

ROUGHLY EDITED TRANSCRIPT
CITY OF EUGENE
EUGENE PUBLIC HEARING
APRIL 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. This is NOT the official record of the proceedings.

* * *

>> WELCOME TO THE EUGENE CITY COUNCIL PUBLIC HEARING.

THANK YOU FOR JOINING US IN THIS HYBRID MEETING FORMAT. ANYONE WISHING TO ACCESS THE MEETING CAN DO SO BY WATCHING THE LIVE STREAM AVAILABLE ON OUR WEBSITE, THE BROADCAST ON COMCAST CHANNEL 21 OR BY FOLLOWING THE INSTRUCTIONS LISTED FOR THIS MEETING ON THE PUBLIC WEBCAST AND MEETING MATERIALS WEBPAGE.

THERE ARE THREE PUBLIC HEARING ON TONIGHT'S AGENDA.

PLEASE NOTE MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WHO SIGN UP TO TESTIFY MAY SPEAK ONLY ON THE TOPIC THAT IS SUBJECT OF THE STATED HEARING.

FOR THOSE WISHING TO TESTIFY DURING THE PUBLIC HEARING, PLEASE FILL OUT A REQUEST TO SPEAK FORM AVAILABLE ON THE PUBLIC WEBCAST AND MEETING MATERIALS WEBPAGE.

THESE REQUEST TO SPEAK WILL BE USED TO GENERATE THE ORDER AND ENTER SPEAKER'S NAMES INTO THE PUBLIC RECORD. WE WILL ACCEPT REQUEST TO SPEAK ARMS UNTIL 5:35 PM.

AS A REMINDER, COUNCILS MEETING RULES OF CONDUCT APPLY TO ALL ATTENDEES.

BOTH IN CHAMBERS AND IN THE LOBBY.

INCLUDING NO FLAGS, SIGNS, LOUD OR DISRUPTIVE LANGUAGE, NOISE OR CONDUCT THAT OBSTRUCTS THE BUSINESS OF THE COUNSEL.

PLEASE KEEP THE ROOM QUIET AND RESPECTFUL FOR THE SPEAKERS. YOU ARE WELCOME TO WAVE YOUR HAND IN SILENT SUPPORT. WE ENCOURAGE THOSE ILL, AND HAVE CLOSE CONTACT WITH THOSE WHO ARE ILL TO JOIN ONLINE RATHER THAN IN PERSON AND ASK AND ENCOURAGE ATTENDEES TO SPREAD OUT WITHIN THE SPACE AND WEAR A MASK IF YOU HAVE BEEN DOING SO.

WE HAVE SOME IN THE LOBBY IF YOU NEED ONE.

IN CASE OF EMERGENCY A DEFIBRILLATOR IS LOCATED ON THE COUNTER BEHIND THE STAFF LOCATED TO THE LEFT ON THE BACK

OF THE ROOM. IN THE CASE OF EMERGENCY EVACUATION EXITS ARE THROUGH THE DOUBLE DOORS LOCATED AT THE BACK OF THE ROOM AND THE DOUBLE DOORS NEAR THE FRONT, THE DOORS TO THE PATIO CAN BE USED AS NEEDED.

WITHOUT I CALL THIS MEETING TO ORDER.

THE FIRST PUBLIC HEARING ON TONIGHT'S AGENDA IS AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE USING FEES.

CITY MANAGER, CAN YOU INTRODUCE THE TOPIC?

>> THIS IS A PUBLIC HEARING OUT OF ORDINANCE ADOPTING HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE USER FEES.

THE PROPOSED RATE IS \$75.22 EQUALING AN EMPLOYEE WITH A MAXIMUM CHARGE OF \$2,000 FOR FACILITY REQUIRED UNDER STATE LAW.

THIS STRUCTURE HAS BEEN IN PLACE SINCE THE PROGRAM BEGAN IN 1,998 AND CONTINUES TO FUND THE VOTER APPROVED TOXIC RIGHT TO KNOW PROGRAM.

THE TOXIC BOARD HAS RECOMMENDED THE RATE TO SUPPORT THE FISCAL YEAR 2,027 PROGRAM BUDGET.

AFTER THE HEARING THE COUNCIL HAS THE OPTION TO ADOPT THE ORDINANCE AS PRESENTED OR PROVIDE DIRECTION FOR MODIFICATIONS.

>> THANK YOU, I OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.

CAN YOU SHARE THE LIST OF SPEAKERS ON THE SCREEN AND ANNOUNCE THE FIRST SPEAKERS?

>> THANK YOU, WE HAVE UNTIL 5:35 UNTIL THE FORM CLOSES.

AT THIS TIME WE HAVE NO SPEAKERS SIGNED UP FOR THIS TOPIC, BUT I WILL HAVE MORE CERTAINTY IN A COUPLE MINUTES.

>> THANK YOU FOR YOUR PATIENCE, THERE IS NO ONE SIGNED UP FOR THIS FIRST COUNCIL HEARING.

>> THANK YOU, I CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM CITY COUNCIL?

NONE, THE NEXT PUBLIC HEARING ON TONIGHT'S AGENDA IS AN ORDINANCE CONCERNING INCREASED PUBLIC HEALTH STANDARDS COORDINATION. AMENDING SECTIONS 9.0500, 9.2460, 9.2461, AND 9.4165 OF THE EUGENE CODE, 1,971 AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE. CITY MANAGER, COULD YOU PLEASE INTRODUCE THE TOPIC?

>> THANK YOU COUNCIL PRESIDENT. THIS IS A PUBLIC HEARING ON AN ORDINANCE CONCERNING INCREASE PUBLIC HEALTH STANDARDS COORDINATION.

THIS IS IN RESPONSE TO A MOTION PASSED IN JUNE OF 2,025 BY THE COUNCIL THAT DIRECTED STAFF TO DEVELOP A LAND USE CODE TO INCREASE COORDINATION WITH THE CITY'S PUBLIC HEALTH REGULATORY PARTNERS.

AS PROPOSED THE ORDINANCE WOULD REQUIRE THE CITY TO PROVIDE NOTICE TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY, THE LANE REGIONAL AIR QUALITY PRIOR TO ISSUING A PERMIT FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE E2, I2 AND I3 ZONES.

THIS IS THE SECOND COUNCIL PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE PUBLIC HEALTH STANDARDS PROJECT. THIS PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD FEBRUARY 17, 2,026 CONSIDERED SIMILAR ORDINANCE BUT ON MARCH 9TH, THE COUNCIL PASSED A MOTION TO HOLD ANOTHER PUBLIC HEARING ON AN UPDATED ORDINANCE THAT INCLUDES THE SAME NOTICING REQUIREMENTS AS THE FIRST ORDINANCE THAT ADDED A REQUIREMENT FOR THE APPLICANT TO ATTEST ANY PERMITS, THEY ARE REQUIRED TO RECEIVE FROM THREE PUBLIC HEALTH AGENCIES.

THIS ITEM IS FOR A PUBLIC HEARING ONLY AND POTENTIAL ACTION ON THIS ORDINANCE IS SCHEDULED FOR JUNE 8TH, 2,026.

>> THANK YOU, TESTIMONY PRESENTED AT THE PUBLIC HEARING SHOULD BE DIRECTED TO THE APPLICABLE APPROVED CRITERIA OR OTHER CRITERIA THE SPEAKER BELIEVES APPLIES TO THIS DECISION.

THE APPROVAL CRITERIA FOR THIS PROPOSED LAND USE CODE AMENDMENT IS LOCATED IN EUGENE CODE SECTION 9.8065.

THE FULL TEXT OF THE CODE SECTION IS AVAILABLE IN THE FINDINGS ATTACHED TO THIS AIS FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING. I OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.

STAFF, CAN YOU SHARE THE LIST OF SPEAKERS ON THE SCREEN AND ANNOUNCE THE FIRST SPEAKERS?

>> THANK YOU.

IF YOU HAVE SIGNED UP TO SPEAK VIA ZOOM, PLEASE TAKE THIS TIME TO ENSURE YOUR SCREEN NAME IN ZOOM INCLUDE YOUR LAST NAME AND MATCHES THE NAME YOU USED TO SIGN UP TO SPEAK. IF YOUR SCREEN NAME DOES NOT MATCH, WE CANNOT ALLOW YOU TO SPEAK WHEN IT IS YOUR TURN.

I WILL ANNOUNCE TWO SPEAKER NAMES AT A TIME. WHEN YOU ARE CALLED TO SPEAK THESE STATE YOUR NAME AND WARD OR NEIGHBORHOOD IF KNOWN. BEFORE BEGINNING YOUR COMMENTS.

IF YOU ARE PROVIDING TESTIMONY VIA ZOOM WHEN IT IS YOUR TURN, WE WILL ANNOUNCE YOUR NAME AND ALLOW YOU TO SPEAK.

IF YOU ARE ANNOUNCED AS THE NEXT SPEAKER AND IN THE ROOM, PLEASE MOVE TO THE SEAT IN THE FRONT ROW DESIGNATED FOR THE NEXT BIGGER.

WHEN IT IS YOUR TURN, YOU MAY COME TO THE PODIUM. PLEASE LEAVE ANY BAGS HE MAY HAVE AT YOUR SEAT.

IF YOU HAVE DOCUMENTS TO GIVE COUNCIL PLEASE PLACE THEM IN THE BASKET NEAR THE PODIUM.

YOU WILL HAVE TWO AND 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 HALF MINUTE MARK.

OUR FIRST SPEAKERS ARE TRAVIS KNUTSON FOLLOWED BY LYNN WOODRICH.

TRAVIS IS ONLINE SO I WILL BE ALLOWING YOU TO TALK.

WE ARE READY WHEN YOU ARE.

>> HELLO, EVERYBODY, GOOD EVENING, MY NAME IS TRAVIS KNUTSON AND I AM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE LANE REGIONAL AIR PROTECTION AGENCY.

I AM JOINING VIRTUALLY FROM SEATTLE WHERE I AM ATTENDING AN AIR DIRECTORS MEETING BUT WANTED TO ENSURE OUR VOICE WAS PART OF THE PUBLIC HEARING RECORD.

SUPPORTING ADOPTION OF THE PUBLIC STANDARDS AMENDMENTS, THIS IS OUR FOURTH COMMENT ON THIS ORDINANCE AND EARLIER VERSIONS CONTAIN LANGUAGE, AMBIGUITY AND A PROCEDURAL CONFLICT WITH STATE PERMITTING REQUIREMENTS IDENTIFIED AND WORKED COLLABORATIVELY TO WORK TO RESOLVE IT.

IT ESTABLISHES A WORKABLE COORDINATION MECHANISM BETWEEN LAND-USE PROCESSES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITTING WITHOUT CREATING A LEGAL OR PROCEDURAL BARRIER FOR THE AGENCIES. THE ELEMENTS OF VERSION 3, THE APPLICANT CAN ATTEST IN THE CITY NOTIFICATION TO REGULATORY AGENCIES GIVES US EARLY ENTRY INTO THE CONVERSATION OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE ZONES PROVIDING VALUE AND THE APPLICANT WILL VERIFY IF REQUIREMENTS HAVE BEEN CORRECTLY IDENTIFIED BEFORE A FACILITY STARTS OPERATING WITHOUT THE NECESSARY CONTROLS.

WE APPRECIATE THE COUNCIL DECISION TO MOVE FORWARD WITH VERSION 3 RATHER THAN VERSION 4, THE REQUIREMENT ADS TRANSPARENCY AT MINIMAL BURDEN TO APPLICANTS AND THE DISTINCTION IS VALUED PRESERVED, WE ARE READY TO IMPLEMENT THE FRAMEWORK. AS THEY MOVE INTO PHASE 2 OF THE HAZARD AND RISK ANALYSIS, WE REMAIN COMMITTED TO PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND THANK YOU FOR YOUR SUSTAINED COMMITMENT TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH COORDINATION AND WE ARE PROUD TO HAVE A PARTNER IN THIS COORDINATION.

>> THANK YOU, TRAVIS. OUR NEXT SPEAKERS ARE LYNN WOODBRANCH AND COURTNEY GRESILL.

>> MY NAME IS LYNN, THE CO-CHAIR OF THE COMMUNITY AND A BETHEL RESIDENT FOR 30 YEARS, I LIVE IN WARD 8 AND SPEAK ON BEHALF OF OUR BOARD.

I AM URGING YOU TO ADOPT VERSION 3, PART ONE OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH STANDARDS LAND USED CODE AMENDMENT CA 25 -- THREE RECOMMENDED BY PLANNING STAFF. A REQUIRES APPLICANT SEEKING BUILDING PERMITS IN THE INDUSTRIAL ZONES TO CONSULT WITH AGENCIES AND IDENTIFY WHETHER THE PROJECT REQUIRES AIR, LAND OR WATER PERMITS. FROM THE EPA, DEQ OR TO ATTEST THAT NONE ARE NEEDED.

IT DOES NOT REQUIRE THOSE PERMITS BE OBTAINED BEFORE BUILDING PERMITS ARE ISSUED.

IT ENSURES THE RIGHT INFORMATION IS SURFACED EARLY.

RIGHT NOW EUGENE'S PLANNING DEPARTMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATORY AGENCIES DON'T COMMUNICATE UNTIL LATE IN THE APPROVAL PROCESS.

THIS AMENDMENT FIXES THAT BY CREATING AN EARLY COMMUNICATION PATHWAY.

YOU MAY HEAR CONCERNS THIS WILL DETER BUSINESSES, IT WON'T. THIS APPLIES TO E 2, E 3, 7-10 APPLICATIONS PER YEAR SO AGENCIES WON'T BE INUNDATED WITH CALLS.

VERSION 3 BRINGS PUBLIC HEALTH INTO THE LAND-USE PROCESS AT THE RIGHT TIME.

GIVING AGENCIES A CHANCE TO UNDERSTAND WHETHER A NEW DEVELOPMENT COULD GENERATE POLLUTION REQUIRING PERMITS BEFORE A BUILDING PERMIT IS ISSUED.

I URGE YOU TO ADOPT VERSION 3 OF PART ONE OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH STANDARDS LAND USED CODE AMENDMENTS.

THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, OUR NEXT SPEAKERS ARE COURTNEY GRESILL FOLLOWED BY TIFFANY EDWARDS.

>> GOOD EVENING NOT MAYOR BUT COUNSEL. MY NAME IS COURTNEY GRESILL, I RESIDE IN WARD 5 AND I'M HERE TO TESTIFY ON BEHALF OF THE CODE AMENDMENT AND I AM SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF A COALITION OF LOCAL BUSINESS OWNERS AND THERE ARE KIND OF UPSET SENT A LETTER LISTING NAMES, SUMMARIZING THE TESTIMONY TO YOU AND I WANT TO KNOW WE ARE NOT TESTIFYING EITHER IN SUPPORT OR OPPOSITION OF ANY OF THE VERSIONS BUT WHAT WE WANT TO TALK ABOUT IS WHAT THEY ARE SIGNALING AND THE PROCESS THAT BROUGHT US HERE. I AM SPEAKING FROM MY OWN EXPERIENCE AS A 20 YEAR PLUS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PRACTITIONER IN PUBLIC SECTOR AND IN PRIVATE SECTOR UNSUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS RETENTION AND EXPANSION PROJECTS AS WELL AS COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS.

A QUESTION WAS RAISED IN FEBRUARY AND THE QUESTION SPECIFICALLY WAS HOW CAN ANY OF THESE VARIATIONS BE BURDENSOME TO BUSINESS?

FROM A BUSINESS PERSPECTIVE THE CONCERN IS NOT THE TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS OF ANY SINGLE VERSION, NOT THREE, PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDED 4, IT IS THE PATTERN INTRODUCTORY THEY REPRESENT.

WE MAKE LONG-TERM INVESTMENT DECISIONS BASED ON PREDICT ABILITY.

NOT JUST OF TODAY'S CODE BUT WHERE POLICY APPEARS TO BE HEADING AND HOW POLICYMAKERS ARE LEADING US IN THAT DIRECTION AND THE CONVERSATIONS THEY HAVE HAD THROUGH THE PROCESS.

WHEN LAND-USE MOVES AWAY FROM CLEAR AND OBJECTIVE AREAS AND A GOVERN STATE, REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT, IT CREATES UNCERTAINTY AND CONFUSION NOT ONLY WHERE SETTLED BUT WHO WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR SETTLING THEM.

IMPORTANTLY BUSINESSES DON'T WAIT FOR INSTABILITY TO MATERIALIZE BEFORE WE REACT, WE EVALUATE EARLY WHICH IS HOW WE AVOID DISRUPTION, PROTECT JOBS AND MAINTAIN OUR LONG-TERM COMMITMENT TO THE COMMUNITY.

ADDITIONALLY LANGUAGE MATTERS, LABELS LIKE CHRONIC, TOXIC POLLUTER USED BY STAFF AND ELECTED OFFICIALS APPLY TO PERMITTED OR REGULAR ENTITIES LIKE US UNDERMINE STRESS AND COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS NEEDED TO ACHIEVE PUBLIC HEALTH GOALS OR ANY GOALS FOR THAT MATTER.

WE AGREE PUBLIC HEALTH IS CRITICAL AND WE LIVE THESE VALUES EVERYDAY NAVIGATING STATE AND FEDERAL AND LOCAL REGULATIONS.

SO WHEN YOU ASKED WHERE THE BURDEN LIES IT IS IN THE CUMULATIVE SIGNALS, NOT IN ANY SINGLE VERSION OR WHAT IT TAKES TO SATISFY ONE TASK.

THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, OUR NEXT AND FINAL SPEAKER IS TIFFANY EDWARDS.

>> THANK YOU.

GOOD EVENING.

TIFFANY EDWARDS, I AM A MEMBER OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND HERE TONIGHT IN THAT CAPACITY.

