

to decide what kind of society we want to be and work to realize that every day. In the meantime, call or email your federal and state officials. Join Health Care for All Oregon (hcao.org). It's up to us.

Patty Hine
Eugene

THE TRUMPKIN COVER

I enjoyed your Donald Trump pumpkin cover Oct. 22. I'm not a Donald Trump fan, but if Bernie Sanders had the guts to talk at Liberty University in September, I wish Trump would come to the University of Oregon. I'd like to come down from Salem and see what kind of reception Eugene would give to a Trump visit.

Jack Presley Evans
Salem

ALLOWING OBJECTIFICATION

To follow-up and add to Ryan Foote's Oct. 22 letter on objectifying women, not only in the media but in society in general, I agree, yet play devil's and objectivity's advocate.

I have taken *EW* to task over objectification in the past, and yet, like most human endeavors, they are contradictory at

best. The *EW* talks and advertises out both sides of its printed mouth, knowing damn well that sex sells, yet prints progressive rants when women's sex is abused. The real issue here is: If it's all right to objectify the gander, then why does the goose, who does the objectifying, not allow an *equal* gander of the goose?

Foote comments on the photo of Storm Large's nipples, yet they're not the true "points" of contention. They're beautiful, though! A picture's worth a thousand words, so what's *EW*'s need for printing "titillates" other than to purposefully draw attention to them? Don't they do that well enough on their own? And what about the previous page's ad for Divas, which shows a woman "threatening" to perform fellatio on a microphone, both hands "cocked" at its base, ruby lips wide open, giving a mere impression that it's really about singing?

Let's be honest here: If women allow themselves to be portrayed this way by approving these photos and display ads, then let's have an open discussion. I live in a college town and see women objectifying themselves constantly, fishing for attention by wearing skimpy and suggestive clothes, then blame men for being devious about it.

Is there any irony in the fact that the word "deviate" immediately follows "deva" in the dictionary? In Jungian terms, they shadow each other.

So the question then remains: Who's objectifying whom?

Sean S. Doyle
Corvallis

CONSUMERISM BITES

High praise to David Hugh Tyson for his Oct. 22 letter "Consumer Culture." He notes that "investing in kids" can go very wrong, if what we're spending on is more consumerism. Kids are being trained from kindergarten to be technology consumers, and to get both their homework and their leisure from these (expensive and polluting) little gadgets.

Too often, liberal causes fall into the trap of advocating change by way of more consumerism. Stop global warming? Buy a Prius? Gotta be kidding — a new car costs the planet and its climate *big* damage. Cure cancer? Buy a bunch of synthetic pink T-shirts died with poisonous chemicals. (Ninety thousand industrial chemicals in the world are untested for human effects and more or less guarantee a rising tide of cancer.)

Small activist groups, staffed mostly by volunteers, may do more good than harm. But once they install an officer in charge of fundraising, the constant inhalation of money becomes the group's main goal. If you're taking money from the Rockefeller Foundation, you really can't knock "clean coal."

Recently, the Nuclear Information and Resource Service (which I respect, generally) sent out an earnest appeal for funds for advertising at the People's Climate March in New York. To save the environment, they proposed to buy 1,200 synthetic banners on plastic poles, saying "No Nukes." Never mind that they were probably produced partly by nuclear electricity. Those banners actually contributed to global warming in their production and have today become poisonous garbage.

Care about the world? Better that you really try (and it's not easy) to do nothing at all than add to our misery with more consumerist posturing. Humans don't need to get off their ass and *do* more. We need to do a lot less.

Christopher Logan
Eugene

VIEWPOINT

BY EBEN FODOR

Major Impacts

SOUTH WILLAMETTE ZONING PLAN EXAMINED

The City Council deftly headed off a major confrontation with residents of the South Willamette area by voting Oct. 21 to not rezone single-family homes in the area. It was the council's first opportunity to provide guidance to city planners on the highly controversial South Willamette Special Area Zone.

