

Q1 (What do you hope the River Road-Santa Clara Neighborhood Plan helps to achieve?)
Walkable, vibrant neighborhood with access to public transportation and shopping while still maintaining (and possibly expanding) green spaces and neighborhood character.
A more coordinated approach to development that addresses the patchwork nature of the area. Bringing more city services into the area (like EmX and regular transit routes, affordable housing development).
More business development to attract more people who would usually congregate in the downtown area
A comprehensive vision of amenities, goals, and policies RR and SC residents want for our neighborhood.
A great solution that is inclusive and considers how the proposed projects will impact residences and the committees.
Clarity about development
Provide park and green space, affordable housing and NO EMEX!
Increased safety for bike and pedestrian traffic, increased open space/natural areas near all neighborhoods, more small/local/cottage businesses scattered throughout to promote a more walkable community. Bus line connection. Preservation of farm land inside and outside Urban Growth Boundary. Prevention of largescale apartment buildings more than 2 stories. Less cars.
Maintain River Rd with buses, not the stupid space wasting EmX type system
I hope that this area will be less ugly. Supporting local businesses is good, but, there should be rules about all the big ugly parking lots and run down buildings. And we need more rules about junked out cars and garbage sitting in neighborhoods. It could be more beautiful and more life affirming here. We need more trees and native plants.
Provide a clear road map for future housing and commercial development, transportation planning, and provisions for additional parks,
I hope that the plan does NOT reduce River Road lanes for automobile traffic. I drive it daily from Spring Creek down to Beltline, and there is already GRIDLOCK on various stretches of River Road at various times with TWO lanes each way. When there is road work being done and two lanes are reduced to one, the gridlock and traffic backups are horrible to navigate. If new lane(s) for buses are added with auto lane(s) being reduced, traffic on River Road will be catastrophically blocked. A loss of any auto lanes in either direction north and south will destroy auto traffic flow beyond repair. I can envision our beloved Santa Clara becoming a nightmare for residents who must drive, along with the resulting **seriously declining property values** for those of us living in Santa Clara. The inevitable result will be a major class action lawsuit against the City, invoking the U.S. Constitution's "Takings" clause to sue the City for damages to property values **created by** reduced auto lanes on already congested River Road.
stop the homeless camps
Economic growth and build home equity in existing home owners
Gives a blueprint for future development, guides City planners.
I hope we can increase walkability, neighborhood character and cohesiveness, attract interesting local businesses, and calm car traffic.
While growth (people, traffic, businesses) is inevitable in the River Road-Santa Clara area, I hope that this plan will guide that growth in such a way that the unique character of this neighborhood is retained. I am against that City of Eugene's plan to homogenize all neighborhoods in the name of a few saved dollars. What makes Eugene (or any city) special? Why do people choose to live there? Answer: The unique qualities of its neighborhoods and downtown area(s). The RRSC Neighborhood Plan incorporates elements that will guide the growth in this neighborhood while retaining its "River and Garden District" grace.
A denser community that still retains the feel of an area with trees and streams. A denser community will help with lower housing costs and more efficient mass transportation.
This question is almost too generic to answer, but I suppose I would like to see the neighborhood urbanize in a physical sense: redesign roads, vastly improve bike and pedestrian infrastructure, allow more density and mixed commercial/residential development. We need neighborhood markets and decent restaurants. River Rd is a classic "stroad" that is dangerous and inconvenient.
A more livable, well-designed neighborhood that fosters community.
Protecting & enhancing green spaces, esp. along the river. Protecting the farmland & farmer's markets and stands. Improving walkability including more sidewalks. Improving the appearance and appeal of River Road.
The Plan should help establish standards for zoning and buildings, access to the Willamette River, require neighborhood parks, protect and enhance the Greenway, encourage business to help achieve a 20-minute neighborhood, and recognize the River Road neighborhood as the destination River and Garden District of Eugene.
to not spoil the area with so much packed housing that River Road becomes unusable, for many of us up north here, that is the only way we have to get anywhere. It is terribly congested already don't cut down all the trees keep park and open space natural, don't pave it over
Maintain quality of current neighborhoods while adding safety for pedestrians.(ie traffic control)

Q1 (What do you hope the River Road-Santa Clara Neighborhood Plan helps to achieve?)

Protection of the Willamette Greenway from any development other than walking paths and maintenance of neighborhood character.

Movement towards change

I have lived in River Rd area for 40 years; I was invited to the White house as an honorary chairman of business council by President Bush in 2008. I have been engaged in neighborhood meetings for the past 7 years. my opinion is that I have wasted my time, city paid \$450000 to a company from the state of Washington to study River Rd Santa Clara and River Rd corridor 3 years ago. all the neighbors who care about their neighborhood attended in many meetings and voiced their opinion, the company who did the study made their recommendations, in which my property on the corridor was included. The city created a new map showing all the changes. according to the city new changes and the drafting the new codes was supposed to be done on November, December of 2022.

in the past 5 years I have seen 3 or 4 different people who have been in charge of this project representing the city and seems like they keep leaving their position and maybe it's because the city does not care about them and the neighbors' voices and opinion. and what happened to the \$450000.

Now the city representatives in charge of this project are saying that they want to put everything on hold again because there are pros and cons. River Rd economic development happened 40 years ago and whatever people have said the past 7 years mean nothing to the city, I asked what pros and cons, and the city say we need more housing in our neighborhood, and they want the corridor to have apartment buildings everywhere. 40 years ago, when city actually did something for our neighborhood the population was so little and now River Rd has the most congestion of vehicles because more people live in our neighborhood cannot get anything of their needs. we have to drive all the way to W11th and Coburg Rd and Springfield to get our needs met. if city would stop playing around and wants to actually help our neighborhood, they would want us to have access to most amenities by drafting the codes ASAP.

by doing so we will have more commercial land on the corridor and more businesses would be attracted to investing for new businesses to solve our problems. in one of those meetings, I recommended a pedestrian bridge for the River Rd and Silver Lane. hopefully that would happen to partially reduce the congestion of vehicles, also I remember when River Rd was 2 lanes and there was no traffic, now we have 4 lanes and in crucial areas between two very close intersections to each other, buses don't have turn outs and have to take one of lanes for the bus stops. it's a mess and seems like no one cares. its simple; move the bus stop or figure out how to add bus turn out,

I own property adjacent to bowling and pizza hut facing River RD and facing Kourt Dr, according to your map its designated to be mixed commercial. there is an example of where more business can come. The city and the county will be making much more money from the high commercial taxes and the neighborhood will have access to more amenities. but the latest i heard is that for no reason the city has decided not to draft the codes???

Thank you so much for taking the time to read all this

Hamid Madani
River Rd resident

I hope the plan creates a cohesive vision and guiding principles for our RR-SC Neighborhood.

I hope it protects our natural features, improves our quality of life, helps bring small local businesses within walking distance of residents, creates infrastructure that supports non-automotive transportation, encourages our youth to stay here for their adulthood, and strengthens connections between neighbors.

Provide direction forward for the city, county, and the community to follow for the next 20 years as both neighborhoods grow and change.

Make area more walkable, improve traffic, protect trees and other green spaces

To provide guidance for development and preservation in our cherished River & Garden district using a collaborative process of engagement.

I would hope there would be more affordable housing and another outlet for vehicles to get to Delta Highway and cut down on the Belt Line traffic. Our parks should be kept clean and made available to people that live and pay taxes in our community and not used for camping .

That the Plan will create a center for the community that includes businesses and natural areas (small park) - - a town square for a town that has been bisected and dissected by busy streets.

A livible environment for people of all classes, races

I am very excited about the the Draft Plan. I support in particular its focus on identifying RR/SC problems and presenting solutions that are very well thought out and flexible. I am particularly interested in addressing the congestion on River Road by creating a regional transportation system and walkable neighborhood centers, projects which go hand in hand with local economic development. Strengthening the established SC and RR Community Organizations will be important for educating our communities about important issues and guiding change.

To create a sense of community, connectedness (to each other, to nature) and safety!

Further 10-20 minute neighborhoods throughout the area with commercial development that meets residents' needs and wants with easy and safe multi-modal access to work, school, social activities and that commercial development. Preserving and improving access to the river is important.

Q1 (What do you hope the River Road-Santa Clara Neighborhood Plan helps to achieve?)

For one thing, I hope for better researched sites for changes they want to make. Regarding the proposed bridge over Beltline Road to "better serve NEHS students with a safer route to school," no one has heard of any survey that has been made to actually learn how many kids would use such a walking or bicycle route. Also, those who are making such decisions have barely spent five minutes in the Sterling Drive/Sterling Court area. Removing a house here or there is talked about, but these good-intentioned people don't KNOW the neighborhood dynamics: the school buses that barely get through with cars on the street, the curve in the road which would be a safety issue now that there are more small children living near the proposed EXIT space, and many other issues which in my opinion disqualify Sterling Drive/Sterling Court from further consideration. Planners would be exchanging problems North to new ones South of Beltline. Please do not destroy our beautiful , well-maintained neighborhood with a hiking, biking bridge exit.

Q13 (What are you most excited about within the Draft River Road-Santa Clara Neighborhood Plan?)

More walkability, nearby businesses that serve the neighborhood, more community spaces

How well-thought out it is, and how much community input has gone into it. It could be a very solid plan for 20-30 years. As is typical of Eugene, we've talked it to death. I'll be interested to see how quickly some of these steps in the action plan materialize, or if a few folks just continue to block progress.

That it lays both concrete actions and an overall vision of what RRSC residents would want to see in our neighborhoods.

