

Minutes



Homes for Good Housing Agency

Location of the meeting:

Springfield Utility Board Conference Room, 223 A St., Springfield OR, 97477

Phone: 541.682.2506

The meeting location is wheelchair-accessible. Anyone needing special accommodations (deaf, people with hearing loss, language translation, chemical sensitivity needs, and large print copies of agenda), please make your request at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.

Wednesday, May 22nd, 2019

(1:30 p.m.) (Springfield Utility Board Conference Room, 223 A St., Springfield OR, 97477)

Char Reavis: Introduction to the meeting. Introduction to Public Comment.

1. PUBLIC COMMENT

Larry Abel

Julie Hulme

Paul Solomon

Kylas Nagaarjuna

Cindy Kokis

Allen Hancock

Melanie Kundert

Dennis Sandow

Steve Goldman

Glen Mandzak

Rob Handy

Jacqueline McClure

Michael Gannon

Christopher Logan

Richard Guske

Claire Strawn

Justice Gross

Above is a list of those who bore public testimony, a recording of public comment is available upon request by emailing jshaw@homesforgood.org. Written testimony that was submitted can be found in APPENDIX A.

2. COMMISSIONERS' RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENT

Pete Sorenson: Expresses appreciation for the public comment that was given. References the NEDCO letter. My view is that we should not look backwards to make a decision, we should look forward. In my view the Board should revisit the sale of the River Road Property and get it on the June 19th Agenda. Our goal on this board is to promote affordable housing, we do that on a couple of different mechanisms, but going through with this sale of this property to a market rate developer is not generally in favor of the overall goal of affordable housing. The second reason is that the agency needs the money from the sale of this property, and assuming that's correct, we have an opportunity because of the city of Eugene's Parks and Open Space Bond to spread that money within Eugene, outside of South Eugene. Now, I am the South Eugene commissioner, I favor Eugene's Parks and Recreation bonding money being spend in South Eugene, but I think it has been a fair statement over the years that within Eugene most of the money has been spent in South Eugene and not other areas. That's why I would be interested in knowing, and that's why I would like to see this on the agenda, I would be interested in knowing whether a portion of the property, perhaps the portion by the river, could be eligible for those funds, that our agency needs, that the city tax payers have agreed to pay.

One of the things that was brought to my attention that many for profit and non-profit developers have actually pulled back on construction at this time, and the reason for that is that the cost of construction now is significantly higher than even a year ago, why is that? Because there is such an intense demand for those, and it's even to the point that it has resulted in the doubling of the cost of some housing projects. I don't know about all of our housing projects, but I know that the demand for specialized services: carpentry, plumbing, electrical, etc. But that is causing people to pull back from construction because it is such a hot market. So, while it may well be that there are people who are planning construction, who want to get out of there construction because of the costs. So those are all reasons why we should have another look at this. I am not interested in looking backwards on what brings us to today, I am interested in trying to make a good decision today, tomorrow, and the next day.

Pat Farr: Thank y'all for being here today. This land is a gem, but it is in the Eugene Urban Growth Boundary. The City of Eugene made the decision not to expand the urban growth boundary for residential. Consequently, this land is included in the inventory for the City of Eugene's Urban Growth Boundary in the twenty-year inventory. Consequently, it is going to be difficult within the city of Eugene's plans not to put multi-family residential on this property. So, leaving it as a park is probably not an option.

Jaqueline MuClure Intercedes What about affordable housing?

Patt Farr: Once again I would like to keep it on the topic I am talking about. But I will meet with any number of y'all and we can talk about many of the things that we went through in the Envision Eugene process, which was a very long process, and very disappointing to me that we didn't expand the urban growth boundary for residential

because it means that everyone's backyard is a part of that inventory of land that we have to build on.

Pat offers to talk to people at a later time about the urban growth boundary issue and bring other staff from the city of Eugene.

Claire Strawn Intercedes Mentions the River Road neighborhood planning process.

Pat Farr: Talks about the "River Road Refinement Plan" and the decision-making process, and land-use.

Heather Buch: Expresses appreciation for those who came out to the meeting. She expresses that Affordable Housing is near and dear to her heart. Heather talks about her experience with Affordable Housing contracts in her professional career. She discusses her review of the contract of the River Road Sale. She addresses the idea that it could be a financial loss if Homes for Good were to back out of the contract. She explains contract benchmarks which have passed, and the legalities of these benchmarks. Heather talks about the current benchmark and ones that have been long passed. Homes for Good is in the benchmark that if they don't perform they will be taken to court to make sure they perform, they are no longer at a point that they can pay a penalty. Heather states that if she was on the board in the past she may have made different decisions or may have wanted to see a different clause or different contingencies. Heather states that in her professional expertise that Homes for Good is no longer in a position that they can just pay a penalty to leave the contract, that they are in a contract that they are past the point of backing out. She states that perhaps there should be further discussion on how to ensure the public is included in the process in the future. Heather restates the idea that Homes for Good is at a point in the contract that if they try to leave they will be brought to court and made to perform.

Public Intercedes One member of the audience mentions that they should cast a ballot that would delay the developer from developing on the land for a couple of years to cause them to backout. Another member of the public states that there will be civil disobedience on the spot.

Joe Bereny: Thanks the public for their comments. He mentions that their comments were beyond persuasive. He thanks Heather for walking him through the contract. States that the only recourse would be for the potential buyer to not want to buy anymore.

