

# MINUTES

Eugene City Council  
Council Chamber—City Hall  
777 Pearl Street—Eugene, Oregon

April 23, 2012  
7:30 p.m.

COUNCILORS PRESENT: George Brown, Pat Farr, Betty Taylor, Andrea Ortiz, George Poling, Mike Clark, Chris Pryor, Alan Zelenka.

Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy called the April 23, 2012, regular meeting of the Eugene City Council to order. She reviewed the order of the agenda, noting that item 5 had been moved up in the order.

## 1. PUBLIC FORUM

Mayor Piercy reviewed the rules of the Public Forum. She limited speakers to two minutes.

**Robert Bolman**, Ward 1, reviewed and submitted written testimony advocating for sustainability efforts at the local level.

**Dennis Ramsey**, Ward 7, distributed materials from a Sister City delegation to Kathmandu as the last opportunity to present them before the May 14 arrival of the Kathmandu delegation. He also shared a recent newspaper from Kathmandu.

**Michael Steffen**, Ward 2, Vice President of the Rental Housing Association of Lane County, asked the council to include a sunset clause in the Rental Housing Code.

**David Gerber**, Ward 2, updated the council about *The Newspaper*, a local newspaper written and sold by the homeless. He said more vendors were needed to sell the goal of 800 newspapers monthly. He said people could take pride in selling newspapers as opposed to panhandling.

**Cedar Cosner**, Ward 5, objected that the proposed social ordinance placed liability on roommates who might have nothing to do with the event that triggered the ordinance. He believed the proposed fines were disproportionate to the offense and could have severe financial repercussions for students. He was also concerned that the ordinance would cause landlords not to rent to students.

**Rachel Cowan**, Ward 3, shared Mr. Cosner's concerns regarding liability and the financial ramifications of the ordinance on students whose roommates might choose to have a party without telling them because the ordinance did not define "social host." She suggested there were more effective ways to address the problems the ordinance sought to address, such as neighbor notification of pending parties.

**Ben Epstein**, Ward 3, President of the Associated Students of the University of Oregon, opposed the proposed social host ordinance. The ordinance infringed on tenant and landlord rights, imposed new cost burdens on students, and strained the legal system while doing nothing to promote neighborhood livability. He called for increased education, renewed outreach, and better coordination between the

University of Oregon (UO), neighborhood organizations, and the police. He called for a focus on problems rather than penalties.

**Dennis Chapa**, Lane County, opposed the council's decision to strike the sunset clause associated with the Rental Housing Code and asked the council to reconsider its action. He asked those in attendance who supported having the sunset clause reinstated to stand. Many people stood.

**Carla Newbre**, Ward 1, recommended that the council make its legislative intent regarding the social host ordinance clear to avoid the possible result of chilling the freedom of speech. She encouraged the council to move cautiously.

**Joe Tyndall**, Ward 1, expressed concern about the council's failure to form a homeless commission and support for the formation of a tent village for the homeless with land supplied by the City.

**Ann Klemp**, Ward 5, said the Rental Housing Code fee made it difficult for landlords to keep rents low. She asked that the program be stopped.

**Sam Chapman**, Ward 3, opposed the proposed social host ordinance. He noted a strategy suggested by the Neighborhood Livability Working Group was for an outgoing freshman orientation program. That strategy was not adopted and he recommended it be reconsidered because he had seen it work. He not think fining students was a way to solve drinking and recommended educational information be provided with kegs sold to students.

**Dennis Casady**, Ward 2, asked the council to reinstate the sunset clause in the Rental Housing Code. He believed that otherwise, his service and the service of others who served on the Housing Policy Board (HPB) advisory subcommittee had been a waste of time.

**Paul Cauthorn**, Ward 2, agreed with the remarks of Mr. Casady. He believed the sunset was the only way that landlords had to get accountability from the City for the program. Speaking to the proposed social host ordinance, he suggested the ordinance could be misused to label a super bowl party where the attendees gathered outside to throw a football as an unruly gathering. He pointed out the ordinance would apply to bars, taverns, and restaurants if one considered the phrase "any place where people gather."

**David Russell**, Ward 3, a rental property owner, asked how far government would go in interfering with the relationship between landlords and tenants. He was very concerned about the removal of the sunset clause from the Rental Housing Code and recommended that it be reinstated.

**William Moskal**, Ward 3, expressed support for councilors Farr and Ortiz and Mayor Piercy and invited everyone to the upcoming anniversary of his release from prison.