I WANTED TO EXPLAIN A COUPLE THINGS ON THE VERSION 3 YOU ARE RECONSIDERING OR YOU HAVE BEFORE YOU FOR THIS PUBLIC HEARING. THIS IS A VERSION THE PLANNING COMMISSION VOTED DOWN, THEY DID NOT APPROVE THIS VERSION, STAFF DIRECTED US TO PROVIDE A RECOMMENDATION PER COUNSEL'S EXPLICIT

DIRECTION SO HENCE VERSION 4 WAS THE VERSION YOU WERE RECOMMENDED.

BUT I THOUGHT I WOULD EXPLAIN, TRY TO DO MY BEST TO EXPLAIN SOME OF THE ISSUES WE HAD WITH THE POLICY AND I BROUGHT SOME HANDOUTS SO I AM GOING TO HAND THESE OUT.

YOU WILL GET THESE TOMORROW.

BASICALLY THIS IS THE LAND-USE, INDUSTRIAL TABLES AND IT HAS ALL OF THE BUSINESSES AND I HIGHLIGHTED THEM FOR YOU ON EVERY PAGE. THE BUSINESSES THAT WOULD BE SUBJECT TO THIS POLICY.

THE ISSUE SPECIFICALLY IS WITH -- WHEN YOU GO THROUGH AND READ MANY TYPES OF BUSINESSES YOU WOULD NOT EXPECT TO HAVE TO HAVE A PERMIT FOR AIR QUALITY OR ANY OF THOSE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY PERMITS.

THE ISSUE SPECIFICALLY WAS THE FACT THAT THESE TYPES OF BUSINESSES ARE NOW SUBJECT TO THIS POLICY.

THESE ARE BUSINESSES THAT DON'T HAVE A PRE-EXISTING RELATIONSHIP WITH REGULATORS, THEY HAVE NEVER BEEN REGULATED, THESE ARE RESTAURANTS, BARS, DANCE STUDIOS, MARTIAL ARTS AND BECAUSE IT NOT ONLY APPLIES TO DEVELOPMENT OR LAND USE PERMITS, IT APPLIES TO ALL DEVELOPMENT PERMITS.

THOSE ARE THINGS LIKE ELECTRICAL WORK, TENANT IMPROVEMENTS, THINGS THAT AREN'T ALREADY CURRENTLY CAPTURED, ANOTHER SPEAKER MENTIONED 7-10 A YEAR, IT IS MORE THAN THAT BECAUSE IT APPLIES TO THE DEVELOPMENT

PERMITS SO ANY BUSINESS THAT IS DOING AN ELECTRICAL WORK OR TENANT IMPROVEMENT THAT IS PERMITTED TO OPERATE IN E2, I3 OR I2 IS SUBJECT TO THIS AND THIS IS THE REASON THE PLANNING COMMISSION FELT IT WAS UNWORKABLE AND FELT WE SHOULD HAVE THE CITY DO THE ATTESTATION AND OUTREACH TO THE REGULATORY AGENCIES TO ENSURE THAT THERE WAS COORDINATION.

>> THANK YOU, TIFFANY. COUNCIL PRESIDENT THAT WAS OUR FINAL SPEAKER FOR THIS SECOND PUBLIC HEARING.

>> I NOW CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. COUNSEL, CONTINUE TO ACCEPT WRITTEN TESTIMONY FOLLOW THE CLOSURE UNTIL ACTION IS TAKEN YOU MAY SUBMIT WRITTEN NOTICE AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMITTING WRITTEN TESTIMONY ARE PROVIDED IN THE PUBLIC NOTICE FOR THIS MEETING AS WELL AS THE AIS. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO RECEIVE FUTURE NOTICES ABOUT THE PROPOSED LAND CODE AMENDMENTS, PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR NAME OR MAILING ADDRESS TO STAFF LISTED ON THE AIS.

ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM CITY COUNCIL?

>> YES, I HAD TWO QUESTIONS.

FIRST ON THE DRAFT FORMS WE RECEIVED I THOUGHT IT SAID CONTACT BY RESPONSE DATE AND INDICATED BY RESPONSE IS

RECEIVED, THAT IS FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES. IF THERE IS A REQUIREMENT ANY APPLICANT CONTACTS THESE AGENCIES EVEN THOUGH THEY DON'T NEED PERMITS THEY DON'T HAVE TO CALL, CORRECT?

>> GOOD EVENING, THIS IS JEFF, PLANNER FOR THE LAND-USE PLANNING TEAM.

THAT IS CORRECT.

THAT IS NOT A REQUIREMENT.

IT WAS MORE OF IN THE IDEA IF THEY HAD CONTACTED AND INDICATED THEY NEVER RECEIVED A RESPONSE WE WOULD WANT TO KNOW THAT SO WE COULD REACH OUT TO AGENCY PARTNERS AND FIND OUT WHERE THE BREAKDOWN IN COMMUNICATION WAS.

>> I DON'T HAVE TO CALL ANYBODY, I CAN JUST CHECK?

>> ABSOLUTELY.

>> MY SECOND QUESTION ARE YOU ANTICIPATING THIS REQUIREMENT WOULD CREATE ANY SORT OF DELAY IN THE PROCESSING OF THESE PERMITS OR PUT THE CAPACITY STREAM ON STAFF FOR PROCESSING THESE PERMITS?

>> THERE WILL BE ADDED CAPACITY IMPACTS FROM THE FACT THAT WE HAVE TO SEND A NEW NOTICE BUT ONCE WE BUILD IN THE PROCESS IT SHOULD BE RELATIVELY STREAMLINED.

FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF AN APPLICANT THEY HAVE ANOTHER FORM TO FILL OUT AND TO CHECK THAT THE BOX IS INCLUDED I WOULD IMAGINE IF THERE IS A SMALL IMPACT TO CAPACITY, YES.

THAT WILL BE MINOR OVER TIME.

>> IT IS NOT SOMETHING I HAVE TO CONTACT AND VERIFY INFORMATION.

THEY JUST GET THE FORM?

>> ALL WE ARE LOOKING FOR IS THE FACT THAT THE FORM IS SUBMITTED.

THESE AREN'T OUR REGULATIONS TO EMPLOY. WE WANT TO MAKE SURE WE CAN SUBMIT THAT FORM TO OUR AGENCY PARTNERS.

WE WILL REVIEW FOR OUR OWN RULES.

>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> THANK YOU.

>> JEFF, BEFORE YOU GET TOO COMFORTABLE.

FIRST OF ALL, WE ALL ARE CONCERNED ABOUT OUR AIR QUALITY, WATER QUALITY, EVERYBODY WANTS TO PROTECT THAT.

I AM MORE CONCERNED ABOUT THE UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES.

I THINK IT IS ONE THING IF A FILER UNDERSTANDS WHAT THEY HAVE TO DO. I AM MORE CONCERNED ABOUT THE SMALL BUSINESS THAT COMES IN THAT HAS NO IDEA WHAT ANY OF THIS MEANS. WHERE DO THEY GET HELP?

>> WITHIN VERSION 3 THAT WAS ASKED TO BE BROUGHT BEFORE YOU WE TRIED TO PROVIDE ATTESTATION FORM THAT WOULD GIVE AT LEAST CONTACT INFORMATION FOR THE GROUPS THEY WOULD NEED TO REACH OUT TO IN SOME HOPE THAT WOULD PROVIDE THEM AT LEAST A REASONABLE POINT OF CONTACT FOR A PLACE TO START SO TO SPEAK.

>> THIS IS FRONT AND CENTER IN MY MIND. I MET WITH ONE OF THE STARTUPS COMING OUT OF THE U OF O SCIENTIFIC ACCELERATOR. I WANTED TO FIND OUT WHAT WAS WORKING WELL WITH THE PLANNING PROCESS AND PERMITTING PROCESS, WHAT WASN'T, WHERE WERE THE BARRIERS, WHAT WERE THE THINGS THAT WOULD HELP AND WHAT WOULD HE LIKE ME, US TO KNOW ABOUT THAT AND I HAD AN IDEA OF WHAT THEY MIGHT SAY.

HE WENT TO A PLACE I HADN'T THOUGHT OF AND HIS BIG THING WAS I AM A SCIENTIST, THE PEOPLE I WORK WITH OUR ENGINEERS. WE ARE NOT BUSINESS PEOPLE. WE DON'T UNDERSTAND THE PERMITTING SYSTEM, WE DON'T KNOW WHERE TO GO.

NOT EVEN HAVING A LIST OF WHO THE RIGHT CONTACTS ARE FOR THE VARIOUS THINGS.

IT GOES BACK TO SOMETHING WE WERE HOPING TO GAIN WITH THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT POSITIONS, ONE WAS TO GET HELP PEOPLE GET THROUGH THE PERMITTING PROCESS AND FOR MY COLLEAGUES I HOPE WE REVISIT THAT AT SOME POINT BECAUSE PEOPLE ARE HAVING A HARD TIME MAKING ENDS MEET AND IF YOU HAVEN'T LOOKED LATELY WE ARE AT THE BOTTOM OF ALL THE COMPARATORS AS FAR AS ECONOMIC GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT.

THAT MEANS JOBS, LIVING WAGES SO PEOPLE CAN AFFORD HOUSING.

WE JUST HAVE TO BE CAREFUL WHAT STEPS WE TAKE.

I AM ALL FOR PROTECTING OUR ENVIRONMENT, LIVABILITY AND THERE IS A BALANCE BETWEEN NOT AND JOB GROWTH. AT THE SAME TIME WE NEED TO FIGURE OUT HOW WE CAN HELP PEOPLE THAT APPLY FOR PERMITS TO HAVE THE MOST GUIDANCE WE CAN GIVE TO MAKE THIS PROCESS EASY. IT SHOULD BE CITY STAFF THAT DOES THAT BUT I THINK I AM PROBABLY IN A MINORITY WHEN I SAY THAT.

WE NEED TO BE DOING WHAT WE CAN TO HELP PEOPLE MOVE FORWARD WITH THEIR BUSINESSES.

THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILOR.

>> THANK YOU, MADAM PRESIDENT.

I WOULD CONCUR WITH MY COLLEAGUE ONLY I WOULD ADD A COUPLE EXCLAMATION POINTS ON TOP OF THAT.

IT IS MY OPINION THAT ONLY STRONG ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN THESE AREAS ARE THE LONG-TERM SOLUTION TO OUR BUDGET PROBLEMS FOR OUR CITY.

I THINK IT IS IMPERATIVE WE DO THIS JOB RIGHT AND THAT WE DON'T UNNECESSARILY END UP CHASING PEOPLE AWAY.

WHILE IT IS ALSO IMPORTANT TO MAKE SURE WE HAVE CLEAN AIR, CLEAN WATER AND A CLEAN ENVIRONMENT ESPECIALLY IN EUGENE WHERE PEOPLE HAVEN'T HAD THE BEST EXPERIENCE IN SOME CASES.

WE NEED TO BE CAREFUL ABOUT THAT BUT WE ALSO NEED TO NOT CHASE BUSINESSES AWAY.

IF VERSION 3 PASSES, WALK THROUGH THIS WITH ME.

THEY FEEL THEY WANT TO OPEN A NEW BUSINESS IN WEST EUGENE.

WITHIN THE ZONE, WITHIN THE AREA.

THEY ARE TOLD THEY NEED TO APPLY TO ALL OF THE REGULATORY AGENCIES THAT ARE SUGGESTED BY YOU.

DOES THE CITY STAFF HAVE ANY POWER TO REQUIRE THOSE AGENCIES TO RESPOND?

>> LET ME JUST CLARIFY REALLY QUICKLY THAT WHAT IS REQUIRED IN VERSION 3 DOESN'T ACTUALLY REQUIRE ANYBODY TO APPLY FOR A PERMIT.

NOR IS IT REQUIRED FOR AN AGENCY TO RESPOND TO THE INDIVIDUAL SO THAT IS A CORRECT STATEMENT.

ALL IT IS REQUIRING IS FOR SOMEONE TO COMPLETE THE FORM THAT SAYS I DO NEED THESE PERMITS AND I UNDERSTAND THAT OR I DON'T NEED ANY PERMITS.

>> YOU MAKE THE DETERMINATION ABOUT WHETHER YOU NEED THEM?

>> WE ARE NOT MAKING THAT DETERMINATION, WE PASSED THE FORM TO OUR REGULATORY PARTNERS TO DETERMINE WHETHER THAT IS CORRECT.

>> WHEN YOU DO THAT, DO REGULATORY PARTNERS HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO RESPOND TO YOU?

>> THE ONLY REQUIREMENT IN THE CODE IS THEY SUBMIT THIS FORM AND WE THEN SUPPLY THAT FORM AS WELL AS BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT THE PROPOSAL TO OUR AGENCY PARTNERS BECAUSE THESE AREN'T OUR REGULATIONS WE DON'T WANT THEM HOLDING UP THE BUILDING PERMIT PROCESS.

WE WANT TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE PROPOSED LAND USE CODE THAT IS COORDINATION AND NOT ADDING A BARRIER.

>> I WANT TO ASK IF SOMEBODY DOESN'T NEED A RESPONSE FROM THE REGULATORY AGENCY AND THEY DON'T GET ONE BUT IT'S DETERMINED THEY DON'T NEED TO WHAT DOES THE CITY DO WITH THAT PERMIT WHEN NO ONE HAS RESPONDED?

>> WE WOULD REVIEW THE PERMIT FOR OUR OWN RULES AND REGULATIONS.

THIS CODE WOULD ONLY REQUIRE WE HAVE A FORM OR DOCUMENTATION THAT SAYS WE DON'T NEED THIS PERMIT AND THAT WOULD BE ENOUGH FOR US TO MOVE ON AND ISSUE THE BUILDING PERMIT.

>> WHAT IF THAT AGENCY NEVER PROVIDES A RESPONSE?

>> TO THE QUESTION ABOUT WE DID ON OUR EXAMPLE FORM INCLUDE THE DATE YOU REACH OUT TO THEM AND WHETHER OR NOT YOU WERE REPLIED BACK TO BECAUSE THAT IS IMPORTANT TO KEEP TRACK THAT WE CAN BUILD THOSE RELATIONSHIPS WITH OUR AGENCY PARTNERS TO ENSURE THEY ARE RESPONDING OR WE FOUND OUT IF THEY ARE NOT THIS NEEDS TO BE REVISITED.

>> MY QUESTION IS MAYBE NOT WORDED WELL.

WHAT IS YOUR RESPONDENT, WHAT IS YOUR RESPONSE WITH CITY STAFF'S RESPONSE TO THE APPLICANT IF THE REGULATORY AGENCY DOES NOT RESPOND?

>> WE WOULD TELL THEM WE NEED TO -- IF THEY BELIEVE THEY DO NOT NEED A PERMIT TO FILL OUT THE FORM AND SUBMIT IT TO US AND WE WILL ACCEPT THAT AND PASS IT ON TO THE AGENCY.

>> TO APPROVE IT ANYWAY EVEN THOUGH THEY NEVER GOT A RESPONSE?

>> WE ARE NOT APPROVING ANYTHING, WE ARE RECEIVING A FORM AND PASSING THAT ON TO OUR AGENCY PARTNERS ALONG WITH SOME ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.

IT IS ABOUT THE RECEIPT OF THE INFORMATION AND BEING ABLE TO PASS THAT UP TO AGENCY PARTNERS.

>> THANK YOU.

>> THANKS.

TO ME THIS IS MUCH MORE STRAIGHTFORWARD. THIS IS REALLY BASIC INFORMATION THAT ANY BUSINESS SHOULD KNOW IF THEY ARE GOING TO BE SUCCESSFUL IN BUILDING A NEW BUSINESS IN EUGENE OR ANYPLACE IN THE COUNTRY BASICALLY.

NOT ASKING THEM TO BE EXPERTS ABOUT THE PROCESS OR GETTING PERMITS BUT THEY KNOW WHAT THEY ARE SUPPOSED TO BE DOING OR SHOULD KNOW WHAT THEY ARE SUPPOSED TO BE DOING, THEY ARE NOT REQUIRED TO APPLY FOR A PERMIT, HAVE A PERMIT, THEY JUST HAVE TO ATTEST THEY KNOW THEY ARE SUPPOSED TO GET A PERMIT.

AND BY THE WAY IF YOU DON'T GET A PERMIT FROM AN AGENCY AND ITS REQUIRED YOU CAN'T GO FORWARD WITH THE PROCESS.

SO IF YOU DON'T KNOW THAT WE AHEAD OF TIME AND THIS HELPS BUSINESSES KNOW THAT WE HAD A TIME THEY WON'T RUN INTO THAT PROBLEM.

YOU STILL HAVE TO GET THE RIGHT PERMIT TO MOVE FORWARD IN ORDER TO BUILD A BUSINESS.

IT IS BASIC, THE WAY THINGS GET BUILT IN THIS COUNTRY.

>> THANK YOU.

>> SOMETIMES IT HELPS ME WITH MAKING SURE I UNDERSTAND WHAT A PERSON IS SAYING IF I DO A CONCRETE EXAMPLE.

[AUDIO ISSUES] I AM APPLYING FOR A BUILDING PERMIT FOR THAT IMPROVEMENT.

I WOULD FILL OUT THIS FORM, I WOULD SAY, SUBMIT WITH THE REST OF MY PAPERWORK, I WOULD SAY I DON'T NEED TO BE DOING THESE PERMITS, I DON'T NEED THEM, I HAND THOSE TWO [AUDIO ISSUES] FIVE STAFF VERIFIES I FILL OUT THE FORM [AUDIO ISSUES] AND THEY WILL GO AHEAD AND ISSUE THE PERMIT BASED ON THE CRITERIA IN EUGENE'S CODE REGARDLESS OF WHAT ANY OF THE REGULATORY AGENCIES DO OR DON'T DO WITH THAT INFORMATION.

IS MY UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT THAT LOOKS CORRECTLY?

>> THAT IS A CORRECT SUMMATION OF THE PROCESS.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCILOR GROVES?