Accessibility plans

Increase in natural areas, bikeable/walkable community with more small local stores closer to my home.

nothing

All of the action items for "Parks and Natural Resources"--but they need to be more eco friendly and sustainable. Also, "Increase Walking and Biking," "Improve Beltline and River Road," but that has to make the bike lanes separate and safe. The Willamette Greenway Standards definitely need to be adopted to protect the beautiful river and the wildlife that need a green area to live.

nothing

Na

Improvements in bikeability and walkability.

Walkability, traffic safety, encouraging locally owned businesses, neighborhood culture and character

The opportunity for residents of RRSC to truly influence the City of Eugene/Lane County's development of this neighborhood. I hope that the Neighborhood Plan will not just be a piece of paper that the City puts in a file cabinet, but rather a living active document that holds power in the face of pressure to make all neighborhoods exactly the same. RRSC is unique!

I like the focus on physical infrastructure: land use, road design, housing and commercial development, density, pedestrian and bike paths, human-scale development, etc. I would love to see the neighborhood improve in these tangible ways in the near future.

The overall vision and goals and suggested code amendments.

1. The plan to increase access to the Willamette River in Santa Clara by developing / growing the riverfront pathway system north of the beltway.

2. The plan's focus on farm preservation, & nurturing local farm stands and markets.

1) all the hard work and participation that it represents; 2) the potential for a bringing about a more cohesive and efficient neighborhood with enforceable laws, codes and requirements.

The process itself seems to have produced a coherent approach to neighborhood development, when needed.

The support for more businesses.

Not excited since the city does not care about our needs.

I am excited that there is a broadscale effort to make the RR-SC community more sustainable, livable and dynamic.

Nothing--all just words. city do what they want regardless, should be working on the homeless problem, not stuff like this

Vision, engagement, outreach opportunities, and explicit values.

Traffic and pedestrian safety and affordable housing.

Developing the empty piece of land adjacent to the Bus terminal on Hunsaker and River Road - - according the the intentions of the plans and the comments made previously in this survey.

I am excited that the residents have had opportunities to discuss it and will have more opportunities

The ability to make changes in our community to enhance our quality of life.

Safer and quieter river road - the ability to actually walk on the sidewalk up to a community gathering place or public house to eat with friends (with good lighting, greenery, nice sidewalks, quieter and slower traffic), listen to music, etc and take a stroll on the river path.; the ability to let my kid bike down river road to his nanas house on his own without being worried about the fast traffic and very narrow and not protected bike lane.

I was excited that we finally had a community meeting at NEHS, and I look forward to another one to view the new NEHS (after watching it being built for 2.5 years). Having an opportunity to meet our neighbors is helpful.

Q14 (What additional feedback do you have on the Neighborhood Plan?)

I would like it all to happen soon!

The feedback form link on the River Rd-Santa Clara neighborhood page is broken.

It would be great to have a document that extracts all the priority strategies for each area. It's asking a lot for people to review a 70-page document to get any granular information, and I didn't find anything besides those purple boxes to indicate a timeline for the next 3-5 years.

Also, maps are a great way to convey some of these action plan items. More of those, please, and always legible. The Vision Map (even at full-size) is hard for people with vision challenges to read. The font is too light.

We own a home on a Maxwell and Northwest Expressway. It's already very noisy. Throwing additional traffic will make it worse. We're not completely against the idea, but want to see sound isolation walls/barriers along Northwest Expressway to accommodate this plan. Examples abound of how these barriers can improve the mental, emotional, and physical healths of surrounding communities. We will not support raising taxes or the increase of traffic on Northwest Expressway if a sound barrier will not be included.

I can't stress enough how opposed I am to adding an EMEX line down River Road. We already have a bus option which is barely used. I have lived and worked in Santa Clara for 40 years. I know the area and the people. I have not heard of anyone in favor of EMEX.

Infill is fine, but its critical for residents mental health to have nearby parks and wild areas to retreat to. There are currently not enough. in some neighborhoods. Postage stamp parks are not enough. Preserve remaining farmland within UGB.

Do not change overcrowded River Rd to put in a space-wasting EmX type system

Please be more forward thinking about best practices for parks and wild spaces in order to make them more hospitable to native plants, native ecologies, birds, pollinators, and other wildlife. We need to catch up in order to take care of the beautiful, amazing Eugene area!

Water features and beautification

I appreciate the thousands of hours of volunteer time spent by thousands of residents in developing this plan.

Reading this plan makes me feel excited to live here. I've been here for about 20 years, and I know it could be a great place to live. Currently kind of run down and shoddy, and full of inconsiderate drivers speeding through residential neighborhoods. I want to help make things better!

none

Overall, I am very, very happy with this plan—great job by all who were involved.

I'm concerned that our area via this plan is not helping much with infill in Eugene. There seems to be a hidden undertone of opposing increased density. The plan is opposed to flag lots and wants to give tax benefits to use space for gardens which is a disincentive for increased density. I love the urban feel of our community, but Eugene won't reach climate, transportation, or housing goals if parts of town fight density.

Even if all lots within the UGB were converted to housing, one would still be able to head east on Wilkes (passing by a huge park), swing north on River Loop 1, pass farms on the right, Whitely landing, River Loop park, farms on the left that are not yet in the UGB, have farms and large lot homes on the north side of East Beacon and have pretty much a rural/farm feel until one reaches River Road

My main comment is that there are some sections written for people who are looking for money (tax breaks). I'm sure they can rationalize it, but even a kid can tell it's not right.

I already gave my other, less critical concerns. I would appreciate it if someone gave them some thought.

Try to give more examples and specifics about these intended plans.

A second plea to direct one time resources to codify more of the suggested actions.

Just an observation that we have a great connection to wildlife here; frogs croaking, owls hooting at night, waterfowl, raptors & myriads of creatures that add to our daily experience. It will become increasingly important to safeguard and nurture this wildlife as this area changes and grows. Infill, if not done carefully, could negatively impact the wildlife and our ability to experience this, which would be a loss for all.

Thank you thank you to everyone who has contributed to getting this Plan ready for final approval!!

Again, my primary concern is the protection of the Willamette River, its Greenway, and the character of current neighborhoods.

Q14 (What additional feedback do you have on the Neighborhood Plan?)

20 to 30 years from now if the corridor is all filled with apartment buildings and we need more Commercial land, is the city going to ask the apartment owner to tear down their building for the city to have access to more commercial spaces ?

Having experience with strategic planning with other groups, I have seen that success is dependent on prioritization and having achievable actions. Also, it is important to be prepared for the ebbs and flows of energy around the plan.

Some of the action items in the table are gray, what does that mean? Example on page 46 among others.

There are a lot of action items with many different organizations involved in the implementation. I did not see in the draft any plan on how to move forward with these action items or if there would be periodic monitoring on how/if these action items were being implemented. For example many action items are designated to be implemented by the Community. So who takes the lead in this community implementation? I don't have a suggestion but the action item list looks great but it needs to have an implementation plan as well.

Each neighborhood in Eugene is unique due to location, natural resources, pattern of development, history, etc. - we need to find a way to honor this uniqueness by allowing neighborhoods to have leeway in developing an appropriate neighborhood plan for their area- certainly there will be areas of commonality, agreement, and opportunities to replicate portions, but trying to use a one-size-fits all approach is the wrong direction for us to pursue as a community and will adversely impact our quality of life.

I am hoping that roundabouts are not being considered to help the flow of traffic. I have watched many trucks and school buses trying to get around those.

It is good to have a community plan in place so that as the neighborhoods/community develops and changes in the years ahead there is a good road map to help make good decisions.

I'm not sure how this plan addresses the fact that neither the City nor the County see RR and SC as "theirs" and as such, it is neglected by both.

Do not extend the city zone to include Farm land presently outside the city limit. We need the No.1 soil left for farming. Also I had some questions about the use of "appropriate" in goal 3.1.5 and in goal 10.1.1 who decides what is appropriate ?

Thank you to all the people who have worked on this project for so many years. It is an awesome plan.

I so appreciate everyone's hard work!! I also know I've been filling out these same questions for over a decade now. Hopefully some action (and funding towards that action) will be happening. I hope river road is given the same equal treatment as the richer parts of town.

The survey, and the many pages of background material were very stressful... due to the late timing of the City's hiking/biking bridge, post cards, and its seeming incidental application to the Neighborhood Plan. This was confusing and alarming.