**Eric Hall**, Ward 7, expressed concern that the council had disregarded the recommendations of the HPB advisory subcommittee and dropped the sunset clause from the Rental Housing Code. He asked that the sunset be reinstated.

**Paul Guernsey**, Ward 3, was concerned that 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue lacked crosswalks at key intersections and motorists did not yield to pedestrians. He also objected that 15<sup>th</sup> avenue was a signed bicycle path but bicyclists had to stop at intersections. He recommended pedestrian corridors on roads serving the University, marked crosswalks at every intersection, and stop signs on the major arterials that crossed 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue traveling north-south so that motorists had to stop for bicyclists.

**Devin Gates**, Ward 7, expressed concern that the council had ignored the recommendations of the HPB advisory subcommittee and asked the council to retain the sunset clause in the Rental Housing Code.

Mayor Piercy closed the Public Forum.

Councilor Brown thanked those who offered testimony. He reminded those in support of a sunset clause in the Rental Housing Code that the council had passed a motion calling for a “mandatory discussion” of the code.

Councilor Poling noted that councilors would have an opportunity to propose additional amendments to the Rental Housing Code.

**2. CONSENT CALENDAR**

- A. Approval of City Council Minutes**
  - February 8, 2012, Work Session
  - February 13, 2012, Regular Meeting
  - March 13, 2012, Joint Elected Officials Meeting
  - April 16, 2012, Public Hearing
- B. Approval of Tentative Working Agenda**

Councilor Brown, seconded by Councilor Farr, moved to approve the items on the Consent Calendar. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

**3. ACTION:  
2012/13 Funding Allocation for Federal Community Development Block Grant and HOME Investment Partnership Programs**

City Manager Jon Ruiz reminded the council that it annually adopted allocations for the use of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME funds. The proposed funding uses must align with locally community needs and the strategic plan described in the 2010 Consolidated Plan.

Community Programs Analyst Michael Wisth of the Planning and Development Department reviewed the CDGB projects being recommended for funding by the Community Development Block Grant Advisory Committee and the HOME projects recommended for funding by the Housing Policy Board.

Councilor Brown, seconded by Councilor Farr, moved to approve the One-Year Action Plan for use of Federal CDBG and HOME funds in FY 2012/13. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

**4. PUBLIC HEARING:  
An Ordinance Vacating West 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue, located between Olive Street and Willamette Street, and Willamette Alley, located between West 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue and West 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue (VRI 12-1)**

City Manager Ruiz introduced the item, a request to vacate West 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue between Olive and Willamette streets and a portion of Willamette Alley located between West 12<sup>th</sup> and West 13<sup>th</sup> avenues. He noted the applicable approval criteria found in Eugene Section 9.8725, which stipulated that the

council must find that approval of the vacation was in the public interest. Findings of compliance with the approval criteria were included in the council meeting packet as Attachment D.

Mayor Piercy asked councilors to declare any *ex parte* contacts or conflicts of interest. She reported she had briefly discussed the alley vacation with representatives of Capstone Collegiate Communities.

Councilor Ortiz declared a potential conflict of interest because of her employment with PeaceHealth. City Attorney Emily Jerome determined that at most Ms. Ortiz's conflict was a potential conflict.

Councilor Poling had met with representatives of the applicant, Capstone Collegiate Communities, and heard a brief overview of the project, which included information about the vacation already in the record. Councilor Zelenka had a similar meeting with representatives of the applicant, which included discussion of the Multi-Unit Property Tax Exemption (MUPTE), on-site management, the proposed project, and a description of the alley vacation. Councilor Farr also had a similar meeting with the applicant although he was unsure the alley vacation was discussed.

City Attorney Jerome indicated that the declared conflicts also applied to the next agenda item regarding the MUPTE. She indicated that in addition to the approval criterion, the council must find that proper consent and notice had been provided.

Mayor Piercy reviewed the applicable criterion. She noted that the council received a request to leave the record open and would do so.

Mayor Piercy opened the public hearing. She first called on those in support of the application and limited remarks to two minutes.

**John Acken**, Capstone Collegiate Communities, commended the community input his company had received and the quality of City's staff work. He concurred with the staff recommendation to straighten the alley, to designate bicycle and pedestrian ways on the alleyway, and to improve the pedestrian and bicycle crossings along adjacent rights-of-way. He said the alley vacation would improve access to downtown and the UO.

