CALL TO ORDER: Meeting was called to order by Nate Brown at 5:32 p.m. Attendance was noted as follows:

**Present:**
- Felicia Squires
- James Hutches
- Mike Kerr
- Rick Kuehn
- Danielle Bethell
- David Dempster

**Absent:**
- Blaze Itzaina, Chair
- Nick Stephenson, Vice Chair
- Carol Doerfler
- Ron Bersin
- Stephanie Iverson

**Staff Present:**
- Nate Brown, Community Development Director
- Shane Witham, Senior Planner
- Debbie Lockhart, Deputy City Recorder
- ECO Northwest Consultants
  - Bob Parker
  - Sadie DiNatale

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Danielle Bethell moved for approval of the Minutes. Felicia Squires seconded. Motion passed as follows: Squires, Hutches, Kerr and Kuehn in favor with Bethel and Dempster abstaining, and Itzaina, Stephenson, Doerfler, Bersin and Iverson absent.

PROJECT UPDATE: Bob Parker from ECO Northwest reviewed discussion that had taken place at the previous meetings noting that strategies would come at the next meeting. He narrated the Buildable Lands Inventory slide show #3, which reviewed vacant and partially vacant lands without constraints, densities, infill potential, and land use efficiency measures. Discussion took place regarding what was the right thing for Keizer to do, the segments of the city’s population whose housing needs are not being met, identifying future housing needs and accommodating those as well as possible.

Committee members voiced concern over the numbers used in the ‘Forecast of Housing 2019-2039’ slide questioning if it was appropriate to use numbers based on Keizer’s past 10 years or using the standard numbers supplied by nationwide studies.

Regarding the ‘Needed Housing Mix 2019-39’ slide, Mr. Parker explained that the consultants had looked at demographic trends, the increase in Latino families which means larger households, millennials, and gaps in housing that is affordable to incomes below $35,000 and above the area median income. He noted that data indicates that the City should be considering more multifamily housing units and how to provide housing options for people and the market.

Mr. Brown noted that the City needs to shift the existing mix so that the new construction is more than single family. Staff will need recommendations for strategies
from the committee – strategies to accommodate the lower density multifamily housing structures that could be interspersed in neighborhoods. The biggest challenge will be to find the land.

When the committee viewed the ‘Historic Housing Densities in Keizer 2000 to 2018’ slide, they asked the consultant to provide a density analysis from 2000 to 2018 so they could see if Keizer has increased density and at what rate it has done so.

Discussion took place regarding the land deficit except for commercial, and use of land for schools, roads and parks. Mr. Parker explained that this all points to challenging decision making for Keizer but some of the housing shortage can be addressed through policy changes. The regional Urban Growth Boundary has enough land to accommodate the growth, but the state is not sure how to address that.

Mr. Brown noted that if Keizer was to pursue a ‘divorce’ from Salem, it would immediately have to go through Periodic Review which will require the City to show that they are meeting all the housing needs required by the State. The other option would be to stay ‘married’ and utilize the capacity available by meeting with Salem and figuring out how to split it. He urged committee members to look at the factors driving the problem, defining housing affordability, strategies the communities can use to drive overall wages up, growth patterns, and anticipated need, and then to come up with recommended actions. He added that he hoped that Keizer would step up to the plate and meet the needs they possibly can recognizing that there are larger things at stake: Keizer is a community with cohesiveness and a fabric that needs to be preserved. He urged the committee to tweak the numbers and accept some responsibility by implementing new strategies, and although the City cannot meet all the requirements, it should strive to meet the needs of those that are underserved.

Mr. Parker added that Keizer would be challenged and probably not win if they tried to expand their side of the UGB. Historically, cities that have tried to expand when they are surrounded by agricultural lands spend decades and millions of dollars. The City would need to meet with Salem to consider how it can meet housing needs jointly. If the desire was to split the UGB, both communities would need to agree to that. It is important for the community to know what the implications are with having its own UGB. They would get their own population forecast and that would change the numbers in the report; accommodating housing needs would be less of a burden because the population numbers would be lower. The question is not whether or not to grow, but whether or not to accommodate growth.

Referring to the PAC Recommendations on Needed Housing Mix, committee members indicated they wished to tweak the numbers. David Dempster moved that the numbers be changed to 63% single-family detached, 10% single-family attached and 27% multifamily. (Original slide was 60%, 7%, 33% respectively.). Danielle Bethell seconded. Motion passed as follows: Squires, Hutches, Kerr, Kuehn, Bethell and Dempster in favor with Itzaina, Stephenson, Doerfler, Bersin and Iverson absent.

Housing Policies were not addressed at this meeting due to the late hour. Mr. Parker proposed that the consultant send out a survey to the committee members to poll them
on their opinions of each of the strategies the City has done. The results could be put in the next packet. Committee members agreed to take part in the survey. Mr. Parker added that as he has talked with staff, he has become cognizant of the limitation of the committee to implement some things. The recommendations will go through the process and end up on the desks of Nate and Shae because they will be involved in changing the development code to reflect amendments which will better accommodate housing needs.

**ADJOURN:** The meeting adjourned at 8:11 p.m.

**Next Meeting:** April 22, 2019

**Minutes approved:** 05-29-19