In the discussion about real leaders, I think that real leaders are people who are really human, and that's what I'm trying to be. I think that this gather, and that discussion and debate, and disagreeing without being disagreeable is going to be the last best hope for resolving certain issues. I wish to God that I came here before this decision was made, and before the clock ticked to the point where the issue is: you pay court fees and you perform, or you perform; its nuts to me but that's where we're at. I would like to say I agree with commissioner Sorenson, I still would like to see this brought up at the June meeting, so that we can have more engagement and input. I think that this is symptomatic of the reason I ran in the first place, I am an old guy who is a new

commissioner, and by the nature of being on this board, Heather and I have learned of these decisions and the timing of these decisions. And I know I am being a bit controversial, and apologies to my fellow board members, but I'm just telling you what I think. I don't think that a decision like this will ever be made again. I don't think going through this sort of a process where the people have not been engaged with front end will ever go on again. I think this is going to be a thorn in the side for Homes for Good. I think that your positions are legit, and that we are in this sort of impasse. My last statement is going to be this: I think we are looking at a time full of atrocities, and I think we are in an era where the local level is going to be the only place where we can re-knit the fabric of our community back together. I think that this is going to be one of those ultimate tests, because everyone is between a rock and a hard place, and nobody is comfortable with this, and finally I would request, as I am trying imperfectly to do: that I resist confusion, distraction, illusions, and try to get the truth, and whatever is going on, try to connect with my fellow humans, even if situations occur that I am dead set against, because of past decisions, and ensure that future decisions follow the proper process.

3. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

None

4. COMMISSIONERS' BUSINESS

None

5. EMERGENCY BUSINESS

None

6. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of the Minutes: 04/17/2019

Michelle Thurston: States that Commissioner Jay was excused not absent in the last meeting and would like the agenda to be amended as such.

Minutes will be amended to reflect Michelle Thurston's comments

Motion to approve: **Michelle Thurston**

Motion to second: **Heather Buch**

Minutes are approved unanimously 6/0 with commissioner Jay Bozievich being excused

B. Executive Director Report

Jacob Fox: Talks about the executive Director Report. He explains about VASH vouchers and some troubles that Homes for Good and other Housing Agencies have been struggling with in relationship to VASH vouchers.

Joe Berney: So it's not a lack of need or a lack of veterans qualifying for the vouchers?

Jacob Fox: No

Patt Farr: Expresses being hopeful of the future for this matter.

Heather Buch: I would like to declare a potential conflict of interest going forward. I have a conflict of interest with a company that provides housing to those with VASH Vouchers and Section 8 Vouchers. I don't think it is an issue at this point, but in the future I will most likely recuse myself of future agenda items that deal with the allocation of VASH vouchers.

Char Reavis Adjourns the Homes for Good Board Meeting start the PHA 5-Year Plan Public Hearing.

C. PUBLIC HEARING

Char Reavis: Introduces the Public Hearing and Melanie Church to present.

Melanie Church: Explains that the Public Hearing is a requirement of HUD. Homes for good will be taking written comments as well as allow the public to speak during this meeting, they have also received comments from the Resident Advisory Board.

Char Reavis: Expresses appreciation to staff for the input that the Resident Advisory Board was able to give concerning the plan.

Michelle Thurston: Expresses agreement in Char's comments of appreciation.

Pat Farr: Expresses appreciation to Char and Michelle for their service as commissioners and on the Resident Advisory Board.

Joe Berney: Asks what the resident input looks like.

Melanie Church: Explains that Resident comments are included in attachment 4, and the analysis of those comments are also included.

Allie Swartz: When the finalized packet is brought back to the board next month, we will include any more comments that are received in the 45-day comment period.

Char Reavis adjourns PHA 5-Year Plan Public Hearing and reconvenes the Homes for Good Board Meeting.

D. ORDER 19-22-05-01H- In the Matter of Approving a Bid and Awarding Contract #19-C-0023 for the Maplewood Meadows Exterior Improvements Project

Kurt Von Der Ehe: Explains the need of the contract and the current state of Maplewood Meadows. The buildings are in need of repair, specifically a new envelope system. The team has been working with Bergsund Delaney Architecture on the project. The team had to remove the community room from the bid to stay in budget. Homes for Good would like to go with the lowest bid of the four bids received.

Jacob Fox: Gives more context about the project.

Motion to approve ORDER 19-22-05-01H- In the Matter of Approving a Bid and Awarding Contract #19-C-0023 for the Maplewood Meadows Exterior Improvements Project: **Heather Buch**

Second: **Pete Sorenson**

Joe Berney: Asks if it is common practice for Homes for Good to take the lowest bid.

Kurt Von Der Ehe: Explains the bid processes, and the comparison process of the two lowest bids. He explains that it is common practice to accept the lowest as long as the comparisons check out.

Joe Berney: Does the low bid ever end up not being so low?

Kurt Von Der Ehe: Yes. He then explains the independent cost estimate that they compare the low bid to in the process.

This motion has passed unanimously 6/0 with commissioner Jay Bozievich being excused

E. ORDER 19-22-05-02H- In the Matter of Approving the Submission of the Five-Year Capital Fund Action Plan 2019-2023

Kurt Von Der Ehe: Talks about the priorities within the 5-year plan which includes roofs of various housing units including McKenzie Village, Maplewood Meadows, and Pengra Court. Sewers, as well as upgrading kitchens and bathrooms are included in the plan.

Michelle Thurston: How do you determine what year something gets done? Like roofs, siding other than they are leaking or falling off, how do you determine things like walkways and elevators or seismic things?

Kurt Von Der Ehe: Explains the prioritizing that is done internally and the considerations such as HUD suggestions, and the staff looks at life expectancy of various products like roofs and sidings.

Char Reavis: Expresses appreciation to the staff who came to the Resident Advisory Board and presented the improvements to the properties that are included in the five-year plan, and for listening to resident input.

