

I now close this public hearing.

Any final questions or comments from city council?

Seeing none, we will move on to the fifth agenda item.

A public hearing regarding unlawful transfer on vehicular portion of the right-of-way.

Assistant city manager, would you please introduce this topic?

>> Thank you, mayor.

This item responds to a November 7th, 2024, city council work session poll, reducing safety hazards related to money or goods between vehicle occupants and pedestrians on public streets.

The proposed ordinance was discussed on October 27th, 2025, would prohibit the transfer of goods or money between pedestrians and a vehicle occupant's while in travel lanes.

After the September and October discussions, city council voted to proceed to a public hearing on this item and that's where we are tonight.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you.

I now open the public hearing and staff can you please share a list of the speakers on the screen and announce the first speakers.

>> We have five speakers this evening.

I will announce two speakers name at a time.

When you are called to speak, please state your name and ward or neighborhood if known before beginning your comments.

When you are announced to the next speaker, please move to the front row designated for the next speaker.

Please leave any bags you may have with you at your seat and if you have any documents please place them in the basket near the podium.

Your microphone will be muted at the two and a half minute mark.

Please note the use of profanity is prohibited and any instances of profanity will result in immediate termination of speaking privileges.

The first is Tai Pierce Zimmerman followed by rob Evans.

>> Thank you.

Good evening, mayor and council.

More things change, the more they stay the same.

We discussed this exact issue seven years ago.

You as a body voted against it at that time.

Some of you were there as individuals, some of you weren't.

Those who were, will recall me testifying against it then and here I am back in opposition once again.

It's -- I had planned thoughts and I'm blanking.

Sorry.

I just -- I don't think anything about the context of this measure has changed since then.

I think that all the relevant facts are the same and I think that a no vote remains the ideal.

I have no changes to my position, but we're here.

So let's talk traffic safety.

Some other time because this is a public hearing and I can only speak to the topic at hand which is not traffic safety.

This is a panhandling ban that is the only phrase used for it in any community conversation that's going on.

Everyone understands it to be a ban on panhandling.

The intent is to move people off street corners and cut off their funds.

We can't directly ban panhandling, but we can use this approach to bypass that.

That's the conversation we are having.

We need to be honest that that is the issue.

And we're getting there.

One of the emerging arguments is that given directly to people is an inefficient use of funds compared to donating to nonprofits.

As far as monetary contributions, I personally tend to agree.

There's varied research.

But I don't believe the city should be making that decision for us.

I also, though, have a big concern about an unintended consequence.

If we move people off of street corners on traffic corridors, where will they end up?

Where can they still ask for money under this ordinance, and be able to get it?

It's where there is foot traffic.

So I urge us to consider what's the impact going to be on downtown if we pass this?

I think -- I believe there will be a significant influx of more people coming downtown and I don't think that's consistent --

>> Thank, you.

Our next speakers are Rob Evans followed by Scott Rogers.

>> Good evening, mayor and city councilmembers.

I sent you a copy of this to your emails also.

So that you have it.

My name is rob Evans.

I'm a resident of ward 8 and a local business owner here in Eugene.

I'm speaking tonight because I care deeply about the future of this city and about the people who call it home, including those who are currently unhoused.

I wish to start by saying something clearly.

Homelessness is not a problem we can hide or wish away.

It's visible because it's real.

And it demands solutions rooted in dignity, compassion and outcomes that will actually help people towards stability.

I do not want to punish somebody for being unhoused.

That is why I actually support the unlawful transfer of goods ordinance, but only as a tool and only as part of a broader, more thoughtful approach towards helping these people.

I believe that roadside giving comes mostly from a place of genuine compassion, but compassion alone does not always lead to progress.

What I have learned through conversations with service providers and community leaders is that these exchanges do not address the underlying causes of homelessness.

In some cases they may unintentionally keep people stuck in survival mode.

If panhandling is their only means of survival, we are failing them.

What matters most to me is what comes next.

My recommendation would be public education that encourages people to give through trusted service providers that have far greater impact, outreach and alternative response efforts that proactively connect people to help, ongoing investment in housing and stabilization services and comprehensive evaluation so we know whether our policies are making a difference.

If we want a more humane and effective system, we have to align our generosity with

what actually works.

I urge you to view the -- or to view the passing of this ordinance, not as an end point but as a step towards a smarter and more compassionate future for Eugene.

Thank you.

>> Thank you, rob.

The next speakers are Scott Rogers followed by Tiffany Edwards.

>> Good evening, my name is Scott Rogers and I live in ward two.

I'm here tonight to speak in support of the ordinance titled unlawful transfer on the vehicular portion of the right-of-way.

I want to talk about an incident that happened to me last fall while exiting the market choice parking lot in south Eugene, an unhoused individual began striking my car window as I attempted to make a legal right turn after I declined to roll my window down and give that person money.

The situation escalated quickly, and was dangerous.

Not only for me, but for the individual, and for others using the roadway.

These kind of interactions place people in active traffic and create unpredictable high-risk situations.