>> THANK YOU, REAL QUICK, MY PURPOSE OF BRINGING UP THE STORY OF SPEAKING WITH THE CEO FROM THE NEW START UP OUT OF THE SCIENTIFIC ACCELERATOR WAS TO THE POINT HE DIDN'T KNOW WHAT HE NEEDED TO DO.

HE IS A SCIENTIST, NOT A BUSINESS PERSON.

MARTIAL ARTS STUDIO, THAT IS GREAT IF THEY KNOW WHAT PERMITS THEY NEED AND WHAT THEY DON'T BUT SOME OF THESE STARTUPS DON'T HAVE ANY IDEA OF WHAT THEY NEED AND THERE IS NOT A SINGLE PLACE THEY CAN GO TO FIND OUT ALL THE ANSWERS.

SO I THINK WE NEED TO BE TAKING THE EXTRA STEP TO BE HAVING THIS INFORMATION AVAILABLE AND SOMEBODY TO HELP THEM GET THROUGH THE PROCESS IF THIS IS WHAT OUR EXPECTATION IS GOING TO BE.

IT SHOULDN'T BE MET WITH THIS IS YOUR RESPONSIBILITY, GOOD LUCK.

IT SHOULD BE MORE THAN THAT IF WE ARE TRULY INTERESTED IN HELPING EXISTING BUSINESSES SURVIVE AND THRIVE, HELPING THEM GROW AND HELPING NEW EMPLOYERS COME INTO OUR AREA TO EMPLOYER PEOPLE, OUR MEDIAN INCOME LEVEL IS THE LOWEST ON OUR COMPARABLES AS WELL AS GROWING OUR ECONOMY. WE NEED TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT THIS.

PART OF THAT IS NOT MAKING THINGS SO ONEROUS THEY CAN'T GET THROUGH AND I DISAGREE WITH THE COMMENT WHILE THEY SHOULD KNOW ALL OF THIS BECAUSE MANY OF THEM DON'T.

THEY KNOW HOW TO DO THEIR CRAFT, THEY DON'T KNOW WHAT ALL IS REQUIRED IN THE REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT. THEY AREN'T ALL PLANNERS.

WHATEVER WE CAN DO I AM PRETTY SURE THIS IS GOING TO PASS.

I THINK WE NEED TO DO SOMETHING.

I ALSO WANT TO MAKE SURE WE ARE DOING WHATEVER WE CAN TO HELP PEOPLE BE SUCCESSFUL IN OUR COMMUNITY. THAT IS OUR RESPONSIBILITY.

>> THANK YOU, WITH NO OTHER COUNCILOR IN THE QUEUE WE WILL MOVE ON TO OUR THIRD PUBLIC HEARING ON THE NIGHT.

WHICH IS IN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE FAIRMOUNT/UNIVERSITY OF OREGON SPECIAL AREA STUDY TEXT AND DIAGRAM. AMENDING SECTIONS 9.4205, 9.4215, 9.4220, AND 9.9570 OF THE EUGENE CODE, 1,971. REZONING THE PROPERTY IDENTIFIED AS ASSESSOR'S MAP

17-03-33-32, TAX LOTS 07000, 07100, 07200, 07300, 07400, 07500, 07600, 07700, AND 07800 TO REMOVE THE /EC EAST CAMPUS OVERLAY ZONE AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

>> [AUDIO ISSUES] FOR THE EAST CAMPUS AREA, A REFINEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT, CODE AMENDMENT AND ZONE CHANGE APPLICATION.

THE APPLICATION, THIS PACKAGE OF APPLICATIONS WOULD AMEND THE FAIRMOUNT/UNIVERSITY OF OREGON SPECIAL VARIOUS STUDY, THE EUGENE LAND USE CODE AND THE 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 COUNSELING DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

TONIGHT'S PUBLIC HEARING IS THE SECOND CITY COUNCIL PUBLIC HEARING FOR THIS PACKAGE OF APPLICATIONS.

THE SECOND HEARING WAS SCHEDULED AFTER THE COUNCIL PASSED A MOTION ON MARCH 9TH, 2026 TO REOPEN THE RECORD AND HOLD ANOTHER HEARING ON THE MODIFIED ORDINANCE.

THE COUNCIL'S MOTION WAS PASSED IN RESPONSE TO THE MODIFICATIONS TO THE PROPOSAL PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT TO ADDRESS CONCERNS RAISED IN PUBLIC TESTIMONY. TONIGHT IS A PUBLIC HEARING ONLY AND DELIBERATIONS ARE SCHEDULED FOR MAY 11TH.

>> THANK YOU, CITY MANAGER.

THE CITY COUNCIL IS GOING TO RULE WITH MODIFICATIONS OR DENY THE APPLICATION.

THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS FOR THIS APPLICATION IS BECAUSE QUASI -- SO WE'LL USE THE FORMAT FOR THIS HEARING.

ANY DISCLOSE OF BIAS, [AUDIO ISSUES].

SEEING NONE. BEFORE WE PROCEED I WANT -- [AUDIO ISSUES].

TESTIMONY PRESENTED AT THE PUBLIC HEARING SHOULD BE DIRECTED TOWARDS THE APPLICABLE APPROVAL CRITERIA OR OTHER CRITERIA SPEAKER BELIEVES APPLY TO THE DECISION.

IF THE CRITERIA FOR THIS PROPOSED REFINEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONE CHANGE ARE LOCATED IN THE EUGENE CODE, THE FULL TEXT OF THOSE SECTIONS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE FINDINGS ATTACHED TO THE AIS FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING.

THE FAILURE OF ANYONE TO RAISE AN ISSUE ACCOMPANIED WITH STATEMENTS OR EVIDENCE WITH THE OPPORTUNITY TO RESPOND, FOR THE PROCEEDINGS ONCE THE PUBLIC HEARING IS OPENED THE APPLICANT WILL PRESENT FIRST AND MAY SPEAK FOR UP TO 10 MINUTES BECAUSE THE APPLICANT BEARS THE BURDEN OF SHOWING THE PROPOSAL COMPLIES WITH APPLICABLE APPROVAL CRITERIA. THEN OTHER SPEAKERS WILL EACH BE ALLOWED 2 AND HALF MINUTES AND WILL BE CALLED IN THE FOLLOWING ORDER. THOSE IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSAL, THOSE WITH A NEUTRAL POSITION AND THOSE OPPOSED TO THE PROPOSAL.

AFTER THIS THE APPLICANT WILL BE ALLOWED UP TO FIVE MINUTES FOR FINAL REBUTTAL.

WE ASKED 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.

IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO RECEIVE FUTURE NOTICE PROCEEDINGS RELATED TO THE APPLICATION, PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR NAME AND MAILING ADDRESS ALONG WITH YOUR TESTIMONY OR PROVIDE YOUR NAME AND MAILING ADDRESS TO THE STAFF CONTACT IDENTIFIED IN THE AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING.

I WILL OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING.

APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES HAVE A TOTAL OF 10 MINUTES TO SPEAK ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT.

I WILL LEAVE IT TO YOU TO DECIDE THE TIME AMONGST YOURSELVES.

>> THANK YOU COUNCIL AND STAFF.

I AM CALLING MACARTHUR WITH LANDSCAPE PLANNING, I AM JOINED BY AARON NILSSON, THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF CAMPUS PLANNING AND WILL PROVIDE THE APPLICANT TESTIMONY.

WE APPRECIATE THE OPPORTUNITY TO HIGHLIGHT THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS PROPOSAL IN THIS SECOND PUBLIC HEARING AND WE WILL START WITH BRIEF CONTEXT, THE UNIVERSITY IS APPLICANT AND THEY ARE PROPOSING A HOUSING PLAN.

IT ADDRESSES SHORT-TERM NEEDS FOR STUDENT HOUSING, PLANNING RESPONSIBLY FOR LONG TERM NEEDS FOR STUDENTS, GRADUATE STUDENTS AND STUDENT FAMILIES.

THE PROPOSAL IS A RESULT OF TWO YEARS OF PLANNING, DURING THAT TIME UNIVERSITY UPDATED ITS REVELATORY PLANS, EVALUATED HOUSING DEMAND, IDENTIFIED THE SPECIFIC BARRIERS THAT ARE PREVENTING NEEDED HOUSING FROM BEING BUILT.

THE CHANGES ARE DESIGNED TO REMOVE BARRIERS.

NOTHING MORE.

THEY WOULD ALLOW RESIDENCE HALLS AS THE PERMITTED USE, INCREASE THE MAXIMUM HEIGHT FROM 45 FEET 85 FEET, EXPAND THE RESIDENTIAL TRANSITION AREA FROM 60 FEET TO 75 FEET NEXT TO PROPERTIES AND INCREASE THE HEIGHT LIMIT WITHIN THAT TRANSITION AREA FROM 30-45 FEET.

THESE ARE THE FOUNDATIONAL ELEMENTS THAT ARE NOT CHANGED SINCE THE PROPOSAL WAS ORIGINALLY SUBMITTED IN MARCH OF 2,025.

RESIDENCE HALLS ARE AN APPROPRIATE USE IN THE PLAN AREA.

IN FACT THEY ARE GENERALLY LOWER INTENSITY THAN MANY ACADEMIC OR INSTRUCTIONAL USES. THE OTHER USES DRAW

LARGE NUMBERS OF PEOPLE THROUGHOUT THE DAY OFTEN FROM EARLY MORNING TO LATE EVENING.

WITH SHARP PEAK OUR SURGES.

THEY FUNCTION DIFFERENTLY IN RESIDENCE HALL, LIVING SPACES FOR DEFINED POPULATIONS WITH PREDICTABLE AND RELATIVELY LOW PEAK ACTIVITY.

THE ORIGINAL PROHIBITION ON RESIDENCE HALLS WAS BASED ON LAND NEEDS IN 2,004.

OVER 20 YEARS AGO.

CIRCUMSTANCES HAVE CHANGED.

SINCE THEN THE UNIVERSITY HAS DEVELOPED SIX NEW RESIDENCE HALL COMMUNITIES, FOUR OF THEM ON THE EAST CAMPUS AREA AS WELL AS RENOVATING THE JUSTICE HALL.

THE CAMPUS AREA IS WELL-SUITED FOR HOUSING, CLOSE TO ACADEMIC ALL THINGS, STUDENT SERVICES, ATHLETIC AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AND OPEN SPACE.

IT IS WELL SERVED BY TRANSIT, PEDESTRIAN INFRASTRUCTURE AND ADJACENT TO COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY ALONG FRANKLIN BOULEVARD, 19TH AND HAGLUND STREET. THIS IS WHERE STUDENT HOUSING BELONGS.

WITH RESPECT TO BUILDING HEIGHT, 85 FEET IS APPROPRIATE AND NECESSARY.

THAT HEIGHT ALLOWS FOR A SEVEN-STORY RESIDENCE HALL USING COMMON AND EFFICIENT CONSTRUCTION METHODS.

FIVE STORIES OF LIGHT FRAME CONSTRUCTION OVER TWO STORIES OF CONCRETE.

THIS APPROACH REDUCES CONSTRUCTION COST AND ULTIMATELY HOUSING COSTS.

UNIVERSITY HAS USED THIS APPROACH SUCCESSFULLY IN RECENT PROJECTS, SHORTER BUILDINGS, SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASE COSTS.

AND MAKE STUDENT HOUSING HARDER TO DELIVER.

WITHIN THE RESIDENTIAL TRANSITION AREA ITSELF WE HAVE PROPOSED 45 FOOT HEIGHT LIMIT IS SLIGHTLY TALLER THAN WHAT IS ALLOWED IN OUR ZONES.

AND THAT PROVIDES A REASONABLE AND GRADUAL TRANSITION IN SCALE.

THERE HAS BEEN AN ASSERTION THIS PROPOSAL DOES NOT MEET THE APPROVAL CRITERIA.

THAT CLAIM IS INCORRECT.

NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS ARE NOT MEANT TO BE STATIC.

THE PLAN ITSELF CALLS FOR REVIEW AFTER 10 YEARS.

IN THIS CASE IT HAS BEEN OVER 20 YEARS SINCE THE LAST UPDATE.

THE PLAN STATES CLEARLY IT IS A POLICY FRAMEWORK.

NOT A ZONING CODE AND IT IS INTENDED TO BE FLEXIBLE.

BOTH POLICY AND CIRCUMSTANCES HAVE CHANGED SIGNIFICANTLY IN THE LAST 20 YEARS.

THE STATE HAS ENACTED HOUSING LEGISLATION TO INCREASE PRODUCTION AND REMOVE REGULATORY BARRIERS.

THE CITY HAS IMPLEMENTED POLICIES TO RENEW HOUSING STANDARDS AND PROCESSES.

MEANWHILE, HOUSING COSTS AND CONSTRUCTION COSTS CONTINUE TO RISE SHARPLY.

UNIVERSITY HAS NEARLY EXHAUSTED ITS AVAILABLE LAND AND THE REMAINING VIABLE HOUSING SITES ARE IN THESE CAMPUS AREAS.

THERE IS AN UNMET DEMAND FOR CAMPUS HOUSING, THIS PROPOSAL RESPONDS TO THE REALITIES.

IN CLOSING, THIS IS A HOUSING PLAN THAT MEETS REAL NEEDS.

UNIVERSITY HAS DEMONSTRATED IN THESE CAMPUS AREAS THAT IT CAN DELIVER A HIGH-QUALITY, WELL-DESIGNED STUDENT HOUSING. WITHOUT THESE CHANGES HOUSING NEEDS CANNOT BE MET.

THE APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSAL IS A CONCRETE STEP TOWARDS ADDRESSING THE HOUSING CRISIS.

RESPECTFULLY ENCOURAGING COUNCIL TO MOVE FORWARD WITHOUT FURTHER DELAY.

>> GOOD EVENING, COUNCIL.

I AM ERIN OLSON.

CAMPUS PLANNING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON. I HAVE BEEN INVOLVED SINCE THE BEGINNING, PLANNING, LAND-USE, WORKING ON FUTURE PROJECTS ON THE EAST CAMPUS AREA.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON HAS CHANGED A LOT OVER THE YEARS. OUR CAMPUS IS KNOWN FOR ITS BEAUTY, TREES, OPEN SPACE AND SO MUCH MORE.

AN EXAMPLE IS A TRAVEL MAGAZINE THAT RANKED OUR CAMPUS AS 27TH IN THEIR TOP 50 RANKINGS OF BEAUTIFUL CAMPUSES IN THE COUNTRY.

WE RECOGNIZE OUR RESPONSIBILITY TO DEVELOP TO MAINTAIN THE STANDARD.

AS WE CONTINUE TO ADD PROJECTS IN THE EAST CAMPUS AREA WE WANT TO BUILD ON THAT LEGACY.

CREATING GREAT BUILDINGS AND WELCOMING OPEN SPACES THAT MAY CAMPUS EVEN BETTER.

THE UNIVERSITY'S PROPOSAL IS BASED ON A 2 1/2 YEAR PLANNING PROCESS THAT PRODUCE THE NEXT GENERATION HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

IN 2023 WE BROUGHT AN EXPERIENCE DOES 19 TO EXPLORE OPTIONS FOR ON-CAMPUS HOUSING FOR FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS, GRADUATE STUDENTS AND STUDENT FAMILIES WHILE MAINTAINING A NEIGHBORHOOD TRANSITION.

WE HEARD A WIDE RANGE OF FEEDBACK AND MADE ADJUSTMENTS WHILE MAINTAINING THE ABILITY TO BUILD MORE ON-CAMPUS HOUSING WHEN NEEDED.

THE PLAN DOES NOT IMAGINE A CONTINUOUS WALL OF 85 FOOT BUILDINGS IN THE BACKYARD OF SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES.

INSTEAD IT INCREASED HOUSING DENSITY ON THE UNIVERSITY OWNED LAND, CREATES HIGH QUALITY OPEN SPACES AND AMENITIES, KEEP THE CURRENT CAMPUS BOUNDARY WE ARE NOT PROPOSING TO EXPAND THE BOUNDARY. AND MAINTAINS A TRANSITION TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD, A DIFFERENT ONE FROM 2004 BUT A TRANSITION.

THERE ARE BENEFITS AND CHALLENGES OF LIVING NEXT TO A MAJOR UNIVERSITY.

WE RECOGNIZE AND WORK TO ADDRESS ISSUES AROUND EVENTS, TRAFFIC, CONSTRUCTION AND OTHER IMPACTS ACROSS THE UNIVERSITY BOUNDARY.

AFTER THE JANUARY 20TH HEARING WE MADE MODIFICATIONS IN RESPONSE TO CONCERNS AND WERE STUDYING TRAFFIC ON AGATE STREET TO IDENTIFY IMPROVEMENTS FOR ALL TRAVEL MONTHS.

THE WORK IS IN ADDITION TO THE TPR ANALYSIS.

A STRONG RELATIONSHIP WITH THE NEIGHBORHOOD MATTERS TO US.

WE HAVE CONTINUED TO MEET WITH NEIGHBORS, WE UNDERSTAND THEIR POSITION AND RECOGNIZE ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSAL WE MUST AGREE TO DISAGREE.

WHEN THINKING ABOUT THE PROPOSAL TO INCREASE HEIGHT, IT IS USEFUL TO COMPARE THE WALNUT STATIONARY ON 15TH AVENUE. CITY CODE TREATS 15 AVENUE, 65 FOOT RIGHT AWAY AS THE TRANSITION BETWEEN SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES AND THE TALLER MIXED USE CENTER TO PROTECT THE RESIDENTIAL CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

THE LARGE STREET HAS A RIGHT OF WAY ABRUPTLY 100 FEET WIDE AND HAS A LANDSCAPE WITH TREES CREATING A LARGER PHYSICAL BUFFER.

UNDER WALNUT STATION ZONING A 90-FOOT-TALL BUILDING CAN BE 55 FEET FROM 15TH AVENUE.

THE UNIVERSITY'S PROPOSAL WOULD ALLOW AN 85-FOOT-TALL BUILDING FROM THE WEST SIDE OF THE STREET.