The SW-SAZ has been pushed forward by the Planning Department under the auspices of a "community-driven" process. However, once residents started learning about the plan in June of this year, opposition swelled. As a pilot project, the SW-SAZ is intended to be replicated in many other parts of Eugene.

The 83-page SW-SAZ zoning amendment would increase potential density by changing the zoning on 469 properties, including 229 single-family homes. It was a bold and unprecedented move by the Planning Department, but there were a number of critical problems. First and foremost, the city had not adequately informed and engaged residents of the affected area. But, second, the plan lacked supporting information indicating what the impacts would be from such a major change to the area. No estimate was provided for the number of additional dwelling units the SW-SAZ would allow. And there was no information on impacts such as traffic, parking, housing affordability, schools, etc.

Thanks to neighborhood fundraising, it was possible to perform a basic impact analysis to estimate what these impacts would be. The results show that the SW-SAZ, as proposed, would have major consequences affecting much of south Eugene. The following summary of impacts reflects the difference between the maximum potential development allowed under the proposed SW-SAZ, and that allowed under existing zoning.

Added capacity: The SW-SAZ would allow 3,358

additional dwelling units with an associated population increase of 5,488 people in this small, 123-acre area — more people than the current populations of Veneta, Creswell or Oakridge.

Traffic: Add 2,140 vehicles to peak-hour traffic in south Eugene (5 to 6 pm) and increase rush-hour traffic on Willamette by 57 percent, causing the failure of the intersection at 29th Avenue and Willamette Street. The SW-SAZ would impact virtually all residents of south Eugene by generating intense traffic congestion on Willamette Street that would spill over onto alternate routes, including neighborhood streets.

Parking: An estimated 4,390 additional parking spaces would be needed to accommodate potential residential development. Due to the decreased parking requirements for development in the SW-SAZ (from 1.5 to 0.5 parking spaces per three-bedroom apartment), about half of the added parking demand would be met on neighborhood streets, consuming all on-street parking for several blocks.

School capacity: An estimated 960 additional school-age children would be added to the area. This would necessitate the addition of at least one new elementary school and expanded middle school and high school capacities.

Housing affordability: The area was found to have some of the most diverse and affordable housing in the city, with housing priced \$42,000 lower than the median for the city as a whole. A city analysis shows that redevelopment under the SW-SAZ will require higher rents to be profitable, and developers may build to the higher end of the market, resulting in a likely loss of affordability.

Based on these results, it's clear that residents of the area have good reasons to be concerned about how the

SW-SAZ might affect them. While the study focused on the major impact categories, residents have noted many other potential impacts, including blocked views of Spencer Butte, lost solar access, property values, potential displacement of small businesses, environmental impacts and fiscal impacts to the city.

It is important to note that there is no mitigation proposed by the city for any of these impacts. There are no street improvements, sidewalks, bike paths, schools, parks or new facilities of any kind included in the SW-SAZ proposal.

The city has determined that subsidies would be needed to make redevelopment profitable for developers. This means extending the controversial MUPTE 10-year property tax exemption to the area. Such tax waivers make it harder for the city to fund the facilities and services an expanded population requires.

Going forward, the council has made it clear that they favor protecting established residential neighborhoods and want more public engagement in the process.

The city has tried to rationalize the SW-SAZ by linking it to the Envision Eugene comprehensive plan; however, the two have no real legal relationship. The city could proceed with finalizing Envision Eugene0 and address the South Willamette area at a pace that is more conducive to broader public participation.

Many residents of the area have wondered why the standard neighborhood refinement planning process wasn't used for the area, instead of the zoning amendment process. This continues to sound like the most reasonable approach for planning this complex, diverse and vital area. If the city wants to salvage the SW-SAZ, the best approach may be to scale the boundaries back to include just the commercial areas along Willamette Street.

Find a complete copy of the 24-page *South Willamette Rezoning Impact Study*, and other information about the SW-SAZ, on the South Willamette Neighbors website, swneugene.org.

Eben Fodor is a professional planner with Fodor & Associates LLC of Eugene.