**Gregory McAleer**, Ward 3, supported the proposed development as a way to expand downtown and integrate the downtown and university areas. The alley vacation would help provide a bicycle path to campus and promote a healthier lifestyle. He also supported the MUPTE application and urged the council to place more emphasis on student housing downtown.

**Eric Gunderson**, Ward 3, shared Pivot Architecture's support for both the alley vacation and MUPTE applications. He spoke of the many new developments downtown and said both new and existing businesses needed people in the form of residents living downtown. He believed the proposed project was perfectly timed. He also believed the City had planned for this outcome and had constructed infrastructure to support it. He suggested the development would more fully integrate the UO into the community. He asked the council to support both applications.

**Mark Davis**, Veneta, supported the application and thought improved bicycle access on 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue needed to allow cyclists to avoid car and bus traffic. He said that those who worked at his downtown firm, "CoChops," were bicycling commuters and would be served by the infrastructure constructed to serve the development.

**Hugh Prichard**, Ward 3, supported the alley vacation because the existing right-of-way was dangerous for all users and the proposed development would fix the alignment and provide a public amenity that enhanced the safety of users.

**Phillip Farrington**, Ward 1, urged the council's support for the alley vacation because it met the applicable criterion because of the reasons cited by Mr. Acken and Mr. Prichard. He also referred the council to policies in the Downtown Plan that supported the proposal. Those policies called for encouraging education-related development such as student housing, increased residential and commercial densities in downtown to increase transit and alternate modes use, and increased multi-unit housing in downtown.

Mayor Piercy then called on those in opposition to the proposal.

**Sara Bergsund**, Ward 1, submitted written testimony in support of the MUPTE application and in opposition to the alley vacation. She did not support giving up air rights to the developer and wanted the buildings to contribute to the environment and be built in accordance with the scale and materials being used on current projects. She advocated for a more urban development.

Mayor Piercy called for rebuttal testimony. Mr. Acken indicated the applicant would submit additional testimony, including rebuttal testimony, during the time the record was open.

Mr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Farr, moved to hold the record open for any written evidence, argument, or testimony until 5 p.m. on April 30, 2012, then open for an additional seven-day period until 5 p.m. on May 7 for any party to submit written argument (but not new evidence) to respond to issues already raised, then, unless the applicant waives its right, to allow the applicant seven days, until May 14 at 5 p.m. to submit final written argument. Roll call vote: The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

**5. PUBLIC HEARING:**  
**Multi-Unit Property Tax Exemption for Student Housing Project**

City Manager Ruiz introduced the item. He said that while no public hearing was required for the MUPTE application, staff had recommended one be held because of the size and scope of the project. He noted that the council had held two work sessions on the project and the comment period for MUPTE applications had been extended for three months. City Manager Ruiz described the scope of the public involvement that had occurred to date, which included neighborhood association meetings, community forums, and a City Club presentation. He indicated he would forward the council a recommendation regarding the MUPTE application prior to its work session on April 25.

Mayor Piercy opened the public hearing. She limited remarks to two minutes.

**Jim Hale**, Ward 5, objected to the subsidy provided through the MUPTE. He believed it would negatively impact all existing student housing. He questioned the need for the subsidy as he perceived the development would be occupied by wealthy students.

**Mark Johnson**, Ward 5, Director of Transit Operations at Lane Transit District, supported the application as supporting the community's goals for a vibrant downtown. The MUPTE had produced many successful projects and was intended to help encourage higher densities in the urban core. He agreed with previous testimony that the project was consistent with Eugene's goals for downtown. Mr. Johnson

believed the additional of 1,200 students would be a boon to downtown businesses and the development would eventually add to the City's tax base.

**Cindy Foster**, Elmira, believed the proposed development would help revitalize downtown and led to new places to shop and eat. She was excited about the new developments occurring in downtown and believed that the project would do much to increase the feeling of safety downtown.

**Dustin Locke**, Ward 7, believed the proposed development would benefit the economy, add to the housing inventory, and help revitalize downtown. He supported the MUPTE application.

**Carlis Nixon**, Ward 8, opposed the proposed development because she believed the application was being rushed and the community was being pressured by the developers. She was also concerned about the developer being willing to include the standards of management into a future sale. She believed the project was too proximate to Olive Plaza and too dense and she was concerned about its impact on the residents who lived there.

**Walter Hunt**, Ward 3, supported the proposed Capstone development as helping to fulfill long-held City goals. He pointed out that similar tax breaks were granted to other projects. He believed the City could require the applicant to include the standards of management in a future sale. He perceived the development as an important step forward.