FAR MORE DISTANT THAN THE WALNUT STATION TRANSITION.

THESE AMENDMENTS ARE NECESSARY TO HAVE THE ABILITY TO BUILD MORE ON-CAMPUS STUDENT HOUSING WHEN NEEDED AND EXPANDING ON-CAMPUS HOUSING SUPPORTS BROADER COMMUNITY GOALS TO INCREASE HOUSING SUPPLY.

APPROVAL OF THIS PROPOSAL WILL ALLOW THE UNIVERSITY TO CREATE A WALKABLE, VIBRANT STUDENT-CENTERED COMMITTEE WITH A RANGE OF HOUSING OPTIONS. THANK YOU.

>> DO WE HAVE ANY INTERESTED PARTIES ASKING TO SPEAK?

>> THANK YOU, YES, WE DO.

PLEASE PUT A LIST OF SPEAKERS ON THE SCREEN.

WE HAVE 24 SPEAKERS SIGNED UP I SPLIT THEM INTO THREE SHEETS.

SUPPORT, NEUTRAL, OPPOSED.

JUST FOR CONTEXT.

IF YOU HAVE SIGNED UP TO SPEAK VIA ZOOM PLEASE TAKE THIS TIME TO ENSURE YOUR SCREEN NAME INSOMUCH AS YOUR LAST

NAME AND MATCHES THE NAME, INCLUDE YOUR LAST NAME AND MATCHES THE NAME YOU USED TO SIGN UP TO SPEAK.

IF YOUR SCREEN NAME DOES NOT MATCH, WE CANNOT ALLOW YOU TO SPEAK WHEN IT IS YOUR TURN.

I WILL ANNOUNCE TWO SPEAKER NAMES AT A TIME, WHEN YOU ARE CALLED TO SPEAK THE STATE YOUR NAME AND WARD OR NEIGHBORHOOD IF KNOWN BEFORE BEGINNING YOUR COMMENTS.

IF YOU ARE PROVIDING TESTIMONY VIA ZOOM WHEN IT IS YOUR TURN, WE WILL ANNOUNCE YOUR NAME AND ALLOW YOU TO SPEAK.

WHEN YOU ARE ANNOUNCED AS THE NEXT SPEAKER AND YOU ARE PHYSICALLY IN THE ROOM THESE MOVED 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 HE 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 2 1/2 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 HALF MINUTE MARK. PLEASE NOTE SCREEN SHARING OR DISPLAYING INFORMATION ON THE SCREEN IS NOT ALLOWED.

AND ANY MISUSE OF THE PLATFORM OR VIOLATION OF THE COUNCIL CODE OF CONDUCT WILL RESULT IN IMMEDIATE TERMINATION OF SPEAKING PRIVILEGE.

PLEASE NOTE THE USE OF PROFANITY IS NOT PROHIBITED OR IS NOT PERMITTED.

THE USE OF PROFANITY IS NOT PERMITTED.

OUR FIRST SPEAKERS ARE MICHAEL FOLLOWED BY HENRY.

>> HELLO, CITY COUNCIL. THANK YOU FOR HAVING US AND STAFF, MY NAME IS MICHAEL AND I SERVE AS THE ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT SERVICES AND ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT AND THE DIRECTOR OF THE UNIVERSITY HOUSING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON.

I STRONGLY URGE YOU TO SUPPORT THE CHANGES.

THIS IS REALLY A NEEDED EVOLUTION TO THIS PROCESS.

THIS ORDINANCE IS AT ITS CORE ABOUT A STRONG EUGENE COMMUNITY, STRONG UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY, STUDENT SUCCESS, INCLUSION AND BELONGING.

STUDENTS WHO LIVE ON CAMPUS IN UNIVERSITY OF OREGON'S RESIDENCE HALL HAVE HIGHER GRADES, STAYED AT HIGHER RATES, GRADUATED HIGHER RATES AND GRADUATE FASTER.

STUDENTS WHO LIVE ON CAMPUS ARE MORE ENGAGED, CONNECTED, FEEL A STRONGER SENSE OF BELONGING AND FEEL MORE SUPPORT. THE RESIDENCE HALLS CLOSELY ADJACENT TO ONE ANOTHER FORM A COMMUNITY WITHIN A COMMUNITY, HEIGHTENS CONNECTION, INCLUSION AND BELONGING.

BECAUSE IT STUDENTS WHO LIVE ON CAMPUS SUCCEED AT HIGHER RATES, THE UNIVERSITY A STRONGER.

WHEN THE UNIVERSITY IS STRONGER, THE GREATER UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY AND EUGENE COMMUNITY ARE STRONGER.

HOUSING IS EXPENSIVE.

BUILDING AS EFFICIENTLY AS POSSIBLE HELPS TO REDUCE COSTS AND INCREASE ACCESS. THIS ALLOWS FOR MUCH MORE HOUSING TO BE BUILT MUCH MORE EFFICIENTLY.

THE UNIVERSITY NEEDS TO BE ABLE TO BUILD ADEQUATE, CONTIGUOUSLY ON-CAMPUS HOUSING SO MORE STUDENTS ARE NOT PUSHED INTO AN ALREADY TIGHT RENTAL MARKET DISPLACING FAMILIES, INCREASING RENT AND FORCING STUDENTS AND NONSTUDENTS FURTHER FROM CAMPUS.

FURTHER FROM TRANSIT AND FURTHER FROM SUPPORT SERVICES.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON'S BEAUTIFUL CAMPUS, THE UNIVERSITY HAS BEEN PURCHASING PROPERTIES IN EAST CAMPUS FOR OVER 70 YEARS.

FOR THE PURPOSE OF BEING ABLE TO EXPAND WHEN NEEDED.

OCCUPANCY HAS INCREASED OVER 40% IN THE LAST 20 YEARS.

SINCE THE LAST ORDINANCE ON THIS CAMPUS OVERLAY THAT WAS REVIEWED. APPROVING THIS ORDINANCE IS NOT JUST A ZONING DECISION, IT IS A STUDENT SUCCESS DECISION, LONGING AND INCLUSION, STRENGTHENING THE UNIVERSITY, STRENGTHENING THE GREATER EUGENE COMMUNITY DECISION.

THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, OUR NEXT SPEAKER IS HENRY FOLLOWED BY JENNY.

>> GOOD EVENING, THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK TODAY IN FAVOR OF THIS PROPOSAL.

SPEAKING BOTH AS A COMMUNITY MEMBER, ALSO AS A STUDENT SETTING, URBAN PLANNING AND PUBLIC POLICY, I AM CURRENTLY A SENIOR AND A STUDENT WHO LIVED ON CAMPUS FOR TWO YEARS, ONE OF WHICH I WAS A RESIDENT ASSISTANT.

DURING MY EXPERIENCE IT WAS MY RESPONSIBILITY TO SUPPORT FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS LIVING ON CAMPUS.

THROUGH THIS I SAW THE BENEFITS OF LIVING ON CAMPUS BOTH IN THE STUDENTS I SUPPORT AND IN MY OWN EXPERIENCE.

MANY OF THOSE BENEFITS INCLUDE A LOWER FINANCIAL BURDEN FOR THE STUDENTS, HIGHER ACADEMIC SUCCESS, LESS OF A NEED FOR STUDENTS TO OWN OR USE A CAR THEMSELVES.

AND AN INCREASED RATE OF WALKING, BIKING AND USING PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AROUND THE COMMUNITY.

AS MY EXPERIENCE HAS BEEN STUDYING URBAN PLANNING AND PUBLIC POLICY, I CAN ATTEST THIS IS THE IDEAL LOCATION TO CONTINUE TO BUILD RESIDENTS AROUND THE UNIVERSITY.

CONNECTING STUDENTS WITH THE CAMPUS WITH BIKE LANES, WALK ABILITY, PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AND BRINGS PEERS TOGETHER AROUND THE SUPPORT SYSTEM THE UNIVERSITY OFFERS FOR STUDENTS.

I ENCOURAGE YOU OR I WOULD LIKE TO REMIND THE COUNCIL THAT BY SUPPORTING THIS MEASURE YOU WILL BE INCREASING THE TOTAL NUMBER OF RENTAL SPACES ACROSS THE ENTIRE CITY OF EUGENE BY SUPPORTING THE STUDENTS AND UNIVERSITY BUT ALSO THE BROADER UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY.

I WOULD LIKE TO REMIND THE COUNCIL THAT ON THE CITY OF EUGENE WEBSITE UNDER THE URGENT COMMUNITY NEEDS IS THE CITY'S GOAL TO STABILIZE HOUSING COSTS ACROSS THE ENTIRE COMMUNITY AND I WOULD LIKE TO REMIND YOU THIS IS AN OPPORTUNITY TO TAKE A STEP TOWARDS ACHIEVING THE GOAL BOTH IN SUPPORTING THE ENTIRE CITY OF EUGENE AND ALL THE STUDENTS AND FACULTY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON.

>> THANK YOU, ONE REMINDER TO OUR SPEAKERS, PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, YOUR WARD OR NEIGHBORHOOD IF KNOWN AND EVEN THOUGH I HAVE SEPARATED INTO THREE GROUPS, PLEASE CONFIRM WHETHER YOU ARE IN SUPPORT OF, NEUTRAL TWO OR OPPOSED TO THIS REFINEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT.

OUR NEXT SPEAKERS ARE JENNY FOLLOWED BY BOB.

>> I BETTER NOT MESS THIS UP.

JENNY, WARD 3, I AM IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSAL BEFORE YOU.

I LIVE THREE BLOCKS FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, I AM VERY FAMILIAR WITH THE PRESSURES THAT COME FROM LIVING IN PROXIMITY TO THE UNIVERSITY, THAT IS ONE REASON WE LIVE THERE IS BECAUSE WE WANT TO BE IN THAT UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT.

I AM ON THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND IN THAT CAPACITY AS WELL AS WARD 3 I AM HERE TESTIFYING IN SUPPORT OF THIS TONIGHT.

I WOULD REFER YOU TO SOME PREVIOUS TESTIMONY SUBMITTED ON THE ORIGINAL PROPOSAL THAT WAS BEFORE YOU AND SOME OF THE POINTS THAT HAVE BEEN MADE ABOUT HOW THIS IS BETTER FOR STUDENTS, THE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF OUR STUDENTS, I THINK ULTIMATELY BETTER FOR OUR NEIGHBORHOOD BECAUSE HAVING STUDENTS CONCENTRATED ON CAMPUS WHERE THEY ARE SUPERVISED, THEY SPOKE ABOUT BEING IN THE RA, WE DON'T HAVE THOSE IN THE RENTALS IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD SO IT IS I THINK A STEP UP FOR THE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT FOR THE

NEIGHBORHOOD BUT ALSO IT HELPS THE UNIVERSITY SUCCEED IN A VERY COMPETITIVE ENVIRONMENT FOR STUDENTS RIGHT NOW.

ONE OF [AUDIO ISSUES] ONE REASON PEOPLE DON'T COME TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON IS BECAUSE WE DON'T HAVE WHAT THEY CONSIDER SUITABLE OR UP TO MODERN STANDARDS, WE HAVE BEEN CHIPPING AWAY AT THAT AND WE HAVE SOME GOOD TERMS THAT HAVE COME ONLINE BUT THIS IS -- AS YOU LOOK AT THE DEMOGRAPHIC CLIFF IF YOU ARE FAMILIAR WITH THAT IN HIGHER EDUCATION, THERE IS MORE COMPETITION FOR FEWER STUDENTS, THIS WILL HELP US COMPETITIVELY AND FRANKLY IN EUGENE I THINK WE NOW THE UNIVERSITY IS SUPER IMPORTANT TO US ECONOMICALLY, IT IS OUR MAJOR EMPLOYER AND I LOOK FORWARD TO PARTNERING WITH THE CITY AND WORKING COLLABORATIVELY WITH THE CITY ON MAKING THE UNIVERSITY AS STRONG AND SUCCESSFUL AS IT CAN BE. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ACCEPTING MY TESTIMONY.

>> THANK YOU, OUR NEXT SPEAKER IS BOB FOLLOWED BY JACOB FOX.

>> COUNCIL MEMBERS, THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK AGAIN IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSED LAND USE CHANGES RELATED TO THE EAST CAMPUS AREA.

I AM HERE IN MY CAPACITY AS CHAIR OF THE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE.

AND THE CBC MISSION IS TO ADVISE THE PRESIDENT ON LONG-RANGE CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT WITH REGARDS TO BUILDING, LANDSCAPING AND TRANSPORTATION POLICY.

I SUPPORT THE PROPOSED CHANGES AS THEY WILL ACCOMMODATE THE CURRENT AND FUTURE NEEDS OF ON-CAMPUS STUDENT HOUSING IN THE EAST CAMPUS AREA.

ON-CAMPUS HOUSING IMPROVES STUDENT PERFORMANCE, REDUCES ACADEMIC COSTS, AS TO THE OVERALL HOUSING SUPPLY AND INTENTIONALLY CONNECTS AND ENGAGES STUDENTS WITH UNIVERSITY.

UNIVERSITY HAS IDENTIFIED EAST CAMPUS AREA FOR FUTURE STUDENT HOUSING.

THE PROXIMITY TO TRANSIT AND COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY ALONG FRANKLIN BOULEVARD MAKES THIS AND THE IDEAL LOCATION FOR ON-CAMPUS STUDENT HOUSING.

THE PROPOSED LAND USE CHANGES WILL ALLOW THE UNIVERSITY TO REALIZE THE VISION ESTABLISHED IN THE NEXT GENERATION HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PLAN THAT SUPPORTS STUDENT SUCCESS AND MAKES EFFICIENT USE OF LIMITED UNIVERSITY LAND.

THE PROPOSED LAND USE CHANGES ARE CRITICAL TO INCREASING HOUSING SUPPLY ON-CAMPUS AND WITHIN THE COMMUNITY. IT IS MY PLEASURE TO ENDORSE THE APPROVAL OF THIS APPLICATION.

>> THANK YOU, BOB.

>> COUNCIL MEMBERS MY NAME IS JACOB FOX, THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF HOMES FOR GOOD AND SPEAKING IN SUPPORT OF THIS APPLICATION TODAY.

HOMES FOR GOOD IS THE LARGEST PORTABLE HOUSING PROVIDER IN MY COUNTY, WE PROVIDE OVER 5,000 HOUSEHOLDS ACROSS THE COUNTY.

THERE IS NOTHING THAT HOMES FOR GOOD AND OTHER COMMUNITY BASED ORGANIZATIONS TO BUILD ENOUGH HOUSING TO ADDRESS THE NEED IN OUR COMMUNITY. THE BOTTOM LINE IS WE HAVE A VERY UNHEALTHY HOUSING MARKET AND I THINK WE ALL HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO CREATE PATHWAYS TO INCREASE HOUSING PRODUCTION IN OUR COMMUNITY.

JUST A FEW STATISTICS.

RENTAL PRICES HAVE GONE UP OVER 40% IN THE LAST FIVE YEARS.

THE PRICE OF A HOME HAS GONE UP 88%.

THAT IS THE REASON WHY THERE ARE SO MANY PEOPLE THAT WE SEE EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS EVERY DAY BECAUSE OUR HOUSING MARKET AND WE HAVEN'T BUILT ENOUGH HOUSING.

SO BASICALLY AS A COMMUNITY WE HAVE TO DECREASE REGULATIONS AND MODIFY OVERLAYS SO WE CAN PROVIDE MORE HOUSING. WE BUILD ABOUT 1,000 UNITS A YEAR IN LANE COUNTY,

WE WILL JUST NOT TAKE OUT OF THE HOLE WE ARE IN IF WE STICK WITH THE STATUS QUO.

I URGE THE COUNCIL TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION AND CREATE PATHWAYS TO INCREASE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT.

>> THANK YOU, JACOB.

>> GOOD EVENING, COUNCILOR'S AND STAFF.

ORIGINALLY FROM BEAVERTON OREGON BUT I LIVE IN WARD 1. I SERVE ON THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON'S CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE AND THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND I AM A STUDENT AT THE COLLEGE OF DESIGN STUDYING PLANNING AND PUBLIC POLICY. I AM HERE TO SPEAK IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSED LAND USE CODE AMENDMENTS.

RELATED TO THE UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT OF THE EAST CAMPUS AREA.

I WANT TO FOCUS MY COMMENTS LESS ON THE PLANS AND POLICY AND MORE OF WHAT IT MEANS FOR STUDENTS.

WHERE STUDENTS LIVE, FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS HAVE THEIR EXPERIENCE IN COLLEGE BOTH ACADEMICALLY AND PERSONALLY.

LIVING ON CAMPUS CREATES ACCESS TO CLASSES, CAMPUS RESOURCES AND IMMUNITY.

STUDENTS WHO LIVE ON CAMPUS ARE MORE LIKELY TO SUCCEED ACADEMICALLY, STAY CONNECTED AND FEEL LIKE THEY BELONG.

IT ALSO REDUCES PRESSURE ON EUGENE'S RENTAL MARKET, WHICH MATTERS NOT JUST FOR STUDENTS BUT FOR THE LARGER COMMUNITY AS WELL.

NEITHER OF MY PARENTS WENT TO COLLEGE AND NAVIGATING MY FIRST YEAR IN HOUSING EXPERIENCE WAS INCREDIBLY IMPORTANT TO ME.

BEING SURROUNDED BY OTHER FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS MEANT I WASN'T GOING THROUGH THIS TRANSITIONAL LOAN. SOME SHARED HIMMLER BACKGROUNDS WHILE OTHERS BROUGHT A COMPLETELY DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE AND THAT IS THE MIX OF ANY ACADEMIC COMMUNITY. THOSE EVERYDAY INTERACTIONS THAT HELP SHAPE MY SENSE OF BELONGING AND SUCCESS FOR MORE THAN I EXPECTED.

AS THE UNIVERSITY CONTINUES TO GROW, CREATING MORE OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENTS TO HAVE THAT KIND OF EXPERIENCE THAT MATTERS.