Source	Q2 Economic Development (What is missing from this topic area?) Q3 Economic Development (What changes, clarifications, or additions are needed to improve this topic area?)	1 - Small Revisions 2 - Policy/Action Changes 3 - General Feedback 4 - Already Addressed 5 - Outside Plan Scope	Staff Notes and Considerations
Q2	Lane County Community & Economic Development, Eugene Economic Development, Eugene Chamber of Commerce, and Lane SBDC involvement in 1.2.1 and 1.2.2. That type of inventory and analysis requires specific expertise and funding these two agencies have. Why tasking the community with this? Also, why is it not a priority?	2	Should these actions be flagged as priority (1.2.1 and 1.2.2)? Add a definition of "Community" in action plan to clarify who is responsible for implementation (i.e., such as Chamber...)
Q2	Natural Foods Stores	2	Falls under Goal 2 - access to daily needs. May be overly specific for the Action Plan, but could be addressed with a clear definition of "daily needs."
Q2	I think all 4 things listed above are important. What is missing is neighborhood beautification. Junky neighborhoods encourage more crime and more littering. Many businesses do not put any effort into beautification. Too many huge, empty asphalt parking lots and ugly signs are depressing and lower the property values in this area. Almost all of the strip malls in this area are ugly, with giant unnecessary parking lots. It looks bad and lowers property values. We can do better!	2	Reclaiming parking areas is addressed under Actions 5.3.6, 10.3.4 (specific to church parking lots), and 11.4.1. Could consider an action specific to frontage improvements under Policy 11.2 or 11.3.
Q2	Economic development and economic incentives for necessary services (small grocery, local eateries, farm stands).	2	Falls under Goal 1 - Incentives for local businesses and Goal 2 - access to daily needs. May be overly specific for the Action Plan, but could be addressed with a clear definition of "daily needs."
Q2	Perhaps creating incentives for women and minority owned businesses.	2	Consider action under Policy 1.1 - Incentives for Local Businesses
Q2	In general, I agree with the policies identified, except ."encourage neighborhood-scale businesses in residentially zoned areas". I don't remember that being identified as desirable.	2	Related to Policy 3.1 - CAC can consider alignment with previous community engagement efforts
Q2	Opportunities for high school students to participate in meaningful community-based projects that provide them with skills for the future in a range of occupations (construction, park maintenance, retail, culinary, medical, etc.).	2	Action 15.1.5 - RRCO/SCCO considering issues important to youth; consider more specific mention of youth engagement and technical education
Q3	Seems like 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 should be priorities. (Inventory and map property available for redevelopment that could be zoned for mixed use). Can we focus on existing properties a little more? I see a lot of goals and action items around developing new property, which is notoriously slow to materialize in Eugene. Yes to reducing zoning barriers for urban farmers to sell their produce and other locally-grown produce! Clarify as much as possible. There's a lot of opportunity here for small biz development.	2	Consider prioritization of 2.1.1 and 2.1.2. Policy 2.2 focuses on existing small businesses.
Q3	Include primary considerations for the concerns of residents and neighbors along northwest expressway in this discussion. How will the already noisy road be addressed to improve livability for residents along northwest expressway?	2	Consider sub-action under Action 5.1.5 to consider sound mitigation strategies (see comment above).
Q3	Natural Foods stores	2	Falls under Goal 2 - access to daily needs. May be overly specific for the Action Plan, but could be addressed with a clear definition of "daily needs."
Q3	We need rules about having green spaces around and in parking lots, more trees, etc. Also, businesses need to stay in good condition, be painted, not have broken signs, etc. If the neighborhood is less junky, the crime will decrease.	2	Reclaiming parking areas is addressed under Actions 5.3.6, 10.3.4 (specific to church parking lots), and 11.4.1. Could consider an action specific to frontage improvements under Policy 11.2 or 11.3. (See comment above).
Q3	"redevelopment that promotes walkability and increases access to daily needs" too vague, what is meant by daily needs?	2	Could be addressed with a clear definition of "daily needs"
Q3	In addition to promoting walkability and human powered transportation, creating ways to discourage (especially fast) automobile travel through residential neighborhoods (ie speedbumps)	2	Speed limit enforcement is addressed in Action 5.4.1. Consider addition of an action related to traffic calming on neighborhood streets?
Q2	Draft code amendments should allow Food Trucks, and also allow some small businesses to operate on residential lots in neighborhoods.	2	Food trucks are not allowed in residential areas city-wide. They are already allowed in commercial areas. Consider adding a policy to support/incentivize food trucks and special events.
Q2	The southern end of Santa Clara on River Road does have comprehensive services and shopping. We are able to get nearly everything we need without excessive driving. If this were duplicated about half way down southern River Road, it would be ideal.	3	
Q2	This sounds amazing	3	
Q2	Nothing. I like this section.	3	
Q2	Maintain quality of local neighborhoods.	3	
Q2	I am happy with these topics	3	
Q2	The only thing missing is that What is the reason for the city placing a total stop on drafting the codes. ?	3	
Q2	It appears you have captured most of the salient visions and policies.	3	
Q3	Not sure what mixed-use means in this context. Residential and commercial?	3	
Q3	stop the homeless camps	3	

Source	Q2 Economic Development (What is missing from this topic area?) Q3 Economic Development (What changes, clarifications, or additions are needed to improve this topic area?)	1 - Small Revisions 2 - Policy/Action Changes 3 - General Feedback 4 - Already Addressed 5 - Outside Plan Scope	Staff Notes and Considerations
Q3	Housing	3	
Q3	Specificity is missing. Give examples. What specific things do you intend to do to meet these goals? Words like "promote" and "support" and "encourage" are just vague notions of intent. What will you actually DO? What is the timeline? When might we expect to see, for example, more small commercial nodes?	3	
Q3	The topic is great if the city listens to people's needs..	3	
Q3	examine underlying assumption that more business is good.	3	
Q2	More care taken when releasing people from taxes and development fees in order to pay for the infrastructure which their development requires	3	
Q2	We should discourage unfriendly development, such as storage units. These are deadly to local quality of life, we already have too many.	4	Addressed in Draft Code Amendments
Q2	Overall I think this part of the plan is reasonable. I needs EMPHASIS on the walkability - pedestrian scale design. I think the introduction of small neighborhood corner stores would get people out of their cars and on their feet to pick up small items, meanwhile meeting and talking with their neighbors. Think of the designs of neighborhoods in 1920! What worked then?	4	Positive feedback; walkability and pedestrian design addressed in the plan and Draft Code Amendments
Q2	Code amendments that ensure walkable access to small commercial development	4	Walkability and small commercial development addressed in Neighborhood Plan and Draft Code Amendments
Q2	incentives to make these things happen. Pathways to allow single family detached homes to become restaurants, small groceries, pubs. We only have commercial zoning along River Rd, so if we want to walk to these things, it can be quite far for lots of us.	4	Residential properties (citywide) are currently allowed to rezone to C-1 Neighborhood commercial; emphasized in Action 3.1.5.
Q2	In addition to allowing urban farmers to sell produce on site, create facilities for a farmers market where many farmers can sell to the community.	4	Addressed under Action 1.3.6.
Q3	Commitment from City of Eugene to provide economic development support, perhaps with waiving fees, planning assistance, tax deferments.	4	Addressed in City-supported actions under Policies 2.1, 2.2, and 3.1 (including 2.1.1, 2.2.1, and 3.1.4 related to funding and tax breaks)
Q3	Specific incentives to promote the desirable economic growth and discourage other types (auto-centric businesses). We need vibrant, diverse local businesses that foster an atmosphere of community (cafes, grocery store,etc.).	4	Incentives for local, neighborhood businesses is addressed in Policy 1.1
Q3	Priority be given to businesses that serve local residents and do not interfere with access and protection of the river Greenway.	4	Incentives for local, neighborhood businesses is addressed in Policy 1.1. Greenway protections are addressed outside of this plan.
Q2	Incentives from the City to encourage development. We lost the opportunity for the Goodwill building to be turned into much more useful development that a sewing and vacuum store because the potential developer couldn't afford the taxes. It would have been amazing if the City could have offered a tax break in exchange for the proposed multi-use commercial development being proposed by the owner of Global Delights.	4	Addressed in Action 2.1.2.
Q3	Commitment from the City to incentivize useful commercial development.	4	Addressed in Action 2.1.2.
Q2	the homeless	5	Outside plan scope
Q2	Equity building of homeowners and work from home improvements	5	Outside plan scope
Q2	Commercial development in the neighborhood should be limited to small businesses of approximately 25 employees or less.	5	Outside plan scope
Q2	the problem of creating business in residential neighborhoods is not addressed. There have to be strict, enforced regulations on any business otherwise the neighborhoods will not be safe for people, especially kids, walking and biking.	5	Outside plan scope - regulation of home-based businesses already exists within the Code. Plan encourages businesses that fall within current regulations.
Q2	allow farmers to have dinners, breweries, etc. do we really need more businesses? think we have enough, except better restaurants	5	Outside plan scope
Q3	I am not sure if you can specify what kind of businesses or economic development is desired. I would hate to see more pot shops along RR.	5	Outside neighborhood plan scope. Potentially a city-wide priority.
Q2	Sound isolation barriers along northwest expressway to accommodate increased traffic that is being proposed.	N/A	Addressed under Transportation topic area
Q3	None.	N/A	
Q3	See above.	N/A	
Q3	See above.	N/A	
Q3	nothing	N/A	
Q3	Noted in question 2	N/A	