Motion to approve ORDER 19-22-05-02H- In the Matter of Approving the Submission of the Five-Year Capital Fund Action Plan 2019-2023:

Heather Buch

Second: **Michelle Thurston**

This motion has been passed unanimously 6/0 with commissioner Jay Bozievich being excused

F. ORDER 19-22-05-03H- In the Matter of Approving the Submission of a Letter of Interest in obtaining Moving to Work designation under the second cohort under the second cohort of Moving to Work Expansion.

Wakan Alferes: Explains that they are here today to ask permission to submit the letter of interest.

Beth Ochs: Would like to remind the board that this is a letter of intent. The next step would be HUD offering an application, and that it isn't guaranteed, and it will be brought back to the board to decide whether or not to apply.

Michelle Thurston: Asks what the likelihood that Homes for Good will be selected to submit an application by HUD.

Wakan Alferes: States that HUD has a standard of the size that they are looking for for PHAs for this expansion, and Homes for Good is close to meeting that criteria. The expansion is expected to be only 10 PHAs across the country. Wakan mentions that there will be other cohorts for Moving to Work in the future that would be larger, but they feel that this specific cohort could be a good fit and would like to pursue it.

Michelle Thurston: Asks for clarification about tiered rent system and the income requirements.

Beth Ochs: Clarifies that the income on the chart is annual, but the tiered rent on the chart is monthly.

Char Reavis: Asks if the board is going to be able to see the letter of the intent.

Wakan Alferes: States that the letter of intent will be very short, and just express interest, and the board may not be able to see it because of the timing of when it needs to be submitted. Wakan expresses that the board will be able to review and discuss the actual application if Homes for Good is asked to submit one.

Motion to approve ORDER 19-22-05-03H- In the Matter of Approving the Submission of a Letter of Interest in obtaining Moving to Work designation under the second cohort under the second cohort of Moving to Work Expansion: **Joe Berney**

Second: **Michelle Thurston**

Motion passes unanimously 6/0 with commissioner Jay Bozievich being excused.

Joe Berney: When will we know if Homes for Good is selected to submit an application?

Beth Ochs: The HUD Board materials state that they will be reaching back out to PHAs in summer 2019.

G. ORDER 19-22-05-04H- In the Matter of Authorizing Additional Representatives to Act on Behalf of MD Commons LLC.

Steve Ochs: Explains changes to the Board Order since the current order is different than what was presented in the board packet. There were four lawyers that needed to make changes, and one lawyer made changes late. He explains the need of the Board Order which allows Ela Kubok, Communications Director and Jeff Bridgens, Finance Director to sign the closing paperwork for MDC commons. This is in anticipation of Jacob Fox and Ela Kubok being out of office in the upcoming weeks and making sure that someone in the office is authorized to sign in the absences.

Pat Farr: Does this require both signatures, or either or?

Steve Ochs: Only one signature is required, but there is a week Jacob will be out of office, then a week that both Jacob and Ela will be out of office, so a third person is needed in case we are able to close during that week.

Michelle Thurston: Comments about the use of the term "Housing Project" within the board order asking if some alternative such as "residential units" or "housing development." She discusses the negative connotation of the term "Housing Project" and how she would like such language to be stopped moving forward.

Steve Ochs: The language can definitely be changed, it was inserted by the attorneys but can be changed to a different term.

Jacob Fox: Asks to clarify if the language will be changed moving forward, or if it can be changed in this current board order as well.

Steve Ochs: It can be changed for this board order.

The Board decides to change the Board order to say, "residential unit" in place of "Housing Project."

Motion to approve ORDER 19-22-05-04H- In the Matter of Authorizing Additional Representatives to Act on Behalf of MD Commons LLC with the amendment that the term "Housing Project" changed to "Residential Unit." as amended with the language change of Housing Project to Residential Unit: **Michelle Thurston**

Second: **Heather Buch**

This motion has passed unanimously 6/0 with commissioner Jay Bozievich being excused.

H. ORDER 19-22-05-05H- In the Matter of Authorizing the Executive Director or Designee to Acquire Real Property in Cottage Grove Oregon to Develop Affordable Housing.

Heather Buch: Declares a conflict of interest with the project being a partnership with St. Vincent DePaul. Heather is related to the Director of St. Vincent DePaul, and would like to recuse herself of this vote.

Steve Ochs: Explains about the Legion Cottage project. He talks about the timeline of the OregonBILDS program designing it in the fall, and building it starting winter term (January). He explains the proximity to Riverview Terrace. He explains the partnership with St. Vincent DePaul. He also explains about community outreach that will be in the future.

Motion to approve ORDER 19-22-05-05H- In the Matter of Authorizing the Executive Director or Designee to Acquire Real Property in Cottage Grove Oregon to Develop Affordable Housing: **Michelle Thurston**

Second: **Pete Sorenson**

Motion passes 5/0 with Commissioner Jay being excused and Commissioner Heather being recused.

I. DISCUSSION- New Administration Building Financing Update

Jacob Fox: This is just an update; no decision needs to be made at this time. The financing is being worked out and will come back to the board next month to be approved. The construction is slated to start July 2019 and conclude March or April 2020.

Nora Cronin: Explains where Homes for Good is in the process. PIVOT has submitted building permits and are on track to start in July. Nora explains about the budget. Nora explains the work with Moss Adams and the options that have been laid out to finance the building. Nora goes through each option and considerations that the Homes for Good team has looked at when making a decision of which option to go with.

Michelle Thurston: Asks for clarification about the option of adjusting the interest rate after 10 years or call off the loan.

Nora Cronin: Explains how that works and says that Homes for Good will treat it as a 10-year loan and then either have a reserve to pay off the rest of the building at that point or will refinance the building.