THIS PROPOSAL HELPS MAKE THAT POSSIBLE.

BY ALLOWING ADDITIONAL STUDENT HOUSING IN A LOCATION THAT MAKE SENSE. CLOSE TO CAMPUS.

CLOSE TO TRANSPORTATION, CLOSE TO EXISTING SERVICES.

THIS IS AN ABOUT SUDDEN CHANGE BUT ABOUT CONTINUING A LONG PLANNED EFFORT TO MEET STUDENT'S NEEDS IN A THOUGHTFUL WAY WHILE BEING MINDFUL OF SURROUNDING AREA IN THE BROADER COMMUNITY.

FOR THOSE REASONS ON BEHALF OF THE STUDENTS I REPRESENT, I RESPECTFULLY URGE THE COUNCIL TO SUPPORT THESE AMENDMENTS.

IS ULTIMATELY ABOUT CREATING MORE OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENTS TO SUCCEED AND FEEL HERE AT HOME IN BEAUTIFUL EUGENE. THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION.

>> THANK YOU, OUR NEXT SPEAKERS ARE DAVID MORGAN FOLLOWED BY PETER CROFT.

>> HELLO, MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL.

I AM A RESIDENT OF WARD THREE AND A STUDENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON AND A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND EMPLOYEE OF UNIVERSITY HOUSING. THE DEPARTMENT RESPONSIBLE FOR BUILDING STUDENT HOUSING AT THE CENTER OF TONIGHT'S CONVERSATION. I WANT TO SAY SOME THING THAT IS DIFFERENT THAN THE PUBLIC HOUSING YOU HAVE HEARD AND THAT IS TALKING ABOUT THE NATURE OF THE PROCEEDING THAT IT IS JUDICIAL.

THAT MEANS THE QUESTION BEFORE YOU TODAY IS NOT WHETHER YOU LIKE THIS PROJECT, THE LAST TIME THE ORDINANCE CAME BEFORE THE BODY NEARLY ALL THE TESTIMONY I HEARD INCLUDING MY OWN WAS ON MERIT. PROPONENTS TALKED ABOUT THE NEED FOR HOUSING, SPOKE ABOUT DENSITY, TRAFFIC AND WHAT BUILDINGS WOULD MEAN FOR SURROUNDING STREETS AND SO FAR, THAT HAS BEEN THE CASE TODAY.

WHILE IT IS NEITHER WRONG TO CARE ABOUT THOSE THINGS, NOR IS IT WRONG FOR THEM TO BE PRESENTED, THE PROCEEDINGS DO NOT ASK YOU TO WEIGH PREFERENCE. THEY ASKED THE QUESTION VERY SPECIFICALLY DID THE APPLICANT FULFILL THE LEGAL OBLIGATIONS AND APPROVAL CRITERIA REQUIRED FOR THE PROJECT.

I FIRMLY BELIEVE WE DID AND THAT IS WHAT I AM TESTING FRYING IN SUPPORT OF. THE UNIVERSITY SUBMITTED THREE LAND-USE APPLICATIONS, REFINEMENT, CODE END ZONE CHANGE VALUED AGAINST CODIFIED CRITERIA STATED BY PLANNING GOALS, THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND AREAS PACIFIC PLANS, THE PLANNING COMMISSION VOTED 4-0 TO ADVANCE THE PROPOSAL AND IT DID APPEAR TO MEET THE APPROVAL CRITERIA AS ARTICULATED BY STAFF.

BEFORE THAT THERE WERE TWO YEARS OF PLANNING AND OPEN HOUSE AND CAMPUS PLANNING COMMITTEE PUBLIC HEARING IN OCTOBER OF 2,024 AND EVEN THE MOST RECENT WHEN NEIGHBORS RAISED CONCERNS THE UNIVERSITY DIDN'T DIG IN BUT MODIFIED THE PROPOSAL.

I WORK IN THE DEPARTMENT THAT IS BUILDING THESE STORMS AND I SIT ON THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, I KNOW WHAT IT TOOK TO GET HERE.

EVERY REQUIRED CHANNEL, RIGHT AWAY, ON RECORD AND SUBJECT TO REVIEW.

NOT APPROXIMATELY BUT ALL OF IT.

THE QUESTION BEFORE YOU TODAY IS, IS THIS GOOD OR NOT, IT IS DID THE APPLICANT DO WHAT IS REQUIRED?

I SAY YES, I BELIEVE THE RECORD SAYS YES, I KNOW THE PLANNING COMMISSION SAID YES, I HOPE YOUR VOTE WOULD SAY THE SAME.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

>> THANK YOU. OUR NEXT TWO SPEAKERS ARE PETER CROFT FOLLOWED BY TIFFANY EDWARDS.

>> OKAY, I WASN'T EXPECTING -- TO BE HERE QUITE SO SOON BUT I THINK I CAN DEAL WITH IT.

I LIVE ON 19TH AND I TOOK A NEUTRAL POSITION HERE BECAUSE I AM ON THE BORDER.

I HAVE 65 YEARS HERE BEING PART OF THE UNIVERSITY AS A STUDENT, TEACHER IN THE DESIGN DEPARTMENT, AS A BOARD MEMBER, AND AS A DONOR TO THE UNIVERSITY. I PROBABLY HAVE

WALKED THE CAMPUS MORE THAN ALMOST ANYBODY, CERTAINLY IN THE TOP 10%.

I AM DOWN THERE ALL THE TIME.

I AM GLAD TO SEE THE DENSITY THAT EXISTS IN THE DORMITORIES BUT ON THE CAMPUS NOW, I AM VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE LINE AND I SAY THAT WITH A LOT OF EXPERIENCE IN DEALING WITH THE INCREASED DENSIFICATION OF MY NEIGHBORHOOD.

AND SEEING PRESSURE FROM THE CITY AND PRESSURE FROM ME UNIVERSITY OPERATING IN A WAY THAT IS HARD TO UNDERSTAND OFTEN WHERE YOU WILL THINK THERE IS AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE NEIGHBORHOOD GROUP AND THERE WAS A TIME WHEN THE GROUPS HAD MORE FORMAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE CITY THAT WERE KIND OF DEFINED AND THERE WERE RULES AND YOU WOULD SEE IN MY NEIGHBORHOOD THE IDEA OF GRANDMOTHER COTTAGES, WAS ACCEPTED AND EXPANDING AND THERE WERE THESE AGREEMENTS AND YOU WOULD SEE A PERMIT ON A BUILDING IN THE ALLEYWAY AND HE WOULD CALL THE CITY AND SAY WHAT'S GOING ON?

AND THE CITY WOULD SAY THEY ARE PUTTING THEIR WASHER AND DRYER IN THE OLD GARAGE.

THEN YOU WOULD SEE IN THE AIR CONDITIONING UNIT GOING UP FOR WHAT?

AND YOU WOULD CALL THE CITY AND YOU WOULD STILL GET THIS NOT HONEST REPLY.

THE UNIVERSITY IS IN THE BACKGROUND TO ALL OF THAT.

--

>> THANK YOU, PETER, YOUR TIME IS CONCLUDED.

YOUR TIME IS CONCLUDED.

YOUR TIME IS CONCLUDED.

>> WHAT NEEDS TO HAPPEN IS THE UNIVERSITY NEEDS TO DO
DRAWING.

>> PETER, I AM SORRY, YOUR TIME IS CONCLUDED AND YOU MAY
SUBMIT STATION

>> YOU MAY SUBMIT WRITTEN TESTIMONY ONLINE. THANK YOU. OUR
NEXT FIGURES ARE TIFFANY EDWARDS FOLLOWED BY DAVID WADE.

OUR NEXT SPEAKERS ARE AND I WILL SURE THE FINALIST.

DAVID WADE FOLLOWED BY JOHN BOROFISKY.

AND HERE IS THIS LIST OF THE LAST SPEAKERS FOR THE EVENING.

>> ONCE AGAIN, IT IS WONDERFUL TO BE IN THIS TEMPLE OF DEMOCRACY AND TO SEE ALL OF YOU HERE.

I AM GOING TO SPEAK ABOUT PROCESS, WE DIDN'T HAVE ONE HERE.

THE UNIVERSITY DID NOT ENGAGE THE NEIGHBORHOOD IN A 20-YEAR-OLD PROCESS BY WHICH WE COULD HAVE AVOIDED ALL OF THIS.

YES, THEY ANNOUNCED THEIR PLANS AND SAID LOVE IT OR LEAVE IT.

NUMBER 2, THE PLANNING COMMISSION, A MAJORITY SAID WE DON'T UNDERSTAND THIS, WE CAN'T EVALUATE, WE ARE GOING TO VOTE YES. GREAT.

THE STAFF, THE STAFF MISSED ALL THE STUFF THE UNIVERSITY WITHDREW AFTER THE NEIGHBORS COMPLAINED, THEY MUST ALL OF IT.

AND YES IT IS A JUDICIAL PROCESS, ONE THAT APPLIES THE METRO CODE, WHICH HAS A SPECIFIC PROVISION FOR PROJECTS LIKE THIS AND THEIR EFFECT ON RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS.

UNIVERSITY NEVER MENTIONED THAT METRO CODE PROVISION IN ANY OF ITS VOLUMINOUS PAPERWORK AND THE STAFF DIDN'T CATCH IT.

SO CITY COUNCIL YOU ARE SITTING WITHOUT ANY HELP ON THIS PROJECT.

WE HAVE OFFERED HELP AND THAT HELP IS IN THE FORM OF TESTIMONY WHICH I SUPPORT FROM EVERYONE NEIGHBORS. I SHOULD SAY I LIVE AT 1,673 VILLARD STREET, I AM DIRECTLY ACROSS FROM THE FOUR BLOCK WALL OF 85 FOOT BUILDINGS, THEY ARE PROPOSING.

TO GET THROUGH THIS COUNSEL.

AND THEY SAY THIS IS ALL FOR THE STUDENTS. IT ISN'T, THIS IS A REAL ESTATE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT BY THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON TO TRY TO MAKE MONEY IN PLACE OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR. THE PRIVATE SECTOR HAS RESPONDED TO THE NEED FOR STUDENT HOUSING, YOU CAN SEE THE 15 STORY BUILDINGS ALL OVER OUR NEIGHBORHOOD, THE DIFFERENCES THEY DIDN'T BUILD IT IN RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS.

THEY PAY PROPERTY TAXES WHICH THE UNIVERSITY DOES NOT, THEY PAY NOT BASED ON ASSESSED VALUE.

THEY WANT TO TAKE AWAY BUSINESS FROM PRIVATE DEVELOPERS WHO PAY TAXES, THAT IS WHAT THIS IS ALL ABOUT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> OUR NEXT SPEAKERS ARE JOHN BOROFKY FOLLOWED BY MARY JAKE.

>> GOOD EVENING, WARD 3 IN OPPOSITION.

CITY COUNCIL, MAYOR, I AM HERE TO TESTIFY ON THE PLAN AMENDMENT BEFORE YOU TONIGHT.

AS A FORMER PLANNING COMMISSIONER I AM AWARE OF THE COMPLEXITY, DECISION FOR YOU.

IT'S VERY CHALLENGING AS A DECISION-MAKER TO BE ABLE TO UNDERSTAND ALL OF THE NUANCES OF THE CRITERIA YOU ARE BEING CHALLENGED, THAT ARE BEING ASKED TO DIGEST.

EVEN MORE SO BECAUSE OF THE FACT THIS IS QUASI JUDICIAL SO GETTING INPUT FROM INTERESTED PARTIES IS LIMITED.

NEIGHBORS HAVE ARTICULATED SEVERAL CRITERIA THAT ARE QUESTIONABLE.

REMEMBER, IT IS THE APPLICANT'S JOB TO MEET THE APPROVAL CRITERIA.

I WANT TO POINT OUT YOU HAVE THE OPTION TO APPROVE, DENY OR APPROVE WITH MODIFICATION.

IN THIS CASE THE BEST AND FASTEST WAY TO ACHIEVE THE OUTCOMES THAT BOTH THE NEIGHBORS AND THE UNIVERSITY WANT IS TO DENY THE APPLICATION, LET THE PARTIES WORK OUT THE DIFFERENCES.

THIS WOULD NOT BE YOU OPPOSING THE STATED GOALS OF THE UNIVERSITY OR THE NEIGHBORS. IT WOULD BE A WAY FOR YOU TO, AS OUR ELECTED DECISION-MAKERS, SAYING WE CAN DO BETTER FOR ALL INVOLVED.

LOOKING BACK AT MY TIME ON THE PLANNING COMMISSION I SAT ON SEVERAL QUASI JUDICIAL DECISIONS AND I HEARD THE GOOD ARGUMENTS ON BOTH SIDES AND THE ARGUMENTS THAT YOU HAVE HEARD TONIGHT FROM THE PROPONENTS ARE VALID.

ALL OF THOSE ARE GREAT IDEAS.

WHAT YOU ARE ASKED IS TO USE THE APPROVAL CRITERIA TO MAKE THE DECISION.

WHEN I WAS ON THE PLANNING COMMISSION THAT IS WHAT WE HAD TO DO AND WE FORWARDED THAT DECISION TO YOU AS THE DECISION-MAKERS.

WE COULDN'T SAY YES, I HEAR YOU.

YOUR CONCERNS ARE VALID AND I BELIEVE IT, WE HAD TO LOOK AT THE CRITERIA.

IN THIS SITUATION BOTH THE OPPONENTS AND PEOPLE IN FAVOR OF THESE HAVE GREAT THINGS TO SAY ABOUT THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND THE UNIVERSITY.

YOU CAN REFUSE IT AND NOT BE BAD GUYS, YOU CAN REFUSE THIS THING AND LET US WORK IT OUT AND MAKE SURE WE GET THE BEST RESULT FOR THE WHOLE CITY AND UNIVERSITY. THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU. OUR NEXT SPEAKERS ARE MARY JAKE FOLLOWED BY CAROL ISAACSON.

>> MY NAME IS MARY JAKE AND I HAVE LIVED IN WARD 3 IN THE VERMONT NEIGHBORHOOD AT 1,755 ORCHARD STREET [AUDIO ISSUES] I OPPOSE THIS REFINEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT.

I BELIEVE THAT FURTHER REVIEW AND NEIGHBOR ENGAGEMENT CAN LEAD TO [AUDIO ISSUES] I AM HERE IN SUPPORT OF MY NEIGHBORS AND THE FAIRMONT NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION AS YOU REVIEW THE TESTIMONY WE ARE SUBMITTING TO YOU TONIGHT.

[AUDIO ISSUES] THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, OUR NEXT SPEAKERS ARE CAROL ISAACSON FOLLOWED BY SUSAN MICKELSON.

>> I AM CAROL ISAACSON, WARD 3. HOMEOWNER IN FAIRMONT NEIGHBORHOOD FOR ABOUT 30 YEARS NOW.

I AM A U OF O GRADUATE AND I SUPPORT THE UNIVERSITY [AUDIO ISSUES] I AM OPPOSED TO THE CHANGES THEY HAVE PROPOSED.

I WAS AT THE MEETINGS WHEN THE UNIVERSITY CAME AND ATTENDED AND ENSURED US NEIGHBORS THE BUILDING HEIGHT WOULD BE NO MORE THAN THREE AND HALF STORIES HIGH.

THERE WERE OPEN HOUSES BUT ALL OF THAT TRANSPARENCY ONE AWAY WHEN THE CHANGES TO DOUBLING THE HEIGHT STRUCTURE AND REMOVING SETBACKS, ALL THAT DISAPPEARED ONCE THOSE CHANGES WERE FORWARDED. I DISAGREE WITH THE UNIVERSITY'S DECISION THAT THIS IS GOOD FOR STUDENTS.

IT IS PROXIMITY TO CAMPUS THAT ENSURES GOOD GRADES. NOT NECESSARILY LIVING ON CAMPUS.

THERE ARE OTHER STUDIES THAT SHOW THAT AS WELL.

THE OTHER THING IS THE UNIVERSITY IS THE DEMOGRAPHIC -- IS FAST APPROACHING, THERE ARE 4,600 STUDENTS THAT ARE FRESHMAN, THEY HAVE WITH CURRENT ESTIMATES OVER 5,000 UNITS CURRENTLY.

THIS IMPENDING HOUSING CRISIS FOR THE STUDENTS WITH THE REDUCTION, OREGON IS GOING TO REDUCE BY 19%, HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES. CALIFORNIA IS GOING TO BE REDUCED BY 29 AND WASHINGTON BY 8%. THIS IS GOING TO PERSIST FOR OVER 20 YEARS.

THERE IS A HUGE DROP IN STUDENTS.

THE FACT THAT THERE IS THIS HOUSING CRISIS FOR STUDENT HOUSING I AM NOT SEEING IT AND THE NUMBERS DON'T MAKE SENSE TO ME. THE OTHER THING IS THE ASSUMPTION THIS IS GOING TO RELEASE HOUSING FOR THE REST OF EUGENE, STUDENT

HOUSING AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING ARE TWO DIFFERENT THINGS. THE REASONS PEOPLE, STUDENTS GO LOOKING FOR HOUSING OUTSIDE OF THE UNIVERSITY BECAUSE THE PRICE OF RESIDENTIAL HALLS ARE RIDICULOUS.

>> THANK YOU, OUR NEXT SPEAKERS ARE SUSAN FOLLOWED BY ARTHUR FARLEY.

>> I AM SUSAN AND I AM ADAMANTLY OPPOSED TO THIS.

THIS IS ABOUT MONEY. IT IS ABOUT THE BUILDING INDUSTRY, BUILDING TAX-FREE, IT IS NOT ABOUT STUDENTS, EXCEPT FOR THE FACT THAT THE UNIVERSITY MAKES MONEY HOUSING STUDENTS. IT IS ABOUT MONEY, THE UNIVERSITY TRYING TO MAKE ANY, 18-YEAR-OLD ARE GOING DOWN IN NUMBERS. THEY ARE SHRINKING POPULATION.