Source	Q4 Transportation (What is missing from this topic area?) Q5 Transportation (What changes, clarifications, or additions are needed to improve this topic area?)	1 - Small Revisions 2 - Policy/Action Changes 3 - General Feedback 4 - Already Addressed 5 - Outside Plan Scope	Staff Notes and Considerations
	Readable maps in the Neighborhood Plan. How are we supposed to evaluate them to provide feedback?		
Q5	Requiring multi-family housing developers (especially nonprofits) to conduct traffic impact analysis will slow the pace of those developments. Can the city and/or county identify some prime lots for this purpose and conduct those studies? And/or contribute staffing and expertise to help manage costs and timelines for this activity?	1	Maps to be updated in revised Plan. Second comment is likely outside the plan scope.
Q4	Educate all about transportation options, not just youth. As we age, driving may not be an option. Educating everyone about the types of public transportation that is available could help all individuals plan for future needs if public transit is not an option currently.	2	Policy 6.2 related to Education and Youth Engagement through existing programs like SRTS. Could consider an action that addresses transportation education for all users (not just youth).
Q4	Sound isolation barriers need to be offered up if you expect to be raising any taxes for homeowners along northwest expressway.	2	Consider sub-action under Action 5.1.5 to consider sound mitigation strategies
Q4	We need to keep River Rd as it is WITHOUT EmX type system wasting space	2	Action 5.2.1 supports EmX or enhanced corridor on River Road. CAC can consider further.
Q4	Add incentives that are designed to reduce single-occupancy vehicle traffic.	2	Consider adding a reference to Transportation Demand Management programs in Goal 6
Q5	Include sound isolation barriers along northwest expressway, especially if this is going to raise taxes.	2	Consider sub-action under Action 5.1.5 to consider sound mitigation strategies
Q5	Clarify whether or not you are forcing EMEX on River Road which is a huge mistake.	2	Action 5.2.1 supports EmX or enhanced corridor on River Road. CAC can consider further.
Q5	While not directly mentioned here, I do not support the development of EMX on River Road. That scale of development would be better placed away from this pedestrian-focused, small scale economic development. Put it on Northwest Expressway and figure out how to shuttle people over to it if necessary.	2	Action 5.2.1 supports EmX or enhanced corridor on River Road. CAC can consider further.
Q5	I would prefer more active support for EmX and wonder why improved signage to guide traffic to Northwest Expressway isn't "short" and "easy"	2	Action 5.2.1 generally supports EmX or enhanced corridor on River Road. CAC could consider amending Action 5.1.5 (a) to short-term priority.
Q5	I would still prefer not to have EMX along River Road. My recollection is that this was not popular at the meetings I attended.	2	Action 5.2.1 supports EmX or enhanced corridor on River Road. CAC can consider further.
Q5	Add a 5.2.6 "Promote increased service to Springfield and its commercial areas". All our current LTD service heads into Eugene and then heads to Springfield and then heads out to the surrounding Springfield area, much like a hub with spokes, how about a hub with spokes and then the wheel tying it all together. Pretty sure many people in the Santa Clara area work in the Springfield area so to promote more public transportation LTD service should provide service, or at least analyze the need, to Springfield that would not have to go through downtown Eugene which lengthens the travel time considerably. Add 5.4.7 "Modify Lane Counties Traffic Impact Analysis Requirements along River Road north of Beltline down to 25 or more automobile trips inside an urban growth boundary to trigger a traffic impact analysis and to include cumulative effects of traffic from Beltline north to the Urban Growth Boundary". I did not find a Traffic Impact Analysis Requirement in Eugene's Code, Chapter 7 – Public Improvements so I assume any land use application north of the Beltline needs to follow Lane County's Traffic Analysis Requirements 15.697. Santa Clara is in a very unique situation where I would estimate 2/3's of the folks living north of the Beltline use River Road to get to Eugene, Springfield, and the I5 corridor. River Road is pretty much the only realistic road for folks to use. Thus, pretty much any development north of the Beltline is going to significantly impact traffic along River Road. 15.697(3)(c) should state that River Road should be evaluated south to the Beltline for any reasonable sized application (modify 15.697(1)(a) to 25 or more automobile trips inside an urban growth boundary); not just to the nearest major intersection with a traffic signal; and analyze traffic impacts over a 20 year period assuming a realistic traffic growth factor. Editorial: In some of the transportation action items the numbered action item is highlighted in blue and then one of the letters is highlighted, confusing in that the letter action items are subsets to the number action item; no other area is set up this way. Example 4.1.1 is highlighted and 4.1.1(a) is highlighted but 4.1.1(b) is not highlighted	2	First comment - related to LTD route planning, out of scope. Second comment - Transportation/Land Use staff can look further into current traffic analysis requirements.
Q5	not sure what is the point of educating the youth	2	Policy 6.2 related to Education and Youth Engagement through existing programs like SRTS. Could consider an action that addresses transportation education for all users (not just youth).
Q4	its not safe to do any of those because of the homeless	3	
Q4	Additional info on housing and fulfilling housing needs	3	Housing is addressed in Land Use topic area.
Q4	Overall I think this part of the Neighborhood Plan is okay.	3	
Q4	Nothing. The plan covers everything we have been talking about for years and years.	3	
Q4	Nothing. I am in favor of fostering alternative forms of transportation including mass transit.	3	

Source	Q4 Transportation (What is missing from this topic area?) Q5 Transportation (What changes, clarifications, or additions are needed to improve this topic area?)	1 - Small Revisions 2 - Policy/Action Changes 3 - General Feedback 4 - Already Addressed 5 - Outside Plan Scope	Staff Notes and Considerations
Q4	don't clog up River Road, it is the only way north to south, other than the NWExpressway, that is not a good solution for those of us who live north by Beacon.	3	
Q4	What role will emanate domain play?	3	Assuming this is a reference to EmX, but its unclear
Q4	I think the issues might arise as to how these policies were implemented.	3	
Q4	This captures it well.	3	
Q5	None	3	
Q5	Specificity is needed. Give examples. What safety improvements? What does it mean, in practice, to "support" bus rapid transit?	3	
Q5	its fine	3	
Q5	planning ahead for 30 years from now	3	
Q5	None needed	3	
Q5	Please see above comments.	3	
Q5	The design of regional transportation for RR/SC must be convenient, clean and safe or people won't use it. For older people to use a transportation system, pick-up stations must be no more than 1-2 blocks from their house. Transporting vehicles in neighborhoods need to be abundant and small scale.	3	
Q5	The Delta Highway was meant to help alleviate traffic tie-ups and safety issues when that project began roughly 4-5 years ago. But one of the Portland engineers told me following the RR/CO meeting that it was outdated before it was to start. Part of this Delta Highway/Beltline is flawed and dangerous unless one has the newest possible safety devices on their vehicle. Those entering Delta Highway, from Goodpasture Road, heading north and wanting to head west onto Beltline can be side-swiped by a vehicle wanting to exit Delta heading east toward Beltline. Our Transportation Department makes mistakes, no matter how hard they try. Policy 4.1 Safety and Accessibility - Improve sidewalks for people walking and shopping or recreational walking. This is what I was doing on 6/18/22 when I fell due to an uneven sidewalk, landing on my brow bone, head first. Trees have uprooted many of our Silver leaf tree, damaging sidewalks.	3	
Q5	A focus on safety, slowing down traffic in south river road area while enhancing traffic flow for north, and BIKE and WALKING options that connect across and through river road. I also want to separate the EMX issues from the goals of what EMX would bring - a lot of us voted for EMX because of what it would bring - protected bike lanes, improved sidewalks, more greenery and aesthetic improvements, slower traffic and more bus transit. But we don't have to have EMX to have these four things. I don't want the main goals to get lost. I'm still in favor of EMX coming through - but won't be bothered if it doesn't - as long as the other goals are met!!	4	Safety and Accessibility for people walking, biking, and using mobility devices is addressed as Policy 4.1
Q4	Prioritize infrastructure improvements (under policy) is not actually what we need; in order to achieve the vision, we need to prioritize improvements that create a safe, multi-modal network. Many people have given up on River Road as a possibility to use for safe walking and biking - but given the fact that the neighborhood doesn't have a grid pattern of streets, River Road is, in the long-term, an important connector and should be made non-lethal for people walking and biking and accessing transit. In addition, the Beltline is a barrier between the two neighborhoods that needs to be breached. In regards to the problem of traffic flow, the only problem really exists close to the Beltline. At all other locations, the traffic flows even during rush hour. Making it possible for people to walk and bike safely between RR and SC (like with the proposed Ruby Bridge) would enhance the traffic flow for those who need to or choose to drive, along with many other benefits.	4	Infrastructure improvements listed in the plan are multi-modal in scope. Safety and Accessibility for people walking, biking, and using mobility devices is addressed as Policy 4.1
Q5	Clarify what kind of infrastructure improvements need to be made. Add connectivity between RR and SC for all modes.	4	Biking, walking, and vehicle projects are detailed in the action plan.
Q4	Suggest prioritizing the installation of user-activated signals at painted crosswalks. Those are doing a lot to slow traffic and make it safer to cross River Rd. More secure bike parking spaces seems like it could be a relatively affordable short-term priority to encourage different modes of transportation.	4	Bike parking is addressed in action 5.3.3. RFB crossings are not specifically called out in the plan other than near schools (4.1.4), but are generally addressed in actions related to pedestrian safety (5.3.1, 5.3.2)
Q4	These are all important. I like to ride my bike to work along the river, but it is VERY UNSAFE to ride on the River Road "Bike Lane." Cars swerve into that bike lane all the time. And it is sometimes impossible to walk or ride a bike underneath the Beltline overpass on River Road--the homeless camps make it impossible to get through safely. Homeless people need housing but people also need to ride and walk safely underneath the Belt Line and other areas.	4	Bike safety is generally addressed through implementation of the TSP (Action 5.1.2) and in detail in Policy 4.1, including implementing protected bike lanes (Action 4.1.2)
Q4	Specific mention of the unique needs of the RR neighborhood. We have no sidewalks, long streets going East-West without North-South connectivity, narrow non standard street design. Safety safety safety must be a top priority.	4	Safety is emphasized throughout the plan, including 5.4 Traffic Management and 5.1 Regional Transportation Network. Policy 6.4 Street Design addresses unique context/conditions in RR/SC.
Q4	more frequent bus service	4	Action 5.2.1 supports EmX or enhanced corridor on River Road.
Q4	If you have a 4-lane artery like River Rd, you should have turn lanes to major side streets. it will result in safer and less congestive corridor.	4	The Plan cannot dictate specific engineering solutions, but Goal 5 generally seeks to address congestion on River Road through a variety of strategies.