**Jack Roberts**, Ward 5, supported the application because he believed the proposed development would help revitalize downtown and would help connect the downtown and UO.

**Rueben Mayes**, Ward 5, encouraged the council to approve the MUPTE and the alley vacation. He believed the project was aligned with the Seven Pillars of Envision Eugene Pillars. He noted the management commitments that the developer had made and suggested the development might be the tipping point downtown needed to attract new businesses and people downtown.

**Amy Perkins**, Ward 4, supported the proposed development and MUPTE application. She believed more students living downtown would be a positive change.

**Mitra Chester**, Ward 1, supported the proposed Capstone project. She emphasized the importance of the project's timing as it related to other downtown development. She said that downtown residents would attract more commercial enterprises to occupy redeveloped downtown spaces. She also thought the development would have a low impact on residents and the majority of traffic would travel down an already commercial street. She advocated for a focus on the big picture and what the development brought to downtown Eugene.

**Larry Newby**, Ward 6, supported the development proposal. He was concerned about parking and recommended that the council remember that students would bring their cars to Eugene. He believed that Capstone Collegiate Communities proposal kept those cars off the street. He hoped the council supported the MUPTE application.

**Jennifer Sutton**, Ward 7, suggested the proposed development would create jobs. Many would not last past the development but their contribution to the economy would last a life time.

**Lillian Parker**, Ward 1, did not object to the proposed development but wanted to ensure that the City addressed the problems that the development might pose for residents. She was particularly concerned about the sidewalks and asked for well-publicized signs on the sidewalk at eye-level prohibiting bicycles

or skateboards on the sidewalks. Many Olive Plaza residents used wheelchairs, walkers, and canes, and were easily startled when such vehicles passed by, generally without warning.

**Cecil Hodges**, Ward 5, had no objection to the proposed development but he objected to the MUPTE application. He suggested the project cost could be reduced and the project could pay for itself. If the project could not be constructed for \$80 million something was wrong. He did not think the City should pay a developer to compete against existing landlords.

**Bob Tranu**, Ward 1, asked for an approved copy of the management agreement, the leasing agreement, and the security agreement and asked that those documents be permanently recorded on the CC&Rs so they went to any new owner. He said if that could not be done, he recommended the council develop an ordinance to cover such situations. He emphasized the importance of on-site property management. Mr. Tranu questioned the length of time that the building returned its investment.

**Janna Ellingson**, Ward 1, questioned the wisdom of student housing in downtown. She did not think the subsidy given the applicant would help downtown and suggested the subsidy be used on other vital services. She did not think that downtown Eugene needed more bars, restaurants, or better shopping. She believed a sale of the property would remove all City control. She particularly objected to the impact she perceived the development would have on Olive Plaza residents, who would be adversely affected by demolition.

**Janet Breedlove**, Ward 1, opposed the proposal because of the amount of land the new development would occupy and the noise and congestion that would result. She believed that the sale of the project would lead to its deterioration and it could become a public liability.

**Bill Davis**, Ward 1, was disappointed by the lack of grocery stores in downtown. He anticipated that the addition of so many students would overwhelm the existing grocery store. He urged the council to work to get a medium sized grocery store in downtown Eugene.

**David Parker**, Ward 1, spoke of the elderly at-risk population living at Olive Plaza who feared walking on crowded sidewalks; that fear would be exacerbated by the addition of so many students. He suggested the City and applicant install closed circuit televisions around the perimeter of the project with large warning signs. He recommended those requirements be included in any CC&Rs. Mr. Parker was also concerned about added on-street demand for parking, which would pressure already limited parking for care workers, visitors, and Olive Plaza staff.

**Barbara Kinsman**, Ward 1, expressed concern that the project owner might sell the project and it would become rundown under another owner as had been experienced in other areas. She asked the council to postpone its decision and do more research. She suggested that under new ownership, the project could become a legal liability for the City.

**Jessica Langdon**, Ward 5, expressed support for the proposed project. The influx of new residents had caused rents to increase and more units were needed. In addition, students living downtown would have better access to campus and would become more familiar with and involved in downtown.

**Kristin White**, Ward 1, supported the proposed project and the MUPTE application. She believed the development would help revitalize downtown by bringing vibrant new energy to downtown. It would stimulate other economic activity. The project would benefit students by giving them unique housing opportunities both on and off campus and would help connect students with the downtown, making them more likely to stay and invest in the community.