Jacob Fox: We could work with the county at that time to issues bonds, but what I would like to see happen is for Homes for Good to set aside a percentage of developer fees over the next ten years to have the money in the bank to pay off the rest of the loan in 10 years.

Joe Berney: So, Homes for Good pays Moss Adams to search for options for the financing?

Nora Cronin: Yes

Joe Berney: Expresses that he thinks the situation isn't that complicated. Whatever structure of loan Homes for Good gets in to they need to mitigate any unforeseen debt that could accrue. He suggests potentially a 15-year amortization. He is weary of making a deal and not having a residual fund to pull from because they are unsure of what the interest rate climate will be in ten years. But, as long as Homes for Good has an idea of how much they want the monthly payments to be, and a plan to mitigate that balloon payment at the end they should be fine.

Pete Sorenson: Agrees that for projects under 20 million it is better to take out loans like normal instead of bonds because the fees are lower.

Jacob Fox: I would love to be able to do a 15-year fixed interest, but there is a relationship between our staffing levels and our mortgage, because right now we don't have a mortgage. So, what we are trying to balance is not cutting staff positions because we are introducing a new operating expense that we haven't historically had.

Nora Cronin: We are looking to bring the financing plan to the board next month in order to start construction the first month of July.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

Pat Farr: Would like to mention again the governance model of the current Homes for Good Board not being ideal for the organization.

Jacob Fox: Jacob agrees, and would like to come to the board in the next 90 days to bring a robust plan of options. Jacob mentions the need for various committees like a real-estate committee for the board which isn't possible in the current board set up.

Adjourn

Please note this is a short excerpt of the proceedings, a full recording of the meeting is available upon request by emailing jshaw@homesforgood.org

APPENDIX A. Public Comment Written Testimony Submission for River Road Property

Written Testimony Submission



Name: Ellen Otani

Date: 5/22/19

Issue: Homes for Good River Road Property

Testimony:

How have you accounted for the possible prescriptive
easement that the general public may hold by virtue of
many years of access through the property to the
~~the~~ trail along the river? This would be in addition to
Willamette Greenway issues which must be carefully considered
for the full length of the River. EO

You may be taking away the public's long established right.
At the very least, please ensure that if the EO

(Continue on Back if Needed)

sale must happen, you require that the developer maintain
public access to the trail by the River. EO

Written Testimony Submission



Name: Kylas Nagaarjuna

Date: May 22, 2019

Issue: River Road.

Testimony:

Best development per neighborhood consensus
is for affordable housing for mobility
impaired and elderly, immensely improving
their quality of life by access to bike path
parks, valley River mall. Both my elderly
parents benefited from access to the
bike path from the meadow — using their
motorized wheelchairs.

(Continue on Back if Needed)

304 Lombard Street



May 21, 2019

Homes for Good Board of Commissioners
177 Day Island Rd
Eugene, OR 97401

Re: Sale of River Rd Property

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of Homes for Good's decision to sell the River Road property. As a peer affordable housing and community development organization, and as a close partner of Homes for Good, I believe you made the right – albeit difficult – decision.

Affordable housing is not an easy business for a host of reasons, but finances and economic realities certainly top the list. And while we are mission-driven, not-for-profit entities, we still have bottom lines, and we still have to make savvy business decisions to maintain operations and continue our service to the public good. Sometimes a necessary decision – that we know is best for the long term health of the organization and our ultimate impact in the community – is also an unpopular one.

NEDCO experienced this firsthand when financial circumstances led to our sale of the popular Sprout Food Hub in downtown Springfield. That decision drew concern, questions, disappointment, and outright anger from many community members and even a few close partners; yet the NEDCO Board of Directors and management all knew it was a necessary decision. We were steadfast in doing the right thing for our organization, transparent and consistent in our messaging, and tried to stay focused on the future. Two years later, Sprout is thriving under its new identity as the Public House, the community loves it, and NEDCO is financially healthy enough to continue the rest of our important work in the community. But I would be lying if I said the process didn't test our strength as an organization.

Homes for Good, like many affordable housing developers across Oregon, faces tough financial decisions to successfully house our most vulnerable residents. From competing in funding applications in which a single point can make-or-break a project, to preserving aging public housing stock, our community needs Homes for Good to make sound, pragmatic choices about where it can most effectively use limited resources – and you are doing exactly that in your choice to sell the River Rd property. The analysis that has been completed on the site and its potential for affordable housing is sound. The reality is that the site will be much easier for a market rate development, and our community needs that housing, too – despite opposition to development from some residents. We're in a housing crisis at many levels of the socioeconomic spectrum. You have an opportunity to enable the development of needed workforce housing, while

212 Main Street
Springfield, OR 97477
T (541) 345-7106
F (541) 345-9584

2700 Market Street NE
Suite 110
Salem, OR 97301
T (503) 779-2680
F (503) 779-2682

421 High Street
Suite 110
Oregon City, OR 97045
T (503) 655-8974
F (503) 303-4763

www.nedcocdc.org



also creating crucial financial resources for more urgent and more viable projects in the Homes for Good pipeline. It's the same choice I would make in your shoes.

Homes for Good has been an incredible partner for NEDCO over many years. From rental deposit loans with Community LendingWorks, to financial literacy classes for FSS participants, to first time homeownership collaborations, Homes for Good has been a creative, nimble, and responsive partner. I have a huge amount of trust in Jacob, your housing development team, and the rest of the staff we work with. We see incredible transformation in the lives of clients we share, and we see nothing but opportunity to build on these partnerships in the coming years.

I know this is a difficult decision for staff and the board. Please let us know if there is anything NEDCO can do to support you and your next steps.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Emily Reiman', is positioned below the word 'Sincerely,'.