Source	Q4 Transportation (What is missing from this topic area?) Q5 Transportation (What changes, clarifications, or additions are needed to improve this topic area?)	1 - Small Revisions 2 - Policy/Action Changes 3 - General Feedback 4 - Already Addressed 5 - Outside Plan Scope	Staff Notes and Considerations
Q4	Ways to wean folks off their fossil fuels. Structural changes to River Rd to make biking safer North of the Beltline. SC folk have a long bike into town and deserve to have it be safe.	4	There are various improvements noted for biking (Policy 4.1, Policy 5.1, Policy 5.3).
Q4	Directly addressing the problem of high speeds on River Road- years ago we had a talented young traffic engineer do an informative presentation at an RRCO meeting on ideas about improving safety on River Road. He mentioned at that time the possibility of timing the traffic signals so that traffic obeying the speed limit could have continuous flow while speeding drivers would be stopped by red lights, similar to the flow pattern of downtown Eugene on 7th Street. More protected pedestrian crossings on River Rd. would help our east neighborhood access the river paths on the west. In addition, more sites for city bike/scooter rentals.	4	Updating signal timing on River Road as well as enforcement of traffic speeds is addressed in Policy 5.4. Safe pedestrian crossings are addressed in Action 4.1.2 thoroughly. Installing bike share locations is addressed in Action 6.1.3.
Q5	I am opposed to enhancing traffic flow and connectivity for cars. My experience is that anytime you add lanes and allow for vehicular traffic to move more freely, it encourages more vehicles and development of natural areas. We really need to be focusing intently on bikes, walking, bus and small electric vehicles and the like. So I would reword the bullet point "increases walking, biking and transit options" to "Prioritizes walking, biking and transit options". You really can't have it all and cars and not very compatible with bikes and walkers. If you want net zero then prioritize them. I would remove "enhances traffic flow". It already flows way too fast and too many cars to ever be safe and capatable with children and elders on the busier streets. We need cars to slow down and less of them. Thank you.	4	Policy 5.4 addresses traffic flow (to enhance safety objectives) and various policies address walking, biking, and transit options. I think these text references come from the summaries. These priorities are adequately addressed through various policies and actions.
Q5	We need a SAFE, separate, bike path on River Road. We need **BIKE LANE SEPARATORS** to keep us safe from getting plowed down by cars! We also need a route that connects communities around Irving/Hunsaker and River Road to the river bike and hike path. It is not safe to get from North River Road down to the water treatment plant where we can connect to the river path. And homeless camps can't be allowed to block bike and pedestrian transportation under the Belt Line.	4	Protected bike lanes and improved bike infrastructure are addressed in Actions 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 5.1.3.
Q5	Reduce speed limits. Focus on Complete Street concepts. Increase the number of lighted and safe crossings across River Road.	4	More enforcement of existing speed limits is addressed in Action 5.4.1 and 5.4.2. Improved crosswalks are addressed in Action 4.1.4.
Q5	speed control	4	More enforcement of existing speed limits is addressed in Action 5.4.1 and 5.4.2. Improved crosswalks are addressed in Action 4.1.4.
Q4	Funding for a second multi-use bridge over the river, e.g., from Division Ave. to Green acres. A second bridge is badly needed. It is needed far more than a hiker/biker bridge over Beltline Road. Most of Eugene's better shopping places are across the river on the east side which is why Beltline Road is over capacity for traffic from River Road.	4	Support for a new bridge over the Willamette River north of the Beltline is addressed in Action 5.1.4.
Q4	fix beltline: close the exits on the west side of the bridge--they slow everything down. why we no have the scooters? big no to pedestrian bridge over beltline. state should start vehicle inspections to weed out loud cars. also need more traffic police	4 and 5	Beltline improvements are addressed in Action 5.1.4. Changes to the plan to build a bike/ped bridge over Beltline are outside the scope of this plan (but could possibly be removed as an Action 4.1.1). Enforcement on Beltline is outside the scope of this plan, but enforcement on city-streets is addressed in Action 5.4.1.
Q4	A comprehensive long range plan to help people wean themselves from large fossil fuel using vehicles. It will take some doing to get people to willingly give up their cars. To replace them, we need a public transportation system that really works for people. It has to go where the public needs to travel. There need to be car parking areas near bus stops so people can drive to the nearest stop to ride further. Then, there needs to be stops adjacent to the large shopping stores so people can get their groceries, etc. onto the bus. The current LTD system is locked into a non-workable, unimaginative pattern.	5	There are several long-range plans that inform the transition to alternative transportation options, including within the COE (Transportation System Plan, scenario planning, transportation demand management) and for LTD.
Q4	More buses that are smaller and stop more frequently throughout the neighborhoods....	5	Mobility management strategies (outside of traditional buses) are a strategy in long-range LTD planning.
Q5	Restricting parking in new developments may not work well. People will continue to want cars even if they are electric. Cars carry loads and people need to be able to haul things. Bikes have limited capacity to carry things - especially young children and the aged or disabled.	5	Action 6.3.3 related to reducing parking requirements will be implemented through new state requirements (CFEC)
Q5	we need a bus that goes to 11th to connect to busses west Then goes downtown on 13th. It wastes half an hour to go downtown so people heading west do not use busses	5	Relates to LTD route planning

Source	Q6 Parks and Natural Resources (What is missing from this topic area?) Q7 Parks and Natural Resources (What changes, clarifications, or additions are needed to improve this topic area?)	1 - Small Revisions 2 - Policy/Action Changes 3 - General Feedback 4 - Already Addressed 5 - Outside Plan Scope	Staff Notes and Considerations
Q7	A before and after set of maps for park and open spaces would be very helpful to quickly understand all the proposed projects. Maybe the single map with existing and new parks would work if it were readable. Also, clarify what amenities mean in parks. Generally, there aren't enough public restrooms, especially after the pandemic. I get it that it's hard to keep them clean and free of drug use, but the city should invest more staffing and resources there.	1	Updated maps will be available in the final plan. Amenities can be more clearly defined/listed in Policy 8.1.
Q6	Bike path along northwest expressway would be nice, with pedestrian exits via Maxwell and any other road to access.	2	Could be considered as an action in Transportation topic area. Seems to conflict with other actions about increased car traffic flow on NW Expressway.
Q6	There is a park on the south end of River Rd that sits between River Rd and the River. it could turn into a most beautiful park for the neighborhood to actually use and enjoy, but I have seen sometimes even the grass is not mowed and grass is very tall.	2	Sounds like Razor Park. Could be noted as an opportunity under Policy 8.1 or 8.3.
Q7	Bike pathways along northwest expressway.	2	Could be considered as an action in Transportation topic area. Seems to conflict with other actions about increased car traffic flow on NW Expressway.
Q6	Increase open space that is specifically natural areas. Increase restoration of parks and open space to foster native plants, pollinators and wildlife. Less mowed fields. Preserve and increase public access to swales and smaller waterways (like Flat Creek) for wildlife and walking trails. Encourage cooperative land use that allows walking trails along edges of some farms.	2	Natural areas are addressed in Policy 7.4. Planting of native plans is addressed somewhat in Actions 7.1.3 (public stormwater) and 7.1.5 (private stormwater). Planting of native plants in park is not explicitly addressed. Public access to swales/waterways is not addressed. Cooperative use along farms is not addressed.
Q6	This needs to be added: "increase native plants to support birds, birds, bees, pollinators, and other life." Also: "create wildflower gardens and other wild areas that are not mowed, in order to support wildlife." And: "eliminate pesticides and herbicides in the parks." And: "assess maintenance practices to minimize the mowing and blowing that are loud, carbon heavy, and destroy wildlife in the parks."	2	Planting of native plants is addressed somewhat in Actions 7.1.3 (public stormwater) and 7.1.5 (private stormwater). Planting of native plants in park is not explicitly addressed. Action 7.4.3 addresses finding resources to pursue maintenance w/o pesticides. Parks practices related to mowing/blowing are not currently addressed - could be added to Action 7.4.3.
Q7	This side of town needs a dog park.	2	Included in Parks and Recreation System Plan (project RS16). Could consider adding a dog park as a part of Policy 8.1.
Q6	make sure 4J doesn't cut any trees when they demolish old north eugene high. clean up camping along the river. let river road park district run the parks--emerald park is way nicer than anything eugene gives us	2	The future of the 4J site is not addressed in the plan. River Road Parks District is addressed in Community topic area - Policy 17.3.
Q7	Eugene Parks need to transition to more sustainable, eco-friendly models. We seem to be behind in this area even though you would think Eugene would be a leader. We need more areas planted with native plants to support birds, butterflies, bees, and other insects. We need more native wildflower gardens and other wild areas to support wildlife. Many of the parks are just giant lawns--the lawns need to be balanced with more native trees, bushes, flowers and other features that support wildlife. This is a national movement to support birds and pollinators--we need to catch up to the best practices! There is also too much mowing--in Aubrey park they mow the grass so often and so low to the ground that it dries out and dies in the summer and becomes a big muddy mess in the winter and spring. Also, please stop using spraying chemicals everywhere--they kill wildlife and cause cancer.	2	Planting of native plans is addressed somewhat in Actions 7.1.3 (public stormwater) and 7.1.5 (private stormwater). Planting of native plants in park is not explicitly addressed. Action 7.4.3 addresses finding resources to pursue maintenance w/o pesticides. Parks practices related to mowing/blowing are not currently addressed - could be added to Action 7.4.3.