**Sue Wolling**, Ward 3, supported the proposed housing project. She recommended that the appropriate transportation infrastructure was put into place, and suggested that the applicant look into bicycle sharing and improved bicycle infrastructure. She described the difficulty of bicycle travel down 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue, which required many stops and advocated for a better bicycle facility on 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue involving a cycle track. She recommended that the developer be asked to help pay for it.

**Dave Mandelblatt**, Ward 1, chair of the Downtown Neighborhood Association, described the scope of the applicant's outreach to the neighborhood association and neighborhood in general. He referred the council to Attachment H in the packet entitled *Statement from Downtown Neighborhood Association* and highlighted the developers' willingness to work with the association on the issues identified in the statement. He reported that progress had been made on many the issues.

**Shawn Hyland**, Springfield, supported the Capstone project. He believed it would help make Eugene downtown a destination again. His company was working with the applicant, Capstone Collegiate Communities, and he found that the company knew what it was doing. He anticipated a good project with more parking than necessary. The company had tight deadlines to meet and time was of the essence. He anticipated the project would create many local construction jobs and would support surrounding businesses. He believed the project would also spur the construction of businesses that would serve the students who lived there.

**Mark Davis**, Veneta, supported the MUPTE application. He enjoyed working downtown but believed that the businesses there would benefit from the new customers. Many downtown businesses had closed. The project would help support retail uses downtown. He said his company, CoChops, also anticipated that its access to the students living there could be integrated into the Eugene technology community and would remain after graduation.

**Milton Oiler**, Ward 1, supported the application. He anticipated the project would be a stable asset after the tax exemption ended and would provide both immediate and future tax revenues. He said the site was costly to redevelop and the applicant had a proven track record. The applicant planned to maintain and manage the asset throughout its life.

**Bill Whalen**, Ward 5, supported the proposed development, which he believed would strengthen downtown. The community had long recognized the importance of downtown housing to downtown revitalization. An increase in downtown residents would result in more business for downtown stores. He believed the MUPTE was valuable in encouraging the redevelopment of such sites. He believed the project was consistent with Envision Eugene and asked the council to support it.

**Hugh Prichard**, Ward 3, spoke of his development of Broadway Place, a MUPTE recipient, which had 179 apartments, nine commercial tenants, and paid \$160,000 annually in taxes. He said the proposed project was similar but larger. He anticipated the project would produce tax revenue right away and would pay its full share of taxes in ten years. He did not think the project could be constructed with a return of six percent, which would be the case without MUPTE. Mr. Prichard asked the council to approve the application.

**David Hauser**, Ward 5, Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce, supported the MUPTE application as consistent with many City plans, which called for incenting downtown housing. Students had considerable disposal income to spend downtown, which had a positive impact on both downtown and the entire community. The project created a new transportation connection between downtown and UO and was in a place to be supported. He also noted the jobs that would be created as a result of the proposal.

**Phillip Farrington**, Ward 1, believed the Downtown Plan's Regional Implementation Strategy C, which called for promotion of multi-story mixed structures downtown through financial incentives or code amendments. He pointed out the MUPTE was the council's only financial tool. He anticipated that the downtown would continue to require public investments to ensure its revitalization. He said if the project went forward it would have a major economic impact; if it did not move forward, he anticipated the property would remain vacant for some time to come.

**John Acken**, Capstone Collegiate Communities, concurred with the staff recommendation. He said the project would not be financially feasible without the MUPTE. He pointed out the project was a large one and would have a positive economic impact downtown. It would also result in many valuable on- and off-site infrastructure improvements. He said that Capstone Collegiate Communities was committed to being a good neighbor to the community.

**Julie Daniel**, Ward 3, supported the proposed project because it had both direct and indirect economic benefits, the additional residents would help revitalize downtown, the project was ideally located, and it would be easier to manage students living in a concentrated area. Students living on the edge of campus neighborhoods increased the cost of housing and put those areas out of reach of families seeking to purchase homes. She believed the project met MUPTE guidelines as well as a range of City plans.

**Rosie Pryor**, Ward 8, supported the proposed development. She was familiar with site and knew that it was difficult to redevelop. She was very happy about the proposal and asked the council to use one of the few tools it had to steer residential development into those locations where density was required.

**Jean Tate**, Ward 1, said residents of her building were concerned about noise and traffic but believed the applicant would address them. She supported the MUPTE application and said she would never do a housing project for six percent. She commended the staff findings and hoped they reflected what the developer planned to do. She asked the council to support the MUPTE application.