I also want to say I have a child in school who walks on the streets in Eugene.

Like many families we depend on drivers paying attention.

We need them to pay attention to our road, traffic signals, crosswalks and other pedestrians.

We face serious challenges with distracted driving in this community, I have seen it too many times allowing roadside changes between moving vehicles and pedestrians adds only another dangerous distraction, especially near school routes.

I have witnessed drivers stop in traffic lanes and miss light changes and narrowly avoid collisions while handing items through car windows.

We know the pedestrians experiencing homelessness are disproportionately on in traffic injuries and we have seen this on highway 99 too many times.

This ordinance is not about criminalizing poverty.

It's about preventing harm.

My family chooses to donate to local organizations to support unhoused individuals because those organizations are better equipped to provide health and safety with dignity.

For the safety of pedestrians and drivers and pedestrians walking to school, I urge you to support this ordinance and thank you for your time.

>> Thank you, Scott.

The next speakers are Tiffany Edwards followed by Brittany quick Warner.

>> Good evening, mayor and councilors, my name is Tiffany Edwards and I'm here on behalf of the Eugene area chamber of commerce.

I want to begin by emphasizing that the chamber's support for this ordinance was not formed quickly or casually.

Over the past several months, we undertook one of the most thorough policy development processes we conducted in years.

That work concluded -- includes a community-wide public opinion poll, a survey of chamber membership, conversations with service providers weeks of deliberation with our local government affairs council and research into how other communities are addressing similar challenges.

Liberal cities like Portland, Berkeley, San Francisco, Madison and boulder have all implemented policies that regulate exchanges in roadways on high-traffic areas.

These communities were clear that the goal was not to criminalize homelessness but to address safety concerns and redirect generosity towards systems that actually work.

What these cities chair is an emphasis on outcomes over optics.

They acknowledge that allowing street behavior in the name of compassion and safety, accessibility and dignity can coexist.

Importantly, these policies have been politically viable in progressive communities because they were paired with strong public education alternatives for giving, outreach and a commitment to evaluate impacts over time.

That approach mirrors what's being proposed here.

This recommendation is grounded in data, dialogue, and deep community engagement.

Let me be clear, the chamber is deeply committed to serving unhoused individuals, and helping to build a system where people can access stability, treatment, employment and welfare.

For that reason, we support this ordinance, but only as one tool and only if paired with complementary efforts that drive real outcomes.

Specifically, we encourage council to move forward alongside a public education campaign, that redirects generosity towards trusted service providers, proactive outreach partnerships and shelters and service organizations.

Data collection to evaluate effectiveness and sustain investment in housing, treatment, stabilization and workforce pathways.

Finally the Chamber is ready to help.

We are prepared to assist in funding a community education effort that encourages giving through proven challenges and through act now lane, we're building a central centralized hub to --

>> Thank you, Tiffany.

The next and final speaker is Brittany Quick-Warner.

>> Good evening, mayor and councilors, Brittany Quick-Warner, Eugene chamber of commerce in ward five.

At the risk of trying not to repeat what other folks have said, I want to start by telling a little bit of a story and helping you understand some of the work that our chamber has been doing over the several years in partnership with some of our service providers.

We got deeply involved in the conversation around homelessness and supporting our unhoused community members several years ago.

We learned very quickly one gap that existed was around workforce development and helping individuals who were unhoused, who were ready and willing find a path and a place to find employment in the community.

So we partnered with several shelter providers in the community and created a workforce develop development program.

One the individuals that actually reached out and said they are doing a little

documentary on which is kind of cool, she started in the industrial training, the industrial sewing training program that we started with viking textiles and then they went for the food for lane warehouse training program and is now employed as a permanent at food for Lane County.

This is one story of an individual who she herself sort of says that this program and this ability to find a place to work has brought this sense of dignity back in my life and that was a huge reason why we started this is to create pathways for individuals who -- who wanted to find a place back in the community, where they could find mean in the work that they were doing.

This is not an individual story.

We have 65 individuals who have graduated from these training programs over the last couple of years.

And we're finding great success.

Some of these have found job.

Some have found housing and we're excited to expand that over this next year.

It's one story of an example of how we are not taking a position lightly.

We spent a ton of time like Tiffany said coming to this position because it matters to us that we have this right as a community.

It matters to us that we are supporting our service providers and we are finding true and authentic ways to find individuals that need that stability.

We believe a program like this does not solve homelessness.

It does address safety concerns and it does provide an opportunity for the city to align their policies with the outcomes that they are trying to achieve.

We are diverting some resources from the service providers that we know are doing work that is research and data driven.

We want to support this policy.

>> Thank you, Brittany.

That was our final speaker, mayor.

>> Mayor Knudson: Thank you.

I now close the public hearing.

Are there any questions?

Or comments from city council?

Seeing none, I will just again offer my appreciation to everyone who took the time to come to our meeting this evening and the multiple public hearings that we held and I will say thank you.

This concludes our agenda for this evening.

And I now close the January 20th, 2026 public hearing.

We are adjourned.