Source	<p>Q6 Parks and Natural Resources (What is missing from this topic area?)</p> <p>Q7 Parks and Natural Resources (What changes, clarifications, or additions are needed to improve this topic area?)</p>	<p>1 - Small Revisions</p> <p>2 - Policy/Action Changes</p> <p>3 - General Feedback</p> <p>4 - Already Addressed</p> <p>5 - Outside Plan Scope</p>	Staff Notes and Considerations
	<p>Some things I am concerned about</p> <p>10.3.1 Create small-scale urban agricultural enterprise zoning (i.e., tax incentive for land in UGB used for food production).</p> <p>I'm not even sure why this is in the plan. There are few farms in the UGB. And if they operate as a business, they file taxes and get the appropriate tax deductions as a business should. I love the farms in the area, but we must participate in a way that agrees with Eugene's goals. I would be sad to lose some small farms for housing, but I'm not a NIMBY on this one and realize that Eugene must increase housing density.</p>		
Q7	<p>10.3.2 Allow property owners who control more than ½ acre of undeveloped land to apply for and receive a property tax credit for that portion of land specifically dedicated to small-scale commercial agricultural production.</p> <p>Several issues with 10.3.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Why a half an acre? Why not a smaller size or no size requirement at all? •Why not a larger size? •Who is going to monitor this tax break? •What constitutes 'commercial agricultural production'? I'm sure almost any definition will be abused a lot. •Why just the Eugene UGB? Why not make the tax incentive for any resident in Lane County? •Giving hard-to-track or enforce incentives could discourage people from adding sorely needed housing to the Eugene market. 	2	Policy/action revisions for consideration by CAC.
Q6	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developing incentives for private landowners adjacent to the park or river to enter into a local conservation easement agreement with the city/county. 2. Developing policy & planning that values the preservation of more WRG open space via endowment programs from landowners or direct purchase of additional lands. As our city densifies, our parks and open space become even more vital to the well-being of the community. More people= more space needed. 3. Specific projects and policies to protect the Willamette River and riparian areas as well as islands in the river. 4. Providing more restroom facilities (portable units)and trashcans to eliminate the human waste & garbage along the river. 5. Establishing a consortium of interested and knowledgeable organizations (Beyond Toxics, Willamette Riverkeeper, UWSWCD, Mackenzie River Trust, Greenway Guardians, U of O Environmental Studies Dept., etc.) to serve as an advisory board to establish and implement policy to protect and enhance the WRG. 6. Expand coordination and outreach for stewardship of the WRG in programs similar to Adopt a Highway programs, complete with signs identifying the group. Kelsey has done a wonderful job working with our neighborhood and helping to sponsor work parties at various sites. 7. Schedule more social events along the bike path to promote engagement, awareness, and valuing of the WRG. 8. Eliminate the discretionary track from the Proposed Greenway Code Amendments- this provides developers with a giant loophole that they will drive bulldozers through! 	Various	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conservation easement creation/funding addressed in Action 10.1.4. 2. Addressed in Action 9.2.3. 3. Address in Policy 9.2, although there are not specific preservation/protection projects listed. 4. Addressed in Policy 4.2, although amenities is not clearly defined. 5. Outside the scope of this plan. Could become a city-wide priority. 6. Addressed in Action 9.2.4. 7. Special events along the River are addressed in Action 9.3.3. 8. Outside the scope of this plan.
Q6	More trees and green spaces. Water features	3	
Q6	View sheds, quiet areas as recognized valuable assets.	3	
Q6	Nothing.	3	
Q6	I agree with these policies.	3	
Q6	its fine	3	
Q6	It is pretty well covered in the review sheet.	3	
Q7	city makes everyone else preserve the trees but has no problem cutting them down when convenient for them	3	
Q7	Please see comments above.	3	
Q7	Address River Road Park District funding and future. Is this a viable entity. Is there a future for a regional park system?	4	Addressed in Community topic area - Action 17.3.3.
Q7	What happens to the River Road Parks and Recreation District that is a significant fixture of the River Road area; Santa Clara needs a similar facility,	4	Addressed in Community topic area - Action 17.3.3.
Q6	clean out bike path of homeless camps so it is safe for women riders	4	Bike safety is generally addressed through implementation of the TSP (Action 5.1.2) and in detail in Policy 4.1
Q6	Requirements for the development of parks that are within easy walking distance for all residents.	4	This is the intention of Policy 8.1 Parks Access.
Q6	Inviolable protection for farmland.....not using it as a temporary state until the city gobbles it up. Connectivity between parks, open spaces and natural areas.	4	Preserving high value farmland is addressed in Policy 10.1. Connectivity is addressed in Policy 8.2.

Source	Q6 Parks and Natural Resources (What is missing from this topic area?) Q7 Parks and Natural Resources (What changes, clarifications, or additions are needed to improve this topic area?)	1 - Small Revisions 2 - Policy/Action Changes 3 - General Feedback 4 - Already Addressed 5 - Outside Plan Scope	Staff Notes and Considerations
Q7	clean out bike path of homeless camps so it is safe for women riders	4	Bike safety is generally addressed through implementation of the TSP (Action 5.1.2) and in detail in Policy 4.1
Q7	More stress on protection of the Willamette River, while providing WALKING access to the river at various points. I would prefer no motorized vehicles (i.e., electric bikes).	4	Policy 9.1 prioritizes safe and convenient access to the riverbank
Q7	Encourage property owners to plant more trees.	4	Encouraging planting of trees is addressed in Policy 7.5 (Action 7.5.2) and Action 7.2.2
Q7	I understand the benefits of keeping the area around the river natural. BUT - if that's going to be the case - this shouldn't be counted as a "park" near homes - because when you have kids and want to hang out at a park these areas don't count. Just like in south eugene - every area of river road should have a KID AND FAMILY PLAY FRIENDLY park in walking distance. The all natural river trail doesn't count.	4	Parks access, with appropriate amenities, including facilities for children, is addressed in Policy 8.1.
Q6	Create more special events and ongoing events to draw people to the parks.	4	Special events along the River are addressed in Action 9.3.3. Other community events are addressed in the Community topic area.
Q6	Security is needed. Policy 7.4 - Safety has been a concern because of drug dealers and unhoused people reacting violently to bicyclists and pedestrians. There is no security behind the area of the wastewater control facility where the unhoused and visibly mentally unstable persons are camping. They hide behind bushes and threaten people who are simply out for access to the riverbank trail for exercise.	4	Improving safety enhancements along riverfront paths is addressed in Policy 4.2 (Transportation).
Q7	Speed limits, signs, and enforcement for all bicycle users, especially e-bikes which endanger pedestrians. There is a need for a separation lane to protect pedestrians. It is no longer safe for older and elderly people from our riverside care and residential homes who want to access these paths for health reasons - or to simply enjoy the beauty and peace which is intended for everyone who wishes to enjoy a nature walk.	4	Improving safety enhancements along riverfront paths is addressed in Policy 4.2 (Transportation).
Q6	parks and open spaces can not be used because of the homeless	4 and 5	Safety in public parks is addressed through parks operational planning. Policy 9.1 emphasizes safe access to the riverbank park system.
Q6	See Willamette Greenway code amendments. Funding for acquisition of land for small pocket parks throughout the neighborhood, especially on the west side of River Road.	4 and 5	Action 8.1.1 addresses continued acquisition of parks to ensure access to all residents. Willamette Greenway Code Amendments are outside the scope of this plan.
	Seems like a thoughtful topic area. The priorities make sense, too.		
Q6	Can anything more be done to subsidize the cost of using community rec facilities for low-income residents? What about providing more public transit to those facilities? Could those be near-term priorities? (in addition to building a rec center in Santa Clara - great idea and will take a while).	5	These comments relate to COE Parks and Recreation policies city-wide.
Q7	The city to collect higher shares of the commercial taxes and spend it on improving parks in our neighborhood.	5	
Q7	For action planning on this topic there will need to be a cohesive approach. For example, develop criteria about where to increase tree canopy based on where most ecologically important and good likelihood of survivability (are the landowners going to take care of the trees, etc.).	5	Exact locations of tree canopy improvements is outside the scope of this plan, but would be addressed by Urban Forestry in their planning.
Q7	The VELO development is a prime example of terrible development along the West Bank path. Its broad face, lack of vegetative screen, use of non-native plants, banners hanging from balconies, attempts to block public access - however this was allowed to be built, those rules need to be changed! We need to safeguard the beauty of the West Bank path and other viewsheds throughout the RRSC neighborhood, as they are a prime piece of the uniqueness of this area.	5	Design standards for housing development along the Greenway are outside the scope of this plan. Some design standards are recommended for C-2 properties in draft code, although not specific to these comments.
Q6	Stop future development in the Willamette Greenway	5	Outside of scope