**Rick Satre**, Springfield, supported the MUPTE application because it supported the community's growth management goals, would aid in the revitalization of downtown, contributed to economic development, and added to public safety. He pointed out that all of the recent projects in downtown had required a subsidy. He thought the applicant had demonstrated that it would be a good neighbor.

**Joe Tyndall**, Ward 1, suggested the proposed subsidy to out-of-state developers was quite sizable, which concerned him. He hoped the council considered that issue.

**Art Bowman**, Ward 1, suggested the question before the council was whether six percent was an acceptable rate of return on investment and if the building could be constructed without a tax break. He believed that if the building could be built without the tax break, the council was opening itself to criticism. He called for more examination of that issue and better explanations to the public.

**Gerry Gaydos**, Ward 3, said the MUPTE was an extremely important tool in the construction of multi-family construction and he thought it should be used in this instance. He believed the effort the applicant put in was extraordinary. He agreed with the remarks of Mr. Farrington regarding the fact the property had been available for some time. Mr. Gaydos also believed the project would help bring the UO and community together.

**Craig Willis**, Ward 4, supported the MUPTE application. He considered it a reasonable City investment. The project would help maintain downtown's current momentum. He believed the application was

consistent with the Downtown Plan, Growth Management Policies, and Envision Eugene. He suggested that if the community wanted students from the UO to stay in Eugene and contribute, it must find ways for those students to connect with residents outside of campus. He also suggested that students living downtown would be more willing to support the efforts of local nonprofits.

**Dennis Casady**, Ward 2, opposed the MUPTE application because the development was geared toward student residents and because he feared the project owner would sell the project. He said if the company could not build at a return rate of 9 percent it should not be build the project.

**Paul Cauthorn**, Ward 2, opposed the proposed development and the MUPTE application because the project would bring many students downtown. He shared an unpleasant experience he recently had at a downtown restaurant with drunken students. He recommended the City seek another project or wait for a project that was a better fit.

**Paul Redhead**, Ward 5, Eugene Hotel Retirement Center, supported the proposed project and MUPTE application and did not anticipate the project would have any negative impact on the residents of his complex. He pointed out the center had its taxes frozen for the first 15 years of its existence and its conversion from a hotel to a retirement center funded with the assistance of State of Oregon revenue bonds at a low entrance rate. Without those factors, the center would not exist and would have either been torn down or left derelict. He believed the project would maximize the value of the parcel and result in a revenue windfall for Eugene.

**Bill Sokol**, Ward 1, supported the proposed development as a positive thing for the community and downtown. He referred to an article about the project in the April 18 edition of *The Register-Guard* by David Funk and Harriett Cherry and hoped all those present had a chance to read it. He asked that the council not change the MUPTE rules in the middle of project development.

**Misha Seymour**, Ward 1, opposed the Capstone project. He averred that all those who supported the proposal were impelled by greed. He called the MUPTE tax breaks for the fat cats. He advocated for housing for the homeless and the poor.

**Barbara Goldberg**, Ward 1, objected to the proposed MUPTE application. She questioned why students were being placed next to senior citizens. She asked how the council would like to live next to so many college students. She did not think the project could be considered a success if it degraded the quality of life of Olive Plaza residents. Olive Plaza residents deserved peace of mind as they aged.

**John Holtz**, Ward 8, supported the proposed development and MUPTE application because he believed students living in the core would help existing businesses and bring more business opportunities.

**Hollie Hawes**, Springfield, supported the proposed development and the MUPTE application. Growth demanded development, and it often required assistance for development to occur. Limiting development would limit the creation of new jobs and housing. She asked the council to support the MUPTE application.

**Michael Gannon**, Ward 7, was perplexed by the struggle in a wealthy society like Eugene's to provide adequate care for youth. He did not think any of the students he knew would be able to afford to live in the project. He opposed the MUPTE application because it would take away money from education.

Mayor Piercy closed the public hearing. She thanked those who testified for expressing their views.

Councilor Brown also thanked those who spoke. He thanked Ms. Kinsman for raising an important point regarding the developer's previous projects. He recommended that the council research what had happened to past Capstone developments, such as the Silver Oaks development in Canton, Ohio to see how Capstone treated elderly people.

Mayor Piercy adjourned the meeting at 10:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Beth Forrest*

Beth Forrest  
City Recorder

*(Recorded by Kimberly Young)*