BUT NOT ONLY ARE THEY SHRINKING POPULATION, THEY ARE NOT GOING TO UNIVERSITY ANYMORE.

BECAUSE UNIVERSITIES ARE SO EXPENSIVE.

AND WHAT DO YOU GET OUT OF IT?

HOW MANY OF US ONE THREE UNIVERSITY AND ACTUALLY DID WHAT WE STUDIED TO DO?

NOT MANY.

AND YOU CAN'T AFFORD TO DO THAT NOW.

IF YOU PASS THIS YOU ARE BASICALLY SAYING THE PROTECTIONS YOU PROMISED US ON HEIGHT ARE OUT THE WINDOW. AT THAT POINT EVERY 10 YEARS THE UNIVERSITY DOES THIS TO US, EVERY YEAR THEY GET AWAY WITH IT, WHY HAVE A CITY GOVERNMENT IF YOU ARE NOT GOING TO LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE.

THE UNIVERSITY ISN'T THE PEOPLE.

IT'S AN EMPLOYER BUT NOT THE PEOPLE YOU SERVE.

YOU NEED TO SERVE US.

WE HAVE BEEN MORE THAN REASONABLE WITH THE UNIVERSITY.

THEY ARE OUT TO MAKE MONEY.

IT IS ALL ABOUT THE MONEY.

>> THANK YOU, SUSAN.

OUR NEXT SPEAKERS ARE ARTHUR FARLEY FOLLOWED BY SUSIE SMITH.

>> GOOD EVENING, I LIVE AT 1,667 FAIRMOUNT BOULEVARD IN THE FAIRMONT NEIGHBORHOOD.

I THINK IT'S FAIRLY OBVIOUS A SEVEN-STORY DORMITORY, 75 FEET BEHIND HOUSES DOES NOT PROVIDE A GENTLE TRANSITION BETWEEN CAMPUS AND NEIGHBORHOOD AS THE UNIVERSITY CLAIMS AND AS METRO WOULD LIKE TO SEE IN ITS REQUIREMENTS.

I WOULD LIKE TO FOCUS ON THE OTHER ISSUE WHICH IS THIS CLAIM OF THERE IS AN IMMEDIATE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL STUDENT HOUSING.

BOTH NOW AND IN THE FUTURE.

UNIVERSITY DATA SHOWS ENROLLMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY IS THE SAME AS IT WAS 10 YEARS AGO.

AND ACTUALLY WENT DOWN A LITTLE BIT THIS YEAR.

IN THAT TIME EXTENSIVE NEW STUDENT HOUSING HAS BEEN BUILT CLOSE TO CAMPUS AND IMPRESSIVE NEW DORMS BEING BUILT ON CAMPUS AND THERE IS ANOTHER BUILD [AUDIO ISSUES] THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY SENT TO THE FACULTY THAT SAYS INCLUDING COMPETITION FOR PROSPECTIVE STUDENTS, NONRESIDENT STUDENTS IS FIERCER THAN IT HAS EVER BEEN AS THEY TRY TO OFFSET LOSSES DUE TO INTERNATIONAL ENROLLMENT UNCERTAIN STATE APPROPRIATIONS, RISING COSTS DUE TO GEOPOLITICAL TENSIONS AND RESEARCH FUNDING AND AS HAS BEEN MENTIONED THE DECLINE IN GRADUATES FROM HIGH SCHOOLS OVER THE NEXT DECADE OR SO.

SO I WOULD ASK YOU TO DENY THE PROPOSAL AS STATED AND WE HAVE TIME TO WORK THIS OUT. I WOULD ASK YOU TO REJECT IT BACK TO THE UNIVERSITY AND THE PLANNING TO WORK WITH THE DEPARTMENT, THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND TRY TO FIND A PLAN THAT MEETS EVERYBODY'S GOALS. WE EXPECT AND SEE THE NEED FOR INCREASED STUDENT HOUSING NEAR CAMPUS AND IT'S A PERFECT PLACE BUT NOT WITH HIS HEIGHT LIMITATION, WE WERE SUCCESSFUL BEFORE WORKING 20 YEARS AGO TO COME UP WITH THE EXISTING PLAN AND WE WORK WITH THE ARENA TO GET THAT APPROVED AND WORK WITH THE UNIVERSITY TO COME TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD, WE CAN LOOK AT SOME ALTERNATIVES AND HOW COULD THEY REALIZE THE SAME DENSITY WITH A DIFFERENT APPROACH RATHER THAN 75 OR 80% BY THE STREET.

LET US WORK THAT OUT, THERE IS NO NEED, NOT THIS NEED LIKE THEY HAVE TO GET THE STORM UP.

>> OUR NEXT SPEAKERS ARE SUSIE SMITH FOLLOWED BY GEORGE McCULLY.

>> GOOD EVENING, MAYOR AND COUNCIL. MY NAME IS SUSIE SMITH I LIVE AT 1,659 ORCHARD IN WARD 3 SINCE 1988, A MEMBER OF THE FAIRMOUNT NEIGHBORS BOARD AND LAND USE COMMITTEE CHAIR AND I AM HERE TO TALK ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD ABOUT THE PREPARATION OF ALL THE MATERIALS THAT WE HAVE SUBMITTED TO THE RECORD.

ALL OF WHICH ADDRESSED THE CRITERIA OF APPROVAL AS WAS OUTLINED REGARDING QUASI JUDICIAL PROCESS. WE WANT TO BRING THAT TO YOUR ATTENTION.

I HATE TALKING ABOUT MYSELF BUT WAS ASKED TO TALK ABOUT THIS BECAUSE -- I HAVE A MASTERS DEGREE IN URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON.

I HAD A 23 YEAR CAREER AT THE CITY OF SPRINGFIELD, NINE OF WHICH WAS AS A LAND USE PLANNER AND THE PLANNING SUPERVISOR DURING WHICH TIME I WROTE REFINEMENT PLANS, PROCESS REFINEMENT PLAN AND CODE AMENDMENTS, FINDINGS, ET CETERA.

RETIRING AS PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR I DEALT WITH LAND-USE ISSUES ALL THE TIME.

I AM QUALIFIED TO DO THIS WORK BUT WE ALSO CONSULTED WITH CURRENTLY PRACTICING EUGENE LAND-USE PLANNING PROFESSIONALS.

A LAND-USE ATTORNEY FOR THE EXPRESS PURPOSE OF EVALUATING THE CRITERIA, THE PROPOSAL AND ALL OF OUR ARGUMENTS FOR THEIR VALIDITY WE WANTED TO KNOW OUR ARGUMENTS AND CLAIMS ARE VALID BECAUSE WE ACTUALLY SUPPORT THE UNIVERSITY AND HOUSING OBJECTIVES BUT WHAT THEY HAVE DONE HERE IS EQUIVALENT TO TAKING A NUCLEAR POWERED CHAINSAW TO A CUBE OF BUTTER IS WHAT THEY HAVE DONE WITH THE REFINEMENT PLAN AND THE CODE AND WHAT WE WORKED SO HARD TO ACHIEVE.

SO OUR TESTIMONY IS NOT THE LONG-WINDED RAMBLINGS OF A NOT MY BACKYARD ANTIDEVELOPMENT NEIGHBORHOOD GROUP.

IT IS A CAREFUL, THOUGHTFUL, PROFESSIONAL EVALUATION AND OUR CLAIM TO YOU IS NEITHER THE APPLICANT OR THE CITY STAFF HAVE MET THE CRITERIA APPROVAL.

AND WE BELIEVE WE HAVE A LEGALLY DEFENSIVE ARGUMENT ON
NUMEROUS OF THEM SO WE HOPE YOU WILL READ TWO PIECES OF
TESTIMONY.

>> THANK YOU. OUR NEXT SPEAKERS ARE GEORGE FOLLOWED BY
SUSAN.

>> GOOD EVENING COUNSELORS, MY NAME IS GEORGE McCULLY
AND I RESIDED IN THE FAIRMONT NEIGHBORHOOD.

THE HOME IN WHICH MY FATHER WAS RAISED.

I HAVE LIVED IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD FOR MORE THAN 60 YEARS.

THIS HAS BEEN AND IS MY HOME AND HAS BEEN SO -- SO SINCE
1,915.

I SUPPORT MANY ASPECTS OF THE CURRENT PROPOSAL THAT IS
BEFORE YOU AGAIN TONIGHT.

HOWEVER FOR THE UNIVERSITY TO CLAIM THIS WILL NOT IMPACT
THE CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD FAILS TO RECOGNIZE
THIS PROPOSAL AND IN FACT MANY OF THE PREVIOUS PROPOSALS
HAVE IN FACT CHANGED THE CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

HOMES I PLAYED IN ARGON, NO CHILDREN IN THE STREETS
BECAUSE THERE ARE FEW FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN IN THE AREA
AS THE UNIVERSITY HAS TAKEN OVER OWNERSHIP OF THE HOMES
IN WHICH THE FAMILIES LIVED.

AND THE TRAFFIC ON THE STREETS HAS INCREASED ESSENTIALLY
WITH NO ATTEMPT TO ADDRESS THE TRAFFIC MOVEMENT AND
PARKING ISSUES.

BUSINESSES THAT LINED FRANKLIN BOULEVARD HAVE BEEN
REPLACED WITH THE ARENA.

AND WHY THE AROMA OF FRESHLY BAKED BREAD NO LONGER
EXISTS.

THIS IS PROGRESS BUT IT DOES COME WITH MANY COMPROMISES
AND IT HAS AFFECTED THE CHARACTER OF A HISTORIC
NEIGHBORHOOD THAT WAS ORIGINALLY ITS OWN CITY.

THE UNIVERSITY THROUGH INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE DISCUSSED
THIS WITH US HAS INDICATED ITS GOAL IS TO BE ABLE TO BUILD A
DORMITORY AND NEARLY DUPLICATE THE NEIGHBORHOOD
REQUEST.

HOWEVER THE PLAN BEFORE YOU ALLOWS THEM TO BUILD A
SIGNIFICANTLY MORE IMPOSING STRUCTURE THEN WHAT IS
PROJECTED BY THOSE INDIVIDUALS.

IF THIS IS APPROVED THE UNIVERSITY WOULD BE ALLOWED TO
BUILD NEARLY ANYTHING THEY CHOOSE IN THE FUTURE WHEN THE
INDIVIDUALS WITH WHOM WE HAVE SPOKEN ARGON.

ALL THEY ARE ASKING IS THE UNIVERSITY CURRENT VISION OF THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE OR DEVELOPMENT BE GUARANTEED BY APPROPRIATE LAND-USE PLANS RATHER THAN AN OPEN-ENDED DOCUMENT.

WE ASK YOU TO DENY THE PROPOSAL IN ITS CURRENT FORM OR AT LEAST REQUIRE MODIFICATIONS THAT WILL ENSURE COMPLIANCE IN THE FUTURE WITH THE ADOPTED PLAN AS PRESENTED TO US.

WE BELIEVE THIS WILL ALLOW THE UNIVERSITY TO CONTINUE WITH THEIR CURRENT DESIGN.

>> THANK YOU, OUR NEXT SPEAKERS ARE SUSAN FOLLOWED BY JEFF.

>> GOOD EVENING, MY [AUDIO ISSUES] 2,018 ORCHARD STREET. I AM OPPOSED TO THE PROPOSAL BEFORE YOU TONIGHT.

AND HERE TO SUPPORT THE FAIRMOUNT NEIGHBORS TESTIMONY AS SUBMITTED THIS EVENING.

I LIVE IN A 120-YEAR-OLD HOUSE, COTTAGE STYLE HOME AND I LOVINGLY CARE FOR OR TRY TO.

IT'S A GREAT PLACE TO LIVE, I ACTUALLY LOVE LIVING NEAR THE UNIVERSITY. I LOVE HEARING THE SOFTBALL TEAM HIT A HOME RUN

WHILE I PLANT MY DAHLIAS AND I LOVE HEARING THE MARCHING BAND PRACTICE WHEN I PICK THEM IN THE FALL.

WE DEFINITELY NEED MORE HOUSING.

OUR POLL NEIGHBORHOOD AGREES WITH THAT OBVIOUSLY.

IT'S VERY OBVIOUS I THINK STUDENTS SHOULD LIVE ON CAMPUS.

I LOVE SEEING THAT.

THAT IS NOT THE ISSUE HERE.

WE ARE NOT OPPOSED TO THE UNIVERSITY PLANS WE WANT THEM TO BE GOOD NEIGHBORS.

AND TO RESPECT OUR NEIGHBORHOOD. WE ONLY ASKED THEY PLAN THE PROJECT WITH THE NEIGHBORHOOD IN MIND AND NOT OVERPOWER US WITH 85-FOOT-TALL BUILDINGS RIGHT BEHIND OUR HOMES.

UNFORTUNATELY THE PARTICULAR PLAN WE SPEAK OF TONIGHT NEEDS REVISION IN THE WAY I UNDERSTAND IT, THE PROCESS WE HAVE BEFORE YOU REQUIRES EVIL AT NO SO WE CAN SEND THIS BACK AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND UNIVERSITY CAN ENTER INTO DIALOGUE THAT WE CAN COME TO SOME KIND OF COMPROMISE AND COME UP WITH SOMETHING THAT WORKS FOR BOTH PARTIES.

PLEASE, PLEASE, I ASK YOU TO VOTE NO SO WE CAN CONTINUE OUR DIALOGUE, WORK OUT THIS PROBLEM AND CONTINUE TO KEEP OUR NEIGHBORHOOD THE WAY IT IS.

MY STREET IS A GREAT STREET WITH STRONG SENSE OF COMMUNITY. MY HOUSE IS A HAPPY HOUSE AND I HOPE YOU VOTE NO SO MY HOUSE CAN STAY A HAPPY HOUSE AND MY NEIGHBORHOOD CAN STAY IN A NICE NEIGHBORHOOD.

I THANK YOU AND MY HAPPY HOUSE THANKS YOU.

>> THANK YOU, OUR NEXT SPEAKERS ARE JEFF FOLLOWED BY HOLLY RAY.

>> GOOD EVENING, COUNSELORS AND AIR.

MY NAME IS JEFF, I LIVE IN THE FAIRMONT NEIGHBORHOOD AND I CURRENTLY SERVE AS THE CO-CHAIR OF THE NEIGHBORS ASSOCIATION AND I AM SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION OF THE PROPOSAL TONIGHT.

RESIDENTS HAVE LONG SUPPORTED THE UNIVERSITY GROWTH INCLUDING HIGH-DENSITY STUDENT HOUSING.

MANY OF US CHOSE THE NEIGHBORHOOD BECAUSE OF ITS CHARACTER AND CLOSE RELATIONSHIP WITH THE UNIVERSITY. WE VALUE THE CONNECTION.

AT THE SAME TIME WE ARE COMMITTED TO PRESERVING THE SAFETY, LIVABILITY AND CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

GOALS THAT ARE REFLECTED IN THE PLAN, THE PLAN AND CODE, TONIGHT MANY RESIDENTS ARE HERE IN SUPPORT OF THE TESTIMONY.

I WOULD LIKE TO ASK THOSE NEIGHBORS TO STAND UP BRIEFLY.

PRETTY GOOD GROUP.

PRETTY DIVERSE GROUP.

WE APPRECIATE THE APPLICANT HAS REVISED ELEMENTS OF THE PROPOSAL IN RESPONSE TO OUR CONCERNS.

WE CONTINUE TO OPPOSE THE REMAINING CHANGES.

AT THE HEART OF THE ISSUE IS THE EAST CAMPUS OVERLAY ZONE.

ESTABLISHED TO CREATE A MEANINGFUL TRANSITION BETWEEN HIGHER INTENSITY CAMPUS USE AND SINGLE-FAMILY NEIGHBORHOOD.

THE APPLICANT IS PROPOSING TO ALTER THE BALANCE.

ELIMINATING THREE QUARTERS OF THE TRANSITION ZONE BY ALLOWING DORMITORIES AND INCREASING BUILDING HEIGHTS FROM 45 FEET TO 85 FEET.

WITHOUT INDICATION OF IMPACTS ON THE ADJACENT NEIGHBORHOOD.

THESE CHANGES WOULD INCREASE BUILDING SCALE, OCCUPANCY, TRAFFIC, PARKING REQUIREMENTS. CREATING IMPACTS FAR BEYOND WHAT CURRENT ZONING ALLOWS.

THE APPLICANT CLAIMS THERE WILL BE NO NEGATIVE AFFECTS AND REJECTS ANY MEANINGFUL MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS. THESE ARE NOT CREDIBLE.

OUR BOARD ALONG WITH QUALIFIED PROFESSIONALS HAVE SPENT HUNDREDS OF HOURS REVIEWING THE PROPOSAL, IT SHOWS IT DOES NOT MEET THE APPROVAL CRITERIA.

WE HOPE YOU TAKE THE TIME TO REVIEW OUR SUBMITTALS, THE BURDEN OF PROOF LIES WITH THE APPLICANT AND THE BURDEN HAS NOT BEEN MET. THE COUNCIL IS NOT OBLIGATED TO APPROVE THE CHANGES AND WE ASK YOU DENY THE PROPOSAL IN ITS CURRENT FORM OR REQUIRE MODIFICATIONS TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH ADOPTED PLANS AND PROTECT THE INTEGRITY OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

>> OUR NEXT SPEAKERS ARE HOLLY RAY FOLLOWED BY TOM EVAN.

>> MY NAME IS HILLARY.

[AUDIO ISSUES] MY HUSBAND STEVE AND I HAVE RAISED OUR CHILDREN ARE WE HAVE LIVED FOR OVER 40 YEARS.

WE LOVE THE STUDENTS AND SUPPORT THE UNIVERSITY.

ABOUT EVERY DECADE IT SEEMS WE HAVE TO FIGHT TO GET NEW PLANNERS TO WORK WITH US.