Emily Reiman
CEO



May 22, 2019

Board of Directors

Steve Christiansen, *Chair*
Steve Hecker, *Vice Chair*
Jason Pellegrini, *Treasurer*
Zoe York, *Secretary*
Brian Cox
Chris Elliott
Margaret Hallock
Tricia Hedin
Trina Kanewa
Sen. James Manning
Kevin Moore
Guadalupe Quinn
Hon. Ilisa Rooke-Ley
Peter Shannon
Darren Stone
Richie Weinman

Staff

Paul Solomon
Executive Director
Nick Crapser
Deputy Director
Laura Johnson
*Director of Program
Development*

Homes for Good Board of Commissioners
177 Day Island Road
Eugene, OR 97401

Re: Sale of River Road Property

Dear Homes for Good Board,

My name is Paul Solomon and I am the Executive Director of Sponsors, Inc. As an organization we have partnered with Homes for Good on a number of developments over the last 25+ years. I am here today to testify in support of Homes for Good's decision to sell its River Road property.

I find it quite disturbing that an agency that is providing cutting edge services to thousands of low-income Lane County residents is being painted as a greedy developer. Nothing could be farther from the truth. I would like to share a little bit of my experience partnering with Homes for Good. Under the leadership of Larry Abel (previously) and Jacob Fox (presently), Homes for Good has helped Sponsors develop housing programs that are the envy of the state and attract visitors from all over the United States and beyond. These projects house men and women recently released from state prison and the Lane County Jail. Most affordable housing developers wouldn't have touched these projects with a ten-foot pole. As you can imagine, early on in the process, we had some pushback from concerned neighbors where our facilities are sited. Jacob and Homes for Good were with us every step of the way and helped us proactively engage and educate our neighbors who we now have great relationships with. In fact, I owe much of our recent success to our partnership with Homes for Good. Due to of our efforts, we are serving thousands of men and women in our housing programs who would be homeless on the streets of our community at high risk to re-offend with predictable results.

Homes for Good has made it a priority to serve the most vulnerable low-income members of our community including people with disabilities, mental illness, those experiencing domestic violence, and people with criminal histories. Furthermore, Homes for Good is one of a handful of public housing agencies around the country that is really moving the dial and developing model projects like the Sponsors' facilities.

Services for People with Criminal Histories Since 1973

Phone: (541) 485-8341 Address: 338 Highway 99 North, Eugene, OR 97402 Fax: (541) 683-6196

Tax ID# 93-0639815

I would also like to address Jacob Fox's leadership and the recent decision to sell the property on River Road. First of all, I believe we are extremely fortunate to have Jacob leading Homes for Good. His leadership and vision have helped take the organization to new highs as evidenced by the many new affordable housing developments completed and in the pipeline. I have worked closely with Jacob on many different projects and issues, wherein, I have the highest regard for his leadership, integrity and honesty. Frankly, I'm shocked and disappointed that people like Rob Handy would attempt to tarnish his name and reputation. Regarding the sale, which I understand is unpopular, I truly believe it was a prudent financial decision. Whatever frustration neighbors have about the proposed development should be addressed with the developer, not Homes for Good. I strongly support the board's decision to stand by the sale agreement on the River Road property. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,



Paul Solomon

Written Testimony Submission



Name: Curtis Phillips 104 Holman Ave Eugene

Date: 5-23-19 541-337-1803

Issue: The developer

Testimony:

I am a local real estate agent in opposition to this project.

There is a right and wrong way to develop housing. The Ecco building on River Road has destroyed the property values of the adjacent homes. This makes (NIMBY) ~~a~~ never ~~more~~ bigger problem for future developments.

I have left some additional documentation that might be helpful.

(Continue on Back if Needed)

I support more housing for all in my neighborhood!



Southeast Aerial

- BERGSUND
- DELANEY
- Architecture & Planning, P.C.

RIVER ROAD AFFORDABLE HOUSING



River Road Affordable Housing Design Recommendations

Introduction

The City of Eugene has sent out a request for proposals for an affordable housing project in the River Road neighborhood. The City has invited community participation in the planning process. Community members, represented here by the board of the River Road Community Organization, and by the Prout Institute, embrace this opportunity to proactively provide design criteria that both enhances the immediately adjacent residential areas, and furthers long term city goals to increase density and to house low-income residents and create a more resilient neighborhood.

Our view is that these objectives are not contradictory but can provide creative opportunities to model an ecologically and socially sustainable design. The intention of this document is to urge planners and developers to adopt a framework for this development that goes beyond existing practices and invests in a showcase of possibilities. We hope to co-create a development that the City of Eugene can be proud of and that the River Road community will welcome as an asset.

We believe that grounding the development within a whole-systems design will pay off in long and short term benefits. By whole-systems we mean one that integrates housing with state-of-the-art ecological sustainability, as well as encouraging innovative on-site economic opportunities. For example, up-front investments in quality will provide returns over time from savings in energy and water costs.

Avoiding less expensive cookie-cutter design will give the project character that nurtures residents' personal investment in their homes, and help integrate them into the larger River Road community. Using the design to deliberately incorporate a variety of individual, semi-private and community spaces into the development would offer exciting and useful resources to the residents and neighborhood, and build both social and fiscal capital that increases and sustains quality of life.

Below we offer six overarching objectives to guide the design process and to stimulate further discussion.

Written by members the RRCO sub-committee for affordable housing, Jon Belcher, Clare Strawn, Ravi Logan, and Cameron Ewing, with many contributions from neighbors through community outreach.

Guiding Design Objectives

1] High-Performing Housing

This housing project should to be not only affordable but, so much as feasible, high performing in terms of energy efficiency, aesthetic quality, and functionality.