Source	Q8 Land Use (What is missing from this topic area?) Q9 Land Use (What changes, clarifications, or additions are needed to improve this topic area?)	1 - Small Revisions 2 - Policy/Action Changes 3 - General Feedback 4 - Already Addressed 5 - Outside Plan Scope	Staff Notes and Considerations
Q9	<p>Anything that can be done to flesh out and clarify Policies 12.1, 12.2 and 12.3 would be good. Love the creative infill ideas. More effort here to get ADUs, duplexes, and townhouses in the pipeline would be welcome.</p> <p>Six months notice before the city or county sell any land parcel? That seems excessive and like it would really slow down this process.</p>	2 and 3	11.1.2 - public agency notice before selling land. 6 months too long?
Q9	<p>Some issues I am concerned about: 11.1.2 Negotiate with public agencies to provide 180 calendar day notice to affected Neighborhood Associations before acting to sell any land parcel within their boundaries.</p> <p>180 days sound excessive. I do think there should be a 90 or 120-day notice. The Community Organizations need time to ask questions and make suggestions.</p> <p>12.1.3. Adopt flexible code that allows infill opportunities that are more compatible to adjacent neighbors than the typical current flag lots.</p> <p>We need more infill, and flag lots are an acceptable way to achieve more infill. Flag lot homeowners typically like the privacy of a flag lot. And flag lots are typically less expensive than homes on street fronts. We need more affordable homes.</p> <p>13.1.4 Allow developments of 4-6 stories in designated nodes along River Road if public amenities are provided by the developer (i.e., enhance pedestrian space).</p> <p>A special exception should be made for the Albertson's/Fred Meyer corner and the old LTD site. Those corners could go up to 7 or even 9 stories if done correctly. These two corners would not be imposing on very many neighbors if they were built higher as there are very few residents near those corners. Given the struggle of retailers, there may be some opportunities to redevelop these corners in the future.</p> <p>14.2.5 Ameliorate the effect of increased density and infill by providing both a clear and objective design path and discretionary path with standards and design review processes.</p> <p>I think this needs to be clarified. It's gobbledygook. Needs specifics.</p>	2 and 3	<p>11.1.2 - 2nd person to say 180 days sounds excessive. Reevaluate?</p> <p>12.1.3 - General comments - wouldn't disallow flag lots.</p> <p>13.1.4 - Possible to create exception for height limits in certain area?</p> <p>14.2.5 - land use language unclear to reader, but this is an adopted land use plan.</p>
Q8	<p>1. Landscape standards that are compatible with the ambience of the River & Garden district- including tree canopy standards and incentives to preserve our precious heritage soils from pavement.</p> <p>2. Throughout my years of work with Razor Park and the WRG, I have heard consistently from the neighborhood that many residents want a designated dog park in the area.</p> <p>3. Incentivize a European model of business on the ground floor and residential above to promote a local, vibrant community rather than creating another "bedroom community" model of growth.</p> <p>4. Provide incentives, additional support/information, and expedited pathways of permitting to the building of ADUs in our neighborhood. With most lots being large in River Road, this would be a simple way to accommodate needed housing while preserving our unique character, identity, and values.</p>	2 and 4	<p>1. Policy 7.5 related to tree canopy and 11.4 encourages green and resilient properties. Action 7.2.2: encourage and educate about tree canopy/tree planting and 11.4.3 addresses incentives for residential tree canopy.</p> <p>2. Could add action under 8.3 Recreational opportunities to address the desire for a dog park (have heard this throughout engagement).</p> <p>3. Policy 2.1 Vibrancy, active mixed-use neighborhood centers. Also see notes about mixed-use above.</p> <p>4. 12.1.1 addresses reviewing existing regulations to identify barriers for housing options, such as ADUs.</p>
Q8	Nothing	3	General feedback
Q8	the homeless make these areas unsafe also	3	General feedback
Q8	Trees and more trees	3	General feedback
Q8	I am pleased to see the max building height lowered to 5 stories and the buffering for C-2 development next to R-1 zoned areas.	3	Positive feedback
Q8	Nothing	3	General feedback
Q8	nothing missing	3	General feedback
Q9	None	3	General feedback
Q9	I would like to see the height limit of building reduced to 2-3 stories. 5 stories is too high. 5 stories will encourage too many large scale/high cost/ housing developments that are incompatible with our goals of promoting small local businesses. I have seen this time and again. Start bringing in the big tall developments and we are going to have worse housing affordability problems. Keep it small.	3	General feedback - lower building height even more.
Q9	I generally disagree with lowering the max height of buildings, although 5 stories seems great. I would like to see buildings with ground level businesses and residences on the upper stories. We really need more varied and interesting businesses south of beltline. Places we can walk to and enjoy. We are too heavily skewed to residential, and it makes people have to get in a car and drive outside the neighborhood.	3	General feedback - these concepts are addressed in the plan.

Source	Q8 Land Use (What is missing from this topic area?) Q9 Land Use (What changes, clarifications, or additions are needed to improve this topic area?)	1 - Small Revisions 2 - Policy/Action Changes 3 - General Feedback 4 - Already Addressed 5 - Outside Plan Scope	Staff Notes and Considerations
Q9	Pedestrian-friendly design should include seating areas (benches, small gathering areas with room to sit and chat with neighbors as well as rest while walking).	3	General feedback
	I don't understand lowering the max building height. I thought density was a goal?	3	General Feedback
Q9	More changes to code categorized as Group 1 and adopted with the neighborhood plan. This plan is the result of incredible work of many neighbors over many years. It has faced the disruption of Covid and of new State legislation. The Council has been impressed with the level of outreach and participation that went into the plan (for example, 400 neighbors at the first big meeting at North Eugene High). Now is the time to direct some one time resources to keep faith with the neighborhood and provide immediate protection and guidance by adopting more code amendments along with plan adoption. Because these neighborhoods are very mixed economically, we can't count on the market to provide aesthetic development that creates more livable spaces, making this an equity issue. It is particularly important given the new density standards adopted by the State and the City.	3	General Feedback
Q9	The term "well defined" needs to be more fully explained and defined itself. It's a very subjective term that will mean different things to different people.	3	Goal 8 uses the term "well designed," this is flushed out more in the policies.
Q9	See above.	3	General feedback
Q9	I disagree with the height limits. Taller buildings make for higher populations density, which supports businesses and walkability.	3	General feedback - prefers to not lower height limits.
Q9	Answering these questions, does it really mean anything.	3	General Feedback
Q9	This looks good.	3	General Feedback
Q9	Please see comments above.	3	General Feedback
Q9	Increase the focus and importance of Policy 11.1 Effective Public Process for Development: Encourage effective collaboration between developers, public agencies, and neighbors through legislative updates to local land use regulations. Re: Policy 13.2 Walkable Neighborhood Centers: My connection to RR/SC is through my relationship with my neighbors within walking distance around my neighborhood. I don't feel connection to the greater RR/SC area, particularly the RR corridor. I support the idea of walkable neighborhood centers, but this envisions large changes in obtaining commercial space and permission from property owners. Will we have a RR/SC "city council" to manage this kind of development for the good of everyone? How do we change the prevailing view of neighbors who work outside RR/SC that our area is more than a bedroom community?	3 and 4	11.1 - All policies under 11.1 are flagged as priorities. General comments/concern about changes to make things more walkable.
Q8	The gigantic parking lots towards the southern part of River Road hamper all of the goals in this plan. The City should incentivize better use of those lots and prohibit such massive amounts of land being used for parking.	3 and 4	These specific lots not addressed, but Actions 5.3.6 address more shared parking among businesses, 6.3.2 assess parking requirements, 6.3.3 reducing parking if requirements met, 10.3.4 encourage de-paving oversized parking areas
Q9	The gigantic parking lots towards the southern part of River Road hamper all of the goals in this plan. The City should incentivize better use of those lots and prohibit such massive amounts of land being used for parking.	3 and 4	These specific lots not addressed, but Actions 5.3.6 address more shared parking among businesses, 6.3.2 assess parking requirements, 6.3.3 reducing parking if requirements met, 10.3.4 encourage de-paving oversized parking areas
Q8	If the city and county can offer tax incentives to property owners for green infrastructure and developing new housing, why can't we offer incentives to landlords to reduce rent to more affordable levels? Rents have more than doubled over the past decade, and the solution of building more affordable housing is too slow. It's notoriously hard to develop housing here, and most of the new housing developed over the past few years is ridiculously expensive.	3 and 4 and 5	Incentivizing rent reductions is outside the scope of this plan. Renter protections are being worked on citywide. Plan does address providing/incentivizing more affordable housing in Policy 12.2 and 15.2 and more specifically in Actions 12.2.1, 12.2.2, and 12.3.3.
Q9	Aesthetics and greenery! Design and encourage design in way that "you" would want to live in this neighborhood. I feel that only the richer parts of towns get this type of treatment. We deserve design and beauty as much as richer neighborhoods. PLEASE put your money where you say your goals are - we need more tax incentives for this part of town to help small businesses. There has been talk for a while of encouraging new eating places like the public house or 5th street to come in - but there is no tax incentives to help with this. And then yes - please keep building height to 60 feet or lower and help build better sidewalks and promote outside seating, etc - let's make it welcoming to walk around and shop/eat on river road.	3 and 4 and 5	Action 2.2.1 - addresses small business tax incentives. Likes the lowered height in C-2. Incentives are possible, but market will determine the type of development built in the area.
Q8	Mixed commercial and residential such as first-floor commercial and upper story(ies) for residences, higher-density housing and affordable housing that includes home-ownership potential.	4	Mixed-use development and neighborhood centers addressed in Policy 2.1 and 13.1. Actions 2.1.2 and 3.1.4 address incentivizing mixed-use development. Affordable housing addressed in Policy 12.2 and 15.2 and Actions 12.2.1, 12.2.2, and 12.3.3.
Q8	make sure that walkable means building sidewalks on all the county streets. address parking issues that arise when buildings don't need to provide enough parking spots.	4	Action 4.1.3 addresses keeping an inventory of sidewalks in both the City and County. Action 13.2.1 related to providing adequate sidewalk space. Policy 5.5 addresses jurisdictional issues between City and County, including parking. Actions 5.3.6, 6.3.2, 14.1.2, 14.1.3 relate to shared parking and assessing parking requirements.