IT'S STRESSFUL AND UNNECESSARY.

WE ARE LOSING A LOT OF SLEEP AND OUR HEALTH IS SUFFERING.

WE LOOK FOR SILVER LININGS, WE ARE GRATEFUL FOR OUR NEIGHBORS SUPPORT FOR US AND THEIR LOVE OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

WE ARE GRATEFUL YOU MIGHT HEAR AND UNDERSTAND OUR REASONABLE CONCERNS.

WE ARE ALSO GLAD THEY TRIED TO FIX THEIR FLAWED PROPOSAL BUT THE EDITS SHOW HOW BAD IT WAS AND KEEPS THE MOST HARMFUL PART, 85 FOOT WALLS [AUDIO ISSUES] THEY SAY [AUDIO ISSUES] WE SHOULD HAVE GOTTEN OUT OF THE WAY.

WHEN THEY STARTED BUYING THOSE HOMES WE DIDN'T RUN AWAY AND CITY LEADERS CREATED THE NEIGHBORHOOD REFINEMENT PLAN TO PROTECT THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

20 YEARS AGO WHEN THEY TRIED TO UPDATE THE PLAN, THE CITY MADE THEM WORK WITH THE NEIGHBORS.

THE DEAL ALLOWED TALLER DEVELOPMENT LEAVING A SMALL BUFFER TO PROTECT HOMES.

NOW WE ARE ACCUSED OF ASKING FOR MODEST HEIGHTS.

15 BASE LINE SYNDROME IS WHEN PEOPLE GRADUALLY EXPECT A WORSE ENVIRONMENT AS NORMAL.

[AUDIO ISSUES] THE LONG-TERM DAMAGE IS HARD TO SEE AND IMPOSSIBLE TO REVERSE.

ONLY THOSE WHO ARE THERE FOR A LONG TIME CAN SEE THE GRADUAL DECLINE.

NONE OF TODAY'S PLANNERS, CITY STAFF OR PLANNING COMMISSIONERS WERE HERE 40 OR 20 YEARS AGO, WE WERE. WE MAY NOT SURVIVE --

>> OUR NECK SPEAKERS ARE TOM FOLLOWED BY NATHAN.

>> GOOD EVENING, COUNCIL. MY NAME IS TOM, WARD 3 AND I AM OPPOSED AGAINST THE APPLICATION AS A 30 YEAR HOMEOWNER OF FAIRMOUNT I HAVE SEEN CHANGES IN OUR HISTORICAL NEIGHBORHOOD. THE NEIGHBORHOOD HAS EXPERIENCED FIRST-HAND INCREASED CRIME, TRAFFIC, NOISE DISTURBANCES, LITTERING, PROPERTY, NEGLECT, FAMILY HOME CONVERSIONS TO RENTALS AND ON AN ON.

THESE ARE THE RESULT OF THE UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES FROM PREVIOUS EXPANSIONS BY THE UNIVERSITY.

NOW THE UNIVERSITY TOP-DOWN APPROACH IS PRESSING OUR HISTORIC NEIGHBORHOOD FOR ITS NEXT CAPITAL PROJECT FOR FUTURE STUDENT DOLLARS EVEN THOUGH SOURCES BORN A STUDENT CLIFF IS ABOUT TO BEGIN AND GOVERNMENT ISSUED STUDENT VISAS ARE EXPERIENCING A 36% DROP IN ISSUANCE DUE TO STRICTER POLICIES AND INCREASED REJECTION RATES.

IN MY OPINION DORMS NEED TO BE CITED ON THE MAIN CAMPUS AND NOT ON THE PERIPHERY IN OUR NEIGHBORHOODS.

ON CAMPUSES THE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS HAS NUMEROUS OPEN SPACES, PARKING LOTS, APPROPRIATE ZONED AREAS SUCH AS FRANKLIN BOULEVARD, RESEARCH PARK OR 13TH STREET.

SINCE THE APPLICANT MARCHED 2,025 APPLICATION THE UNIVERSITY OF MINISTRY HAS NOT MET WITH COMMUNITY OWNERS TO ADDRESS OUR NEIGHBORHOOD CONCERNS SURROUNDING ZONING CHANGES FROM AN ALLOWED HEIGHT OF 45 FEET - 85 FEET.

I ASKED THE COUNCIL TO VOTE NO AND NOT ALLOW THE UNIVERSITY TO BUILD ANY HIGH-RISE IN OUR HISTORICAL NEIGHBORHOOD.

ALLOWING THIS WILL BURDEN THE COMMUNITY WITH ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC, PARKING, NOISE DISTURBANCES WHILE CONTRIBUTING TO FAMILY RELOCATION NEARBY AS ESTABLISHED RESIDENTS FLEE TO AVOID THE PERILS AND CHAOS OF STUDENT HOUSING.

I STAND WITH THE F AND A AND THE TERMS OF NOTIFICATION OF THIS MEETING RECEIVED TWO BLANK PAGES FROM THE CITY REGARDING ATTENDING MEETINGS. SOMETHING NEEDS TO BE DONE, I WILL LEAVE THESE AS EXAMPLES AND ONE OF THEM WAS ADDRESSED TO SOMEONE ELSE THAT CAME TO MY ADDRESS, BLANK PAGES.

>> THANK YOU, TOM. OUR NEXT SPEAKERS ARE NATHAN FOLLOWED BY STEVE.

>> THANKS AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME AND SERVICE AND FOR LETTING US ALL SPEAK. I KNOW THIS IS A LONG MEETING.

I AM A 30-YEAR-RESIDENT OF FAIRMONT NEIGHBORHOOD AND A BOARD MEMBER AND I STAND OPPOSED TO THE REFINEMENT PLAN CHANGES AS WRITTEN.

I ALSO LOVE THE NEIGHBORHOOD, SOMEONE WAS TALKING ABOUT THE MUSIC AND I LOVE LISTENING AND BEING NEXT TO THE UNIVERSITY TO THE SONG THAT ENDS AT 9:59:59 PM. VERY ENERGETIC.

IN JANUARY I SPOKE ON THE HISTORIC NATURE OF THE FAIRMONT NEIGHBORHOOD. TODAY I WOULD LIKE TO REFERENCE AS HAS BEEN REFERENCED THE HISTORY OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD WORKING WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON.

WE HAVE A HISTORY OF COLLABORATION THAT IS LONG-STANDING ON THE BORDER AND REFINEMENT PLAN DATING 2,003 AND WORKING CLOSELY ON MITIGATING TRAFFIC AND PARKING ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH THE BUILDING AND USE OF THE ARENA.

WE WANT TO GET TO YES TO HELP THE UNIVERSITY ACHIEVE ITS GOALS.

UNFORTUNATELY AS WAS POINTED OUT BY YOUR OWN COUNCIL IN THE LAST MEETING THIS PROPOSAL IS LIKELY TO BE OPPOSED AND APPEALED. I DON'T THINK THIS HELPS ANYBODY.

IT WILL DELAY THE DESIRED BUILDING OF THE DORM IN QUESTION AND BE COSTLY FOR BOTH PARTIES.

I RECOMMEND THE COUNCIL VOTE AGAINST THIS PROPOSAL AND REMANDED IT BACK TO THE PARTIES TO NEGOTIATE COLLABORATIVELY AND IN GOOD FAITH BECAUSE I THINK WE WILL DO THAT AND HAVE INDICATED WE ARE COMMITTED TO THAT PROCESS.

WHILE I APPRECIATE THIS IS A DIFFICULT VOTE AND IN SOME WAYS IT FEELS UNCOMFORTABLE, I THINK IT IS SIMPLY THE BEST AND MOST EXPEDITIOUS WAY FOR YOU TO MOVE FORWARD AND FOR US TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> OUR NEXT AND FINAL SPEAKER IS STEVE GAP.

>> MY NAME IS STEVE AND I LIVE AT 1,818 THE LORD'S STREET AND OPPOSED TO THIS PROPOSAL.

THANK YOU FOR THE TIME YOU HAVE TAKING WAITING THROUGH HUNDREDS OF PAGES OF WRITTEN TESTIMONY.

THANK YOU FOR LOOKING AT OUR SCALE MODEL. IF YOU HAVEN'T PLAYED WITH IT, PLEASE DO. TAKE IT APART AND SEE THEY CAN BUILD UP TO FOUR STORIES IN THE BUFFER ZONE.

THEY CAN BUILD 85-FOOT-HIGH RATES IS EVERYWHERE IN THE ENTIRE EAST CAMPUS AREA.

RIGHT NOW WITH NO CHANGES.

REST ASSURED DENYING THIS PROPOSAL WILL NOT PREVENT THEIR GOAL OF STUDENTS LIVING ON CAMPUS.

LET'S RECAP. WE ARE HERE BECAUSE THE APPLICANT MADE A BUNCH OF CHANGES TO 1/2 PROPOSAL.

THEY SAY THEY DID IT AS A GIFT TO APPEASE CONFUSED NEIGHBORS. I THINK THEY REALIZED AN APPEAL WOULD BE A SLAMDUNK AND THEY ARE TRYING TO SHOEHORN THIS BACK INTO SOMETHING MORE DEFENSIBLE.

IT IS BETTER THAN IT WAS AND I APPRECIATE THE ADMINISTRATORS WHO STEPPED IN TO TRY TO HELP BUT IT IS STILL A MESS.

LEGAL PRECEDENT WAS IGNORED, TYPE V WAS USED IN 2,003 AND SHOULD HAVE BEEN AGAIN.

TO GET HERE HISTORY WAS MISCONSTRUED TO SAY YOU MUST ACCEPT PLANS AS POLICY.

TO GET HERE THE BUZZWORD NEEDED HOUSING IS THE EXCUSE TO PUSH THE PROJECT ONTO THE WRONG SITE.

AND BUILD IT ON THE CHEAP WAS NO CONSIDERATION FOR THE IMPACT ON US 20 FEET AWAY.

THERE ARE BETTER SITES FOR DORMS AND STUDENT HOUSING DEMANDS ARE WELL MET BY PRIVATE DEVELOPERS BUT THIS IS WHAT THE STATE MEANT BY NEEDED HOUSING?

IT'S TO ATTRACT NEW STUDENTS, NOT TO RELOCATE THE ONES LIVING IN APARTMENTS AROUND TOWN AND NOT THE HOUSE ALMOST VOTES.

MORE CARS, PEOPLE AND NOT A SOLUTION TO ANY OF THE CONCERNS YOU HAVE TODAY.

I SERVED ON THE COMPATIBILITY STANDARDS TASK AIM HELPING TO FIGURE OUT WHAT GOOD IT WAS AND TO GET HERE YOU MUST IGNORE EVERYTHING WE LEARNED ABOUT GOOD INFILL.

TOO BAD YOU CAN'T TELL STAFF TO CONVENE STAKEHOLDERS TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION WITHOUT DENYING IT.

LACKING THAT THE NEIGHBORS' AMENDMENTS WOULD MAKE THE APPLICATION MORE TOLERABLE.

PLEASE ADOPT THOSE AMENDMENTS OR DENY THE APPLICATION.

THEY SAY WE HAVE IMPROVED THE NEGATIVE IMPACT, JUST COME VISIT ME, STAND IN MY YARD AND IF YOU DON'T THINK THERE IS A NEGATIVE IMPACT I WILL WITHDRAW MY OPPOSITION.

THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, COUNCIL PRESIDENT THAT WAS OUR FINAL SPEAKER.

>> AT THIS TIME THE APPLICANT MAY PROVIDE UP TO FIVE MINUTES FOR REBUTTAL.

>> THANK YOU, [AUDIO ISSUES] ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUBMITTED LATE THIS AFTERNOON.

THAT IS SOME OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW SO WE WILL TAKE THIS TIME TO ADDRESS MAYBE SOME MISCONCEPTIONS AND THE INFORMATION -- NOTHING IN THE PROPOSAL AFFECTS ALLOW DEVELOPMENT ON OUR LAND ZONE.

THERE IS NO IMPACT ON OUR ZONING.

THERE IS AN ASSERTION THERE IS NO MEANINGFUL RESIDENTIAL TRANSITION.

OUR HEIGHT PROPOSAL OF 45 FEET IS VERY CONSISTENT WITH WHAT IS ALLOWED AND ESPECIALLY IN CONSIDERATION OF THE 20% INCREASE IN HEIGHT ALLOWED BY SENATE BILL 1,737 AND THERE CONTINUES TO BE A REQUEST FOR LAND-USE PROCESSES TO BE APPLIED TO THE PROPOSAL.

THIS REQUEST IS CONTRARY TO STATE NEEDED HOUSING.

AND STAFF HAS ADDRESSED THIS IN THEIR JANUARY 2,026 MEMO IN RESPONSE TO A QUESTION FROM -- I WANT TO ADDRESS ONE OTHER THING. THE UNIVERSITY IS NOT BUILDING A WALL OF 85-FOOT BUILDINGS [AUDIO ISSUES] ENVISION THE SCALE, THAT IS WHAT THEY ARE PLANNING.

I WANT TO ADDRESS THE PROCESS IN REGARDS TO TODAY, THE APPLICANT WAS SUBMITTED IN MARCH OF 2025, IT HAS BEEN UNDER REVIEW FOR MORE THAN A YEAR.

THERE HAVE BEEN THREE PUBLIC HEARINGS ON THE PROPOSAL AND FOR THE FIRST HEARING IT WAS OPEN FOR NEARLY 2 MONTHS.

FOR THE SECOND IT WAS OPEN FOR MORE THAN A MONTH.

LEADING UP TO THE THIRD HEARING RECORD HAS BEEN OPEN ANOTHER MONTH AND HALF.

ALTOGETHER THE RECORD HAS BEEN OPEN FOR MORE THAN FOUR MONTHS OR 120 DAYS.

WHICH IS IN EXCESS OF THE CITY STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS TO MAKE A DECISION ON A LAND-USE APPLICATION.

THE APPLICANT DID SUBMIT PROCEDURAL OBJECTIONS ON MARCH 9TH IDENTIFYING CONCERNS ABOUT THE PROCESS.

THOSE ARE PART OF THE RECORD AND HAVE BEEN PRESERVED FOR CONSIDERATION.

THE HEART OF THE DEBATE APPEARS TO BE WHETHER OR NOT THE PROPOSAL MEETS THE APPROVAL CRITERIA.

AT THIS POINT THE APPLICATION HAS BEEN THOROUGHLY REVIEWED AND VETTED, CITY STAFF HAVE RECOMMENDED APPROVAL, THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDED APPROVAL, THE CITY HAS DRAFTED A PROPOSED ORDINANCE WITH LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS, SUPPORTING APPROVAL.

WE HAVE HEARD SOME ASSERTIONS SOMEHOW THOSE PEOPLE MADE MISTAKES OR MISSED THINGS.

I HAVE HEARD COUNCIL SPEAK TO THE INTEGRITY OF SERVICE OF THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS AND OF STAFF AND LEGAL COUNCIL AND WE DON'T BELIEVE THAT TO BE TRUE.

WE BELIEVE THEY THOROUGHLY VETTED THE PROPOSAL AND IT DOES MEET THE APPROVAL CRITERIA.

AGAIN, THE PLANNING COMMISSION VOTED 402 APPROVE.

SO GIVEN THE EXTENSIVE REVIEW, THE MULTIPLE HEARINGS, LENGTH OF TIME RECORD HAS BEEN OPENED, WE DO NOT SEE ANY JUSTIFICATION FOR KEEPING THE RECORD OPEN ANY LONGER.

OR FOR FURTHER DELAY OF A DECISION.

SO WE RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THE COUNCIL CLOSE THE RECORD
AND MOVE FORWARD WITH LIBERATIONS IN ACTION.

THANK YOU.

>> STAFF RESPONSE?

>> GOOD EVENING, AT THIS TIME THERE IS NO FORMAL STAFF
RESPONSE BUT WE ARE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS YOU
MAY HAVE.

>> ANY QUESTIONS THAT COUNCILORS WOULD LIKE TO ASK?

>> YES, THANK YOU, VERY IMPRESSIVE TESTIMONY TONIGHT. VERY
PROFESSIONAL.

I HAVE BEEN DOING THIS FOR 20 YEARS AND I HAVE NEVER SEEN IN THE APPLICATION LIKE THIS WHERE IT WAS SO FUNDAMENTALLY FLAWED THAT THEY HAD TO REDO AND SUBMIT IT.

SO SUBSTANTIALY THAT THE REVISIONS THAT WE HAD TO REQUIRE ANOTHER PUBLIC HEARING.

I HAVE READ A LOT OF THE RECORD, WHILE YOU HAVE REMOVED MANY OF THE PARTS THAT WERE PROBLEMATIC AND INCONSISTENT WITH THE CRITERIA DOESN'T APPEAR THEY HAVE REMOVED ALL OF THE INCONSISTENT ASPECTS.

JUST TO BE CLEAR THIS ISN'T ABOUT STUDENT HOUSING.

WHAT ABOUT THE IMPACTS ON THE NEIGHBORHOOD. THAT HASN'T CHANGED. MY UNDERSTANDING IS THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS HAS NOT CHANGED, IT HAS BEEN RELATIVELY FLAT. NOT A LOT OF NEW STUDENTS.

THE BURDEN OF PROOF IS INDEED ON THE APPLICANT TO SHOW THEY ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE APPROVAL CRITERIA.

STAFF IS SUPPOSED TO DO THE ANALYSIS TO SHOW IT IS NOT, I WAS DISAPPOINTED IN THE LACK OF CRITICAL THINKING ANALYSIS.

I AGREE THEY NEED TO BE REVIEWED AND UPDATED BUT NOT COMPLETELY CHANGED AND TAKE OUT MANY OF THE IMPORTANT ASPECTS.

I AM INTERESTED IN WHY THE ANALYSIS AND MITIGATION THAT WAS REQUIRED IN THE PLAN IS NOT DONE BY STAFF.