2] Emergency Preparedness / Resilience

The housing project should not only be structurally sound to withstand extreme seismic events, but designed to provide for basic life support following a natural disaster. Life support examples could be site food production, rainwater catchment, passive solar design and residential conditions that enhance social cohesion.

3] Low or Positive Environmental Impact

Environmental concerns that should be considered in the project design include: minimizing the carbon footprint of building operation, minimizing the embodied energy in building materials, minimizing use of toxic building materials, providing for rainwater catchment, reducing need for landscape irrigation, and supporting pollinators.

4] Enhance Immediate Community and Integrate with Broader Community

The project should include design features that enhance a sense of community among the residents, as well as foster integration of residents into the larger River Road community.

5] On Site Economic Opportunities and Services

Design features could be arranged to offer encouragement to ~~on-site economic opportunities,~~ such as small cottage industries, internet-based enterprises, and mutual self-help projects for the low-income residents. The development should also provide on-site social services, as appropriate and as needed. Examples would be daycare, after school programs, and skill development education.

6] Enhance Resident and Neighborhood Security

Design features should be incorporated that promote security from theft, harm and harassment of both the residents of the complex and of immediate neighbors.

Design Concept

To create needed affordable housing that will contribute to the neighborhood fabric of River Road.

Design Criteria

1] Cultural Sustainability

To enable residents of this project to connect economically and socially with the existing community of River Road, and to accommodate a diversity of demographics, from single parents to an elderly couple.

2] Green Innovations

To use as many green strategies as possible considering climate, budget, payback periods, and maintenance feasibility. [See Appendix 1]

3] Positive use of space

To include a variety of outdoor spaces so that residents are allowed to extend a sense of ownership beyond the interior of their homes. These can be semi-private spaces arranged around a common area, so that residents can look outward into an area that belongs to them as a member of the community. Some buffer areas can be deliberately undeveloped so that residents may personalize their own spaces, creating a sense of home rather than simply "being housed." By shifting and rotating edges of the development footprint the negative spaces in-between the building footprints become interesting and create mini-venues that can host a variety of activities.

4] Diversity of units

Units should be designed to accommodate many different household compositions. Residents should be able to identify their unit with more than a posted address. If units are less homogeneous the development will gain a higher quality aesthetic character.

5] Open and Inviting

When privacy is not required for adjacent neighbors, other site property lines (River Road or West portion of East Maynard.) should not use unnecessary hard boundaries. This can allow residents to connect to their neighbors more easily, extending the sense of community beyond the area of the site, while still maintaining territorial cues with soft boundaries such as a short wall or fence.

6] Pedestrian/Bike Path and Public Transit Connection

To use the housing complex to connect the West Bank Park bike trail to the River Road bike trail, and to arrange close connection with public transit. Alternative means of transportation should be encouraged. Providing amenities that attract residents who do not want to own their own car such as free bus passes, car share/flex car on site and safe/convenient places to store bikes with reduce the burden on residents, neighbors and the environment.

7] Minimizing Impact

To minimizing any negative impact of the housing project on existing adjacent residences. [See Appendix 2]

8] Building Orientation

An East to West building orientation will take advantage of prevailing winds for natural ventilation and will provide maximize solar exposure on south facing walls.

Appendix 1: List of Green Innovations and Features

- thickened and highly insulated exterior walls for insulation and sound reduction
- building orientation that maximizes daylighting and ventilation potential
- natural daylighting
- passive cooling
- rainwater harvesting
- greywater system
- low flow plumbing fixtures
- energy efficient appliances and lighting fixtures
- composting program
- recycling program
- connecting ecological systems
- use of integrated systems
- permeable paving and asphalt
- native landscaping
- edible landscaping
- integrated with community garden and on-site garden

Appendix 2: Factors for Minimizing Impact on Existing Adjacent Residences

1] Site Access

To minimize the impact of traffic on adjacent, narrow residential streets, vehicle access will be from River Road or the west end of East Maynard only.

2] Setbacks

There will be maximally reasonable setbacks from adjacent existing housing.

3] Parking

Parking can be located on periphery to maximize setbacks from existing adjacent homes. Adequate parking will also be provided to minimize overflow onto adjacent streets.

4] Building Heights

Building heights and orientation should maximize the privacy of adjacent neighbors.

5] Balconies

Balconies will be on inner facades, facing away from neighboring properties.

6] Smoking Area

If a non-smoking facility, a covered smoking area will be provided within the site.

River Road Resident Survey

Question 1

If you, hypothetically, were going to live at this affordable housing development, what design features, programs or considerations would you like to see. Please list in order of importance, number 1 being most important.

Number 1. priority answers

- The living space meets my space and personal use needs.
- Context – sensitive design using sustainably-sourced materials.
- Community room—to be available for both development-wide and private resident use.
- Distance from fence (especially of two story homes)
- A clean, safe and easy to maintain residence
- Good insulation between adjacent apartments. I mean really good, so you don't hear televisions going and conversations and running water and music, etc. etc.

Number 2. priority answers

- It is easy to connect to my immediate neighbors and the community
- Open, inward-facing courtyard with beautiful landscaping and features that encourage neighbors gathering/interacting. (community center building for multi-use)
- Ample on-site parking.
- Plenty of parking. On E.Howard we already have a jam of cars from the Day Care Center. If residents of the complex need more room, this larger street on the East Side of River Road will become a hive of parked cars and this will not help with neighbor relations.
- Some covered outdoor spaces such as patios or gazebos
- Someplace to grow your own plants in the ground, not in pots. Either some border areas and/or a raised bed or two.