Source	Q8 Land Use (What is missing from this topic area?) Q9 Land Use (What changes, clarifications, or additions are needed to improve this topic area?)	1 - Small Revisions 2 - Policy/Action Changes 3 - General Feedback 4 - Already Addressed 5 - Outside Plan Scope	Staff Notes and Considerations
Q9	Conservation easements and incentives for sustainable development and land preservation along within the Willamette Greenway. Tax relief for owners who dedicate land to green space, tree preservation, native plan restoration.	4	Conservation easements addressed in Action 10.1.4 and 14.3.4. Willamette River compatability addressed in Policy 14.3. Green infrastructure and incentives addressed in Policy 11.4 and Actions 11.4.1 and Policy 18.1.
Q8	Add more street lights with better lights.	4	4.1.3 d. addresses safety and accessibility: improving lighting to make walking and biking safer
Q8	There is no community park or playground within 1/2 mile from the North Eugene High School. Emerald Park is 0.9 mile from 656 Sterling Drive.	4	Goal 8 of the plan is focused on access to parks, including implementing a plan for all residents to have access to parks within 1/2 mile.
Q8	Specifics related to node development, string of pearls concept? Particular focus on enterprise areas with additional incentives.	4 and 5	String of pearls specifics were originally addressed in Special Area Zone, which is now outside the scope of this plan. The concepts remain in the plan - Policies 2.1, 2.2, and 13.2 address active, walkable mixed-use neighborhood centers. Action 5.3.5 addresses zoning to implement the walkable neighborhood centers policy/encouraging commercial areas near active transportation.
Q8	Within the constraints of new State legislation, design standards for residential zones that mitigate the effects of infill on existing residences.	4 and 5	Transition standards between R-1 and C-2 addressed in code amendments. Compatible infill addressed in Policy 12.1. Design standards of residential zones outside scope of this plan.
Q8	On my street there are so many old junky cars and huge garbage in the front yards--mattresses, shelving, rotting trailers, etc. Where I used to live people were not allowed to leave big piles of garbage in their front yards, because it is ugly and because junky neighborhoods encourage crime--there is social science research on that.	5	These comments are related to code compliance enforcement issues. Not a specific problem to the RRSC neighborhoods.
Q8	I agree in general with these draft code amendments, except: "add transition standards such as buffering and setbacks for C-2 development next to Low Density Residential (R-1) zoned areas". I would prefer not to have commercial property within residential areas.	5	Commercial property is zoned commercial and mostly on the corridor. Not rezoning as part of plan.
Q8	Are there ways to restrict pot and porn shops?	5	Outside neighborhood plan scope. Restricting pot shops has been a city-wide discussion.
Q9	do not allow ADUS that leave no yards. We do not vote for city officials yet you control our lives. This is taxation without representation and is illegal	5	Outside scope/general comments.
Q9	Please create codes for the residential neighborhoods that do not allow piles of big garbage in the front yard and limits the number of cars one can park in the front yard. My neighborhood has gotten junkier and there has been more crime!	5	These comments are related to code compliance enforcement issues. Not a specific problem to the RRSC neighborhoods.
Q9	Encourage high school students to remain on campus during lunch hour, thereby keeping them safer and eliminating noontime congestion at one of the City's worst intersections: River Road/Silver Lane.	5	Outside scope

Source	Q10 Community (What is missing from this topic area?) Q11 Community (What changes, clarifications, or additions are needed to improve this topic area?)	1 - Small Revisions 2 - Policy/Action Changes 3 - General Feedback 4 - Already Addressed 5 - Outside Plan Scope	Staff Notes and Considerations
Q10	No involvement from the City of Eugene Human Rights office or commission in 15.1 (creating an inclusive community and responding to hate crimes). No support from the county. Putting it all on the neighborhood associations. Doesn't seem like a setup for success to put regular folks in charge of this, when Eugene leads the state in bias crimes.	1	Add City as partner on relevant actions in Policy 15.1.
Q11	The term cultural services could use some definition.	1	Cultural services could be further defined in the plan.
Q10	Unarmed community watch groups	2	Could be considered, but watch groups might conflict with Policy 15.1.
Q10	Developed space for community to network and share information- such as community bulletin boards (these are non-existent in Santa Clara)	2	This is generally addressed under Policy 15.1, but information sharing spaces are not explicitly included in actions.
Q11	<p>Some areas I am concerned about: 17.1 Address Present Confusion about Service Providers: Assist River Road and Santa Clara residents by providing information about current service providers so there is clarity about which agencies provide services and where and how to contact them.</p> <p>Just want to let you know that Lane County has a great web page for finding out which agency provides which service. Just have to get the word out.</p> <p>https://lcmaps.lanecounty.org/propertysearchnew/</p> <p>It's important to note that county residents within the UGB are vehemently opposed to annexation and increased taxes, yet want better services. They enjoy many city parks and can attend many City events (such as at the City Library) for free. The county residents should come up with a figure that would buy them City services and then set up a special taxing district, much like the River Road people do for Emerald Park.</p> <p>17.4 Annexation.</p> <p>Even bringing this up throws county people into a frenzy. But there should be some reality included in this statement. Perhaps a time line. County residents should not be given a free ride without paying the City for whatever service they like. If they want Eugene police, pay for it. Cahoots, pay for it. Etc.</p>	2	Policy revisions for consideration by CAC and City staff.
Q10	Welcome Wagon, really encourage people to use electricity not fossil fuels in their homes and business at least when building something new.	2	Could be considered as a part of Welcome Wagon related actions
Q10	Creating more pods for food trucks--possibly including stages that can be used for music and other entertainment.	2	Adding a policy about food truck pods could be considered. Also mentioned under economic development topic.
Q11	<p>15.1.9 and 16.2.2 should be priorities.</p> <p>So should 17.1.2 and 17.1.3 as it relates to public safety. It's very confusing to live here and know what public services are available. It's slightly scary to think that we would have to rely on the sheriff's office to respond to a crime, when we live &lt;3 blocks from a major corridor. Zero support from CAHOOTS or Eugene Police. No library services.</p> <p>15.3.3 and 15.3.4 are unclear. Wait lists are a huge issue. What are the city and county doing to address those? (there aren't enough housing first options and services for all the need)</p> <p>Establishing an urgent care center would be expensive, but seems more important to the health of citizens, especially those with transportation issues, than some of the land use priorities.</p>	2	Suggested priorities to consider.
Q10	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Promoting a more bilingual-friendly atmosphere via partnerships (organizations & businesses), events, outreach, bilingual signs in public spaces. Providing attractive signage welcoming visitors and residents to the River & Garden District. Incentivize or penalize the eyesore of junkyard car business at the entrance to our neighborhood at River Road and Railroad Blvd. This has been a travesty and eyesore for decades - can we get funding to purchase and create a landscaped food cart pod or ? Regular updates from the Army Corp of Engineers regarding flood/dam hazards, similar to the presentation given several months ago at RRCO. Establish communication for updates with Union Pacific (pollution, noise, etc.). Continuation of close partnership with SC and expand to Whiteaker and Trainsong neighborhoods. 	2 and 4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Addressed in Action 15.1.6 and 15.1.7 Addressed in Action 11.3.2 (land use) Food carts could be added to plan Community education on natural hazards and communication with local industrial/environmental justice issues could be added in Community topic area. Could be added in Community topic area.
Q10	these cant be done until the homeless are addressed	3	

Source	Q10 Community (What is missing from this topic area?) Q11 Community (What changes, clarifications, or additions are needed to improve this topic area?)	1 - Small Revisions 2 - Policy/Action Changes 3 - General Feedback 4 - Already Addressed 5 - Outside Plan Scope	Staff Notes and Considerations
Q10	Promoting local businesses and business owners	3	
Q10	Nothing, well done!	3	
Q10	Nothing	3	
Q10	I agree with the policies identified in this topic.	3	
Q10	Its ok.	3	
Q10	topic is good	3	
Q10	Looks complete	3	
Q11	Work with existing organizations that have crappy community infrastructures and try to improve them. Don't just create new things--start with improving what already exists.	3	
Q11	None.	3	
Q11	None.	3	
Q11	I would like to see housing be economically mixed - high through low end housing, and it be equitable with the rest of the city. Yes for inclusive neighborhoods.	3	
Q11	I know that folks at RRCO have been working hard to do something good for our neighborhood and they are also hoping for some results from all the meetings they have arranged for the neighborhood. Thank you, Jon Belcher,	3	
Q11	None	3	
Q11	just say no to pedestrian bridge over beltline	3	
Q11	Please see comments above.	3	
Q11	This is the most important policy in this section: Policy 16.1 Communication and Outreach: Enhance communication and outreach capabilities of the River Road and Santa Clara Community Organizations by advocating for stable local funding to reach the entire neighborhoods. Our RR and SC community organizations are the most well-informed local leaders and need more funding.	3	
Q10	Combating antisemitism and other hate in the community.	4	Addressed in Policy 15.1
Q11	Projects to combat antisemitism and other hate in the community.	4	Addressed in Policy 15.1
Q11	We desperately need a community gathering place in south river road. The need and desire is there - it's come up in every survey. Help us make this happen!!	4	Addressed in Policy 16.2
Q10	One thing that seems to be missing is working with run down facilities that already exist. There is a Grange on my street that is very run down, ugly, and not used. It could be transformed into something so much more welcoming and beautiful and community oriented. No one would want to go there now because it is so depressing.	4	Policy 14.2 (land use) includes a focus on identifying and preserving historical and cultural properties (and associated action 14.2.3).
Q10	Annexation, governance, obstacles to service delivery due to patchwork administrative tax base and local governance,	4	While annexation policies are outside the scope of this plan, clarifying confusion about service delivery is addressed in Policy 17.1.
Q10	Incentives/funding to make these fantastic art and culture changes become reality.	4	Addressed in Action 15.4.1.
Q10	addressing homeless people setting up camp everywhere. this should be top priority. also need to address inequities between city and county properties--we pay the city taxes but get minimal benefits	4	Work to address the unhoused community is addressed in Policy 15.3. Clarifying City/County services is addressed in Policy 17.1.
Q10	Policy 15.1 - There is still ambiguity about where the city limits are and the county begins. Various entities classify the Silver Lea addition as city (as we pay city taxes) but they turn us away because we are considered county residents. This has been a real problem for one of my close neighbors.	4	Clarifying confusion about service delivery is addressed in Policy 17.1.
Q11	Why do community centers charge more for those who are called "out of district"? This does not seem ALL INCLUSIVE when an activity may charge a fee to cover the cost of the activity regardless of where the person lives. Our Sterling Drive neighbors tell us that people are camping out behind their homes along the Beltline. They can hear them from their yards and they feel less safe than ever before.	4	Clarifying confusion about service delivery is addressed in Policy 17.1.
Q10	allow us to vote for city council. I live on Hawthorne and have no council member	5	Outside plan scope
Q11	allow us to vote for city council. I live on Hawthorne and have no council member	5	Outside plan scope
Q11	Annexation deserves a mention and further explanations as in 'for future consideration'. Many residents would like to vote in City of Eugene elections, but can't because we are county residents.	5	Annexation policies are outside the scope of the plan.
Q11	Create a group to address concerns about safety and crime. Every other post on Next Door is about a vehicle being broken into or stolen.	5	Outside plan scope