I AM ALSO INTERESTED IN THE EXISTING EAST CAMPUS OVERLAY ZONE WHICH PUTS THAT INTO ORDINANCE AND INCLUDES APPROPRIATE ZONING POLICIES AS THE METRO PLAN SAYS IT IS SUPPOSED TO AND MAINTAIN THE STABILITY AND QUALITY OF OLDER HISTORIC NEIGHBORHOODS AND WONDERING WHAT HAPPENED TO THAT?

AND WHY THAT WAS AND ADDRESSED?

THE NEIGHBOR SUBMITTED TESTIMONY OVER THE LAST COUPLE DAYS AND DIDN'T JUST FIND ONE THING INCONSISTENT, BUT SIX THINGS THAT WERE INCONSISTENT WITH THE APPROVAL CRITERIA.

AND IN PARTICULAR THE ELIMINATION OF THE TRANSITIONAL BUFFER ZONE IS WHAT IS AT THE POINT HERE. IT GOES FROM 45 FEET, THIS WOULD ALLOW 85 FEET, PRETTY CLOSE TO PEOPLE'S HOUSES. YOU SAW THE MODEL IN OUR OFFICES, GO LOOK AT IT.

>> [AUDIO ISSUES] I HAVE THE CITY CLERK IN THE QUEUE.

[AUDIO ISSUES] EVANS?

>> CAN YOU HEAR ME?

HELLO?

>> WE CAN HEAR YOU.

>> OKAY, I WASN'T SURE.

EARLIER IN THE TESTIMONY IT HAS BEEN BROUGHT UP BY A COUPLE PEOPLE JUSTIFIED THAT THEY FELT THEY NEEDED A LITTLE MORE TIME TO BE ABLE TO IRON OUT SOME OF THE CONFLICTS THEY HAVE WITH THE UNIVERSITY PLAN.

ONE I WANT TO KNOW BESIDES WHAT ALAN JUST MENTIONED, ARE THERE OTHER STUMBLING BLOCKS TO MAKING THIS HAPPEN THAT WOULD REQUIRE US ARE NOT NECESSARILY REQUIRE BUT DECIDED WE COULD DO IT OR NOT DO IT THAT WOULD PUSH US OUT ANOTHER COUPLE MONTHS IN TERMS OF ULTIMATE APPROVAL OF THIS PROPOSAL OR DID NOT ALLOW THE PROPOSAL IF THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND UNIVERSITY CAN'T WORK THROUGH THOSE STICKING POINTS?

>> GOOD EVENING, IF YOU COULD REPEAT THE QUESTION THAT WAY, I CAN ANSWER IT A LITTLE MORE SUCCINCTLY.

>> LET ME SHORTNESS UP.

THERE HAVE BEEN SEVERAL PEOPLE WHO HAVE TESTIFIED TONIGHT THEY FELT IF WE, WE, THE CITY WERE TO CONTINUE

CONVERSATIONS, NEGOTIATIONS THAT THERE COULD BE A REASONABLE RESOLUTION TO THIS THAT WOULD MINIMIZE THE ACRIMONY THAT HAS BEEN RAISED IN THIS PART OF THE TESTIMONY.

>> THANK YOU FOR THAT CLARIFICATION.

THIS IS AN INTERESTING PROCESS AND WE TALKED ABOUT THIS ON OUR MARCH 9TH MEETING.

WE ARE IN A SITUATION UNLIKE OUR TYPICAL LAND-USE PROCESSES OR CODE AMENDMENT WE BRING YOU WHERE YOU ARE DIRECTING STAFF TO DO WORK OR REHASH THE STUFF THAT HAS BEEN PUT IN PLACE. WE HAVE AN APPLICATION PROVIDED BY US, BY A PRIVATE PARTY, IN THIS CASE THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON BUT THERE IS A PRIVATE PARTY THAT HAS SUBMITTED AN APPLICATION SO UNLIKE IN OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE YOU CAN TELL US TO GO BACK TO THE DRAWING BOARD, GO WORK WITH THE NEIGHBORHOOD, THAT IS NOT WHAT WE SEE AS THE ROLE WE HAVE HERE. OUR ROLE IS TO EVALUATE, THE CITY STAFF ROLE ISN'T TO MAKE THE APPLICANT COLLABORATE WITH THE NEIGHBORHOOD BUT RATHER EVALUATE THE PROPOSAL FOR US AND SEE IF IT MEETS THE MERIT OF THE APPROVAL CRITERIA.

I HOPE THAT HELPS ANSWER THE QUESTION.

>> IT DOES TO SOME DEGREE BUT IF I HAVE OTHERS I WILL GET BACK TO YOU.

>> THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU.

SEVERAL OTHER QUESTIONS FOR STAFF. I AM WONDERING WHY THERE ARE NOT MEASURES TO ADDRESS THE PARKING AND TRAFFIC IMPACTS.

EVEN THOUGH THEY WILL ADD AN ENORMOUS AMOUNT OF STUDENTS INTO THIS AREA.

THE UNIVERSITY CONTENDS THERE ARE NO IMPACT BEYOND THEIR PROPERTY LINE.

AND AT IS THE PRIMARY CONTENTION THAT THERE ARE IMPACTS.

WONDERING WHY AREN'T THERE IMPACTS MODERATED AND THAT IS WHAT THE FAIRMONT NEIGHBORHOOD IS OBJECTING TO.

THERE ARE THINGS LIKE STEP BACK HEIGHT LIMITS, WE DID THIS IN PARTICULAR ON THE LOT WHERE THERE IS A STEP BACK OF HEIGHTS.

WE DID IT ON 19TH AVENUE BECAUSE OF THE STEP UP OF HEIGHTS.

AROUND SOUTH OF THE UNIVERSITY.

THERE ARE THINGS LIKE LANDSCAPE SETBACKS, NO TRAFFIC AND PARKING PLANS AND I AM WONDERING WHY THOSE AREN'T ADDRESSED.

CITY COUNCIL IS TO BALANCE THE INTEREST WITH INCREASING STABILITY AND QUALITY OF OLDER NEIGHBORHOODS LIKE THE VERMONT NEIGHBORHOODS.

WE SHOULD NOT BE RUBBER STAMPING.

WE ARE VERY LIKELY HEADED TO APPEAL WITH DELAYS AND DIVISIVENESS.

IF WE FIND THIS PROPOSAL DOES NOT MEET THE APPROVAL CRITERIA BY DENYING THE APPLICATION AND IS SENT BACK AND REWORKED, THE ISSUES NEED TO BE RESOLVED AND CONSISTENCIES THAT WERE RAISED BY THE NEIGHBORS COULD BE ADDRESSED.

I DON'T THINK WE WANT TO SAY AS A COUNCIL THE MESSAGE THAT THE NEIGHBORHOODS CAN'T WORK WITH LARGE INSTITUTIONS AND CITY HALL AND THAT NEIGHBORHOODS OPINIONS DON'T MATTER.

I THINK WE NEED TO ADDRESS THOSE AND TAKE THOSE SERIOUSLY.

>> THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU.

THE COUNCILOR BROUGHT UP A POINT I AM INTERESTED IN
KNOWING THE ANSWER TO.

REGARDING VEHICLE USE BY STUDENTS LIVING IN DORMS ON
CAMPUS, DO WE HAVE ANY DATA ON THAT BY PERCENTAGE?

OF THE STUDENTS THAT LIVE ON CAMPUS HOUSING, IS THAT
SOMETHING THAT CITY STAFF DOESN'T HAVE THAT THE UNIVERSITY
HAS?

I AM JUST THINKING BACK TO MY OWN TIME WHEN I LIVED ON
CAMPUS I DIDN'T HAVE A CAR, I HAD A BIKE.

IT WASN'T UNTIL I WAS OFF-CAMPUS BEFORE I HAD A VEHICLE.

>> GOOD EVENING.

ASSOCIATE PLANNER, I WOULD WANT TO LOOK CLOSER AT THE RECORD TO SEE WHAT DATA WE HAVE TO RESPOND TO THAT QUESTION.

I WILL NOTE THE APPLICABLE CRITERIA DON'T DIRECTLY ADDRESS TRAFFIC OR MITIGATION OUTSIDE THE REQUIREMENT TO ADDRESS STATEWIDE PLANNING GOALS AND IT REQUIRES THE APPLICANT TO SUBMIT THE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ANALYSIS WHICH THEY DID AND THAT CONCLUDED THE PROPOSED WOULD NOT RESULT IN A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM.

AND DURING THE PROCESS OF REVIEWING MATERIALS DURING THE OPEN RECORD PERIODS WE DID CONFIRM WITH OUR STAFF THEY REVIEWED THE ANALYSIS AS WELL AS TESTIMONY AND ARGUMENT RELATED AND BASED ON REVIEW OF THE MATERIALS, WE MAINTAIN OUR INITIAL FINDING THAT THE APPLICANT WAS CONDUCTED WITH ACCEPTED METHODOLOGY.

>> I APPRECIATE THAT AND I AM SURE IT WAS DONE ACCURATELY BUT WAS CURIOUS WHAT THE NUMBER WAS.

>> WE CAN LOOK INTO THAT.

>> THANK YOU.

IF THERE IS NO OTHER COMMENTS I WILL CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AND AT THIS POINT CITY COUNCIL GETS TO DECIDE WHETHER WE CLOSE THE RECORD, KEEP IT OPEN FOR SEVEN DAYS FOR THE APPLICANT TO SUBMIT FINAL ARGUMENTS OR KEEP IT OPEN FOR AN ADDITIONAL SEVEN DAY PERIOD IN WHICH WE WILL BE ABLE TO CONTINUE TO RECEIVE TESTIMONY AND I WILL TURN IT TO STAFF.

>> JUST THOUGHT I WOULD HELP YOU OUT, THE APPLICANT DID NOT ASSERTIVELY WAIVE ITS STATUTORY RIGHT TO SEVEN FINAL DAYS FOR ARGUMENT. ARGUMENT ONLY SO NO NEW EVIDENCE.

AT DEFINITELY NEEDS TO BE PART OF YOUR PLAN.

YOUR OPTIONS ARE TO CLOSE THE RECORD TO EVERYONE ELSE, LEAVE THE RECORD OPEN FOR JUST THOSE SEVEN DAYS FOR ARGUMENT FROM THE APPLICANT.

OR YOU CAN CHOOSE TO LEAVE THE RECORD OPEN FOR OTHERS TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE OF ARGUMENT AND YOU HAVE OPTIONS AROUND THOSE PROVIDED AT LEAST TWO THE COUNCIL PRESIDENT TO WORK FROM.

SO OPTION A IS OFF THE TABLE.

>> I WOULD LIKE TO, I SEE COUNCILOR EVANS, I WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK FIRST TO THAT AS COUNCIL PRESIDENT.

I HAVE SEEN AND HEARD A LOT OF TESTIMONY TODAY DIRECTLY SPEAKING TO APPROVAL CRITERIA.

I WOULD LIKE TO PURSUE THE OPTION TO KEEP THIS OPEN FOR THREE SEVEN DAY PERIODS AND OPEN TO HAVING DISCUSSION FROM CITY COUNCIL AND I SEE A HAND.

>> THERE WAS ONE MORE THING I WANTED TO SAY. IF YOU CHOOSE TO LEAVE THE RECORD OPEN FOR 21 MORE DAYS AS YOU ARE PROPOSING WE WILL NEED TO POSTPONE ACTION PROBABLY UNTIL JUNE 10TH.

RIGHT NOW IT IS SCHEDULED FOR DELIBERATION AND POTENTIAL ACTION ON THE 11TH OF MAY.

AND IF YOU MADE A MOTION AND IT PASSED TO ALLOW THREE SEVEN-DAY PERIODS THE END OF RECORD WOULD BE AT 8 PM ON THAT DAY WHICH WOULDN'T GIVE STAFF TIME TO PACKAGE THINGS FOR YOU.

>> THANK YOU FOR THAT CLARIFICATION, I WAS UNDER THE ASSUMPTION OUR OPTIONS WOULD HAVE BEEN DIFFERENT THAN THAT.

I WILL TAKE IT TO [AUDIO ISSUES].

>> [AUDIO ISSUES]

>> IF THAT IS NOT THE CASE I WILL MOVE.

>> MY HAND WAS UP.

>> YES, THANK YOU.

I KNOW FOR LOTS OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF LAND-USE APPLICATIONS THERE ARE OTHER REQUIREMENTS ABOUT HOW LONG WE HAVE TO MAKE DECISIONS.

CAN YOU HELP ME KNOW WHAT THOSE ARE FOR THIS PARTICULAR TYPE OF DECISION?

>> IT IS NUANCED BECAUSE THIS IS NOT THE INITIAL PUBLIC HEARING FOR THIS ONE.

IF AFTER, AT THE INITIAL PUBLIC HEARING IF SOMEONE ASKS THE RECORD BE LEFT OPEN YOU NEED TO ALLOW IT.

YOU HAVE ALREADY DONE THAT. YOU DID THAT THE LAST TIME.

NOW THAT WE HAVE LEFT THE RECORD OPEN THERE IS NO STATUTORY OR CODE OBLIGATION TO LEAVE IT OPEN ANY FURTHER BEYOND THE FIRST OF THOSE SEVEN DAYS.

YOUR QUESTION WAS MORE SPECIFICALLY --

>> I KNOW FOR CERTAIN TYPES OF APPLICATIONS THERE IS A DEADLINE FOR WHEN YOU HAVE TO MAKE A DECISION.

>> IN THIS PARTICULAR ONE THE ONLY DEADLINE IS ONCE YOU CLOSE THE RECORD IF THE RECORD REMAINS CLOSED FROM THE DATE OF CLOSURE THE COUNCIL HAS 30 DAYS WITHIN WHICH TO MAKE A DECISION.

ONCE THE RECORD HAS BEEN CLOSED, IF YOU LEAVE IT OPEN FOR SEVEN MORE DAYS IT WOULD BE 37 DAYS FROM TONIGHT AT A DECISION MUST BE MADE. 30 DAYS AFTER THE RECORD IS CLOSED.

>> THANK YOU.

>> I DON'T THINK THE APPLICANT ASKED TO CLOSE THE RECORD. I DON'T THINK ANYONE ASKED TO KEEP IT OPEN. THERE ARE HUNDREDS OF PAGES, I LOOKED AT THAT DOESN'T PRECLUDE US TO ASK A QUESTION IF THE RECORD IS CLOSED, CORRECT?

>> THAT IS RIGHT BUT STAFF ANSWERS WILL BE LIMITED TO WHAT IS ALREADY IN THE RECORD.

AND I WILL SAY WITH PLANNING STAFF BEFORE WE CAME IN AND STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS THAT YOU CLOSE THE RECORD, THERE IS SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO RESPOND TO PRETTY MUCH ANY QUESTIONS THAT RELATE TO THE CRITERION WE COULD THINK OF.

SO CLOSING THE RECORD WOULD MEAN ALLOWING JUST SEVEN DAYS FOR THE APPLICANT.

>> SO WHAT DOES THE CALENDAR LOOK LIKE?

WE HAVE A SCHEDULE FOR MAY 11TH?

THAT WOULD WORK. WE COULD CLOSE THE RECORD AND THE APPLICANT WOULD HAVE SEVEN DAYS AND THAT IS IT AND WE WOULD HAVE 30 DAYS AFTER THAT TO MAKE A DECISION AND MAY 11TH DATE FITS WITHIN THE CALENDAR.

THAT WOULD BE MY PREFERENCE.

>> THANK YOU, COUNSELOR EVANS I SEE YOUR HAND.

>> THANKS, COUNCIL PRESIDENT.

ONE QUESTION I ASKED A WHILE BACK ABOUT THIS I NEVER GOT A CLEAR ANSWER TO.

AT IS HOW MANY STUDENTS ARE WE LOOKING TO ACCOMMODATE WITH THIS BUILD OUT?

ARE WE LOOKING AT 5000, 10,000, EXACTLY HOW MANY STUDENTS IS THE UNIVERSITY LOOKING TO ADD?

>> THANKS FOR THE QUESTION, STAFF WOULD BE HAPPY TO LOOK THROUGH THE RECORD MATERIALS AND SEE IF THAT NUMBER IS PROVIDED WITHIN THOSE MATERIALS.

>> IT WOULD BE HELPFUL IF WE KNEW THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS THAT WOULD BE ACCOMMODATED BY THIS TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT.

>> ABSOLUTELY, WE WILL DO OUR BEST.

>> AND WHAT THE NEIGHBORHOOD IS LOOKING FORWARD TO.

>> WE WILL DO OUR BEST TO PROVIDE THAT INFORMATION PRIOR TO THE NEXT ACTION.

>> THANK YOU.

I AM SEEING -- DO WE NEED TO HAVE A VOTE OR I FEEL LIKE I AM GETTING A GENERAL CONSENSUS --

>> I THINK IT WOULD BE A GOOD IDEA. I THINK IT WOULD BE A MATTER OF IF YOU ARE LOOKING FOR A MOTION BASED ON WHAT THE COUNCILOR WAS PROPOSING, A MOTION USING THE TERMS I PROVIDED YOU WITH OPTION B. IT WOULD BE A MOTION THAT THE RECORD REMAIN OPEN FOR SEVEN DAYS UNTIL 5 PM APRIL 27TH FOR ONLY THE APPLICANT TO SUBMIT FINAL ARGUMENTS AND NO NEW EVIDENCE.

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND.

>> ALL IN FAVOR?

SEEING ALL EIGHT VOTES COMING IN AFFIRMATIVE MOTION PASSES
8-0.

AS A REMINDER DELIBERATIONS --

>> MY VOTE WAS A YES, I DIDN'T SEE IT POP UP.

>> WE GOT IT, THANK YOU SO MUCH. DELIBERATIONS ARE
SCHEDULED FOR MAY 11TH, 2026.

THANK YOU, THIS CONCLUDES OUR AGENDA FOR TODAY.

I NOW CLOSE THE APRIL 20TH, 2026 MEETING.

WE ARE ADJOURNED.