Number 3. priority answers

- I can easily access bike paths and public transit.
- Adequate soundproofing and quality materials that create privacy within the community.
- Considerations for children—playground for children of residents and their guests; possibly on-site day care
- Secure easy-to-access storage for bicycle(s); camping gear, etc
- Skylights. These are essential in the Pacific Northwest for bringing in healthy sunlight in winter.

Question 2

If you, hypothetically, were an adjacent neighbor of this affordable housing project what design features, programs or considerations would you like to see. Please list in order of importance, number 1 being most important.

Number 1. priority answers

- My personal privacy is maximized
- Ingress/egress that respects current neighborhood patterns/uses.
- Plenty of on-site parking—no spillover to neighbors. If at some future date, parking isn't completely used, it can be converted to another use—small house, community garden, etc.
- The architectural design of the development blends well with the surrounding neighborhood. I visualize a sort of a vintage cottage look, circa 1950ish.
- Noise barriers so that you wouldn't hear music, outdoor conversations, landscaping machinery (esp. leaf blowers). The overall noise level should be kept really low, not by decree but by good design. It's bad enough having River Road roaring by all hours of the day & night.

Number 2. priority answers

- The project is attractive as viewed from my property.
- Inward-facing balconies and bike path access/interface.
- Retain privacy. No balconies looking down over adjacent properties. Tall buildings hidden by vegetation from adjacent properties.
- The landscaping enhances the River and Garden District concept, with areas for residents' gardens, attractive shrubs, shade trees, and play areas. There is easy access from the development into the Maynard Park and thus to the River.
- An attractive wall (preferably brick) to delineate the boundary between this project and the most adjacent neighbors, not a high wall to actually keep people out, but more of a "good fences make good neighbors" kind of wall that could also encourage "over the back fence" conversations.

Number 3. Priority answers

- My new neighbors will be compatible with the existing community.
- Community center for multi-use to promote interactions within the neighborhood.

- Fits in with neighborhood—either same style as surrounding properties or hidden by vegetation.
- The development is well-maintained, clean, quiet, and does not create excessive additional vehicular traffic on Maynard St and River Road.
- Visual privacy so that people on higher floors couldn't see into their neighbor's yards or through their windows.

Additional Survey Comments

- Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this community development project!
- I hope neighborhood concerns will be considered. The River Road area has had three recent developments which have been unacceptable to neighbors. The ECCO apartments are built and are causing major parking problems in the neighborhood and have impacted the privacy of adjacent residents. Just because a development is near a bus stop, doesn't mean that bus transportation is realistic for the residents. There may be no stop near their work. They may need to carry tools or other materials. Their work days or hours may not coincide with bus schedules. They may need to go to so many places during the day (e.g. work, childcare/school, own education, shopping) that using buses is too time-consuming. The city's parking requirements are completely inadequate for current resident needs.
- After attending the meeting a few weeks ago at the church, it does sound like much care will go into the planning of this facility. I appreciate the desire to make this a positive experience for the neighborhood. We are glad that those with limited incomes will have more housing options. I hope we can keep a positive future relationship.
- Thanks to everyone working on this project. I visualize that it will be an attractive asset to the neighborhood.
- Chiefly, people in the neighborhood should not feel threatened by this new set of buildings full of strangers. They should know that this is not a cheap housing project that will attract noisy, irresponsible people, who would need constant discipline, rules and regulations to keep them under "control." Some of the control can be built into the design and configuration and spacing of the new buildings.

Specific concerns, and suggestions from individual community members.

Creativity Center and Art Program

The affordable housing complex on River Road has the opportunity to address three major issues in River Road, the need for affordable housing, the need for a more vibrant cultural identity, and support for parents and children to rise out of poverty.

As the founder of ArtCity Eugene and lead coordinator of EUG-ART404, I propose using social design to address these issues in a similar manner as Rick Lowe's Project Row Houses. The concept is that this part of the affordable housing project and the people involved will participate in living work of social sculpture, where artists and parents work together to shape and form their lives and the community.

Like Project Row Houses, I propose that we provide short-term subsidized housing to single parents and short-term studios to artists. To be eligible to participate in the 2-year program, low-income parents must work and pursue higher education, and their children must be enrolled in daycare or school. The parents will be deeply integrated with the artists who will live onsite and have onsite studios. For artists to participate, they must make art and maintain a practice of applying to exhibitions, publishers, performances, and in some way getting their art out into the world. They also need to provide artistic after-school activities for children who live in the housing complex when they get home from school. Artists must qualify for and pay full rent for their low-income housing, but their studio space will be provided as part of their participation in the residency. Each artist will be provided with a studio that is equivalent in size to a studio apartment. Studios will have running water, heat, ventilation, and high ceilings. Artists will integrate children and participating parents into their artistic processes and parents will be encouraged to apply the creative process and artistic expression to their own lives.

The result of this program will be an ongoing paradigm shift that will enrich and shape the lives of parents, children, and the greater community.

Artist studios need to be adjacent to a playground area and a large indoor play area that can also be used as a community room. I also suggest including a maker-space, such as the Eugene Library Maker Space and perhaps a workshop such as the one that is available at the Campbell Center. Use of equipment in the maker-space could be available to residents in the River Road Neighborhood.

Organizational entities would need to collaborate to oversee the program. ArtCity Eugene would oversee the artist residency program and workshop, and organize open houses so people can experience the art and community that is being created.

An organization such as St Vincent DePaul, Women's Space, or the Relief Nursery, could oversee housing and life-skills development for parents in the program. And the Eugene Library may be an ideal entity to establish a satellite makerspace in the Creativity Center.

Sincerely,
Charly Swing

Neighborhood Parking

My greatest concern is the amount of parking availability that will be incorporated into this development.

I live on Maynard, which is almost directly opposite the DariMart and which will be the most natural street to accommodate the development residents' parking needs since no parking is allowed on Howard. One of my neighbors across from me parks two vehicles on the street and four vehicles in the driveway. When my neighbor immediately next to me has guests, they park in front of my house, which is fine, but it makes navigating out of my driveway a bit of a challenge. If their guests also park in front of their house, it becomes especially problematic. We don't need non-residents parking on our street as an alternative to insufficient parking in their development.

At a meeting early this year regarding the ECCO apartments and the neighborhood street parking problems as a result of that development, the City representative indicated, if memory serves, that code requires only three-quarters of ONE parking spot per apartment, which is absolutely ridiculous. I know the goal is to force people out of vehicles and onto public transportation or bikes, but this doesn't seem a realistic way to accomplish that.

It is not uncommon for a residence of two adults to have two vehicles. If there are children of driving age, it is not uncommon for those children to also have a vehicle. Not to provide sufficient parking for the residents of this development will make it an extremely unwelcome addition to this neighborhood.

Please provide realistic parking space for these residents. It is not fair to them not to and it is definitely not fair to surrounding neighbors who would like to welcome them to this area.

Thank you for adding this concern to the RFP soon to be sent to developers.

Sincerely,
Sylvia Gillings

Garden Program and Native Landscaping

At present there are some very tall trees, hedging the far border with existing houses. I think it would be called the east border. This means that **three-story construction along that line of trees** would not dominate the existing houses, and if these were set back, possibly allowing play areas, etc., the trees would continue to get plenty of sun. **Also on the north side, three-story construction** could abut the road, possibly with no setback. This allows for denser concentration in those areas, and leaves more room for open space, especially along the southern and eastern orientations, which are critical for gardening. **Two story buildings could occupy the center**, with unshaded gardens along the periphery.

The tour we took showed us three Affordable Housing sites. The first, Turtle Creek, was an early build (2008). A half acre was set aside for community gardens, but only three small plots were being worked. The people just do not prioritize this kind of activity. The second and third were later builds, and contained very small plots, and only a few of them. I suppose the developer figured nobody was using garden plots anyway, so why dedicate so much land. In fact, even those pathetically small plots had to be planted by volunteers outside the developments, because nobody cared to use them. This shows **a need for outreach**, and I'm concerned that future developers will knock in a couple of coffin-sized raised beds and call it good. That would be a horrible mistake.

First of all, outreach can affect rates of use. **We have master gardeners and permaculture designers and all kinds of PR-capable outreachers** to conduct this. Give it time, and there will be more interest.

Second, and much more importantly, the economy is sliding into the toilet. Things are definitely going to be worse for those on the margins, as a few years go by. The growing of food is going to be seen as dramatically important as times get tougher. It would be prudent to have a large garden space with good sun.

My suggestion is, that **a large community garden** be included, with plenty of sun. Fifty or so plots of around 20x4' or so could be created, and that tenants be given first chance to pick them up. A certain number could be held in reserve for other residents who might want to start later (after outreach, or when times get much tougher), and worked by volunteers. North Eugene High School is not far away, and hundreds of high school seniors need 100 hours of community service to graduate. You can bet they'd go for a fun group activity, of planting some stuff and keeping those beds healthy and productive. Food could be donated to the tenants. If half the plots were available to the general public (after the tenants got their initial chance) many community members would be happy to take up one of the plots. They should be allowed to keep the plot, year after year, by paying the nominal fee necessary for maintenance. But if they give up a plot, tenants get first dibs again. This plan would make say, a half acre site, tremendously productive, with low-income families increasingly able to eat fresh organic fruits and vegetables.

For the same reasons, I suggest planting **fruit trees and blueberry bushes for the kids to raid**. Kids need clean, organically grown food. **No spray!** Fresh, sweet, ready to eat produce is tremendously important for mood, nutrition and success in young lives.

Mike Brunt had a good suggestion, when we were viewing Turtle Creek. He noted that the garden was shunted out to the back, where nobody would see it unless they really tried. His comment - and I think he's correct - was that **putting the garden in the center of the complex** (or in the middle of a U-shaped construction) would bring people together as well as propagandizing the importance (and fun!) of growing food. Put benches and a couple of little tables in it, and let people relax there in the evening. The playground equipment could be within a short distance, and eyesight, such that daytime childcare would be especially uplifting.

Another plan - and I don't know about the feasibility of it - would be to make **multi-level parking**. If you put a garage at the corner where Hunsaker meets the east trees, those on the third floor could walk rain-free from car to apartment, and the same for the second and first floor residents. A garage coming off River Road could service two-story buildings there. This would save a lot of land and be more sightly than a sprawling asphalt lot.

I very much liked the planting of **native species** at Willakenzie. However, the maintenance seems to involve bark dust and poison spray. One strategy would be to make residents responsible for their own weeding, in front of units. Another would be to **plant cover crops and hire weeders** (possibly from the low-income residents, and even better if it puts some money in the pockets of teens there).

Sincerely,
Christopher Logan

East Maynard St. and Pollinator Garden.

Jen Hornaday is a adjacent neighbor of this project and lives at the very east end of E. Maynard. She and other neighbors on both E. Maynard and E. Hatten are concerned about additional traffic on a gravel county road that is currently maintained by residents. The concern is that the intersection at E. Maynard and River Road will be backed up with traffic during peak hours and some people will choose to go down E. Maynard to E. Hatton in order to connect to River Road. She asks that a right turn only sign be placed on the exiting side of the E. Maynard entrance to alleviate this issue.

Secondly, at the corner of the South-East portion of the development side Jen has been planting pollinators and turning over soil for about ten year. She hopes that the pollinators and rich soil will be seen as a resource for this development.

Sincerely,

Cameron Ewing on behalf of Jen Hornaday.