



REGION 2050

Sustaining Quality of Life in the Southern Willamette Valley

REGION 2050 PROCESS

December 1, 2004

On November 9, 2004, the Lane County Board of Commissioners and Lane County Planning Commission met in a joint work session to hear a status report on Region 2050 and to discuss the process. The Board and Planning Commission generally expressed support for Region 2050.

At the meeting, Lane County Commissioner Anna Morrison expressed concerns about Region 2050 and handed out a list of questions and requested staff to respond. The following responses were prepared by staff and reviewed and edited by the Regional Technical Advisory Committee and the Regional Policy Advisory Board prior to distribution and posting on the web site www.Region2050.org.

General Response to Questions

The end product of Region 2050 is not a pre-determined outcome. Region 2050 began as, and continues to be, a project that is conducted in strict adherence to the direction of the participating local governments. No outcome from this process will be decided without the consensus of all participating local governments. These responses reflect the discussion of the participants at this point in time.

At the meeting, Commissioner Morrison handed out a hard copy list of the questions below. Following the meeting, additional information was requested about the cost of Region 2050 and about other Regional Problem Solving Projects. Responses to these questions are provided below following the responses to Commissioner Morrison's initial list of questions.

- 1. Would this Regional Growth Management Strategy have the direct effect of becoming "binding" public policy for each jurisdiction? In other words, is it merely a strategy or is it policy?**

Response:

The local governments participating in Region 2050 have voluntarily agreed to work together to develop and endorse a Regional Growth Management Strategy. The Policy Board has not yet recommended the exact form the inter-governmental

agreement to endorse the Strategy will take. There are several types of agreements now in place that may serve as models or examples for endorsement of the Strategy, including the locally-adopted Urban Growth Management Agreements between Lane County and nine small cities, or Cooperative Urban Services Agreements between local governments and urban service providers.

The Strategy is not intended to be a formal framework plan that would contain binding policies. The importance of this point to the local participants is so great that they have requested DLCD to issue a letter that clearly states that DLCD will not use the Strategy as a framework plan that requires the local governments to take actions they have not agreed to take. This statement could, in fact, be included in the language of the Strategy itself and be reiterated in all intergovernmental agreements. The Strategy is intended to be the tool by which each city agrees to set population and employment targets they will serve over the next 50 years and goals, objectives, and actions to improve and sustain quality of life under the agreed-to Preferred Growth Scenario.

The agreement to endorse the Strategy will be binding only to the extent each local government commits to the agreed-upon actions, as in any inter-governmental agreement. When local governments ask DLCD to approve actions that are not consistent with the Strategy, they could demonstrate how the action meets the Strategy's goals and objectives, or why the action cannot meet the goals and objectives, or the Strategy could be amended. In any event, no jurisdiction can be worse off with the Strategy than without it, because if any jurisdiction decides to revisit or repeal the Strategy, until a revised Strategy is in place, the state administrative rules would apply just as they do today. The Policy Board could agree to include language to this effect in the intergovernmental agreement they adopt approving the Strategy.

The Strategy will be approved by LCDC in order to facilitate DLCD approvals of the requested land use actions, but the Strategy will not be used to make the participating jurisdictions take actions they have not agreed to take or adhere to rules that the Strategy is not subject to. In other words, the Strategy will improve the status of all participants because it will reflect the visions of each community and will be a tool for each community to realize the communities' respective local visions. This pro-active planning will, in turn, provide the information needed to plan and finance needed infrastructure – roads, transit, sewers, and water – and to ensure there is an appropriate, buildable land base sufficient to meet the future development needs of the region.

While Region 2050 is a voluntary process, it has been the expectation of the participants that Region 2050 will facilitate agreement on state requirements. For example, regional agreement on population targets will be used to meet state requirements for coordinated 20-year population projections which state law currently requires counties to adopt. Outside of Region 2050, the state-mandated coordinated population projections will be **based on past trends rather than on**

each community's vision for the future. This is significant for all cities in the region because all public facility planning is required by law to use these coordinated population projections.

Region 2050 will also facilitate agreement between the local governments and the state on urban reserves and urban growth boundaries, which, outside of the Region 2050 process can be an expensive and time-consuming process without assurances of approval, particularly because the standard in the administrative rule for Urban Reserves is difficult to meet to the letter. Each of the local governments participating in Region 2050 will include in the Strategy a UGB and urban reserves that are consistent with their own community vision. DLCD approval of future UGB expansions consistent with the Strategy will be done through an expedited process that will not require taking further exception to the Statewide Planning Goals.

Through the appointment by the Lane County Board of Commissioners of a Resource Lands Committee and through their recommendations, Region 2050 will also allow this region to examine the potential for rural development not allowed by administrative rules while still adhering strictly to the intent of statewide planning goals to protect productive farm and forest lands, as stated in the following section of **ORS 197.656:**

“(6) If, in order to resolve regional land use problems, the participants in a collaborative regional problem-solving process decide to devote agricultural land or forestland, as defined in the statewide planning goals, to uses not authorized by those goals, the participants shall choose land that is not part of the region's commercial agricultural or forestland base, or take an exception to those goals pursuant to ORS 197.732. To identify land that is not part of the region's commercial agricultural or forestland base, the participants shall consider the recommendation of a committee of persons appointed by the affected county, with expertise in appropriate fields, including but not limited to farmers, ranchers, foresters and soils scientists and representatives of the State Department of Agriculture, the State Department of Forestry and the Department of Land Conservation and Development.”

2. If not “binding policy” then why does the background material refer to “implementation actions?” Also confusing because 2050 is described as “voluntary” but then come the references to “implementation actions.”

Implementation actions will define how the Strategy will be carried out and how it will be monitored, evaluated, and modified over time. The process to develop and implement the Strategy is voluntary and will be used to achieve local objectives. For example, a city that agrees to serve population “X” will also agree to adopt implementing actions to amend its UGB, set urban reserves, and adjust its public facility plans to provide the land and facilities needed to serve that population level. A key aspect of this is that the Strategy would *not* be an overriding plan that will be enforced by some central authority; but, rather, will be an agreement entered into

voluntarily by and by which each participant agrees to implement in accordance with the timeframe that is appropriate to their situation. As things change, the implementation actions will be modified and adjustments to the Strategy will be made using the process for review, evaluation, and modification that is agreed-to and is an integral part of the Strategy.

Both the Strategy development and implementation are voluntary processes. There will be two stages of consensus in approving the Regional Growth Management Strategy. The first stage is Policy Board approval, which is advisory. The second stage is the individual elected bodies of the participating local governments and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC).

According to the unanimously-approved Groundrules for the Policy Board, process decisions (i.e., decisions to amend the Groundrules) are made by majority vote while all substantive decisions of the Policy Board are made by consensus of the members representing the wishes of their elected bodies, as stated in the following approved Groundrules:

- “4. The decision carries if it is agreed-to by nine (9) of the members, including proxy votes, obtained either before or after the meeting. Proxy votes will be obtained after the meeting only when the action requested changes as a result of discussion or a member is out of town, EXCEPT that when one or more of the following conditions applies, the decision cannot carry:
 - a. The decision is counter to adopted policy of the objecting member’s city or county; and/or
 - b. The decision is counter to the wishes of the elected body of the objecting member’s jurisdiction, as expressed by motion of that body.
5. When an objecting member states that either condition a or b applies, the matter will be dropped or tabled until such time as the Policy Board decides to re-open it for discussion; for example, when a member wants time to confer with their council or board, or when conditions change following the initial discussion.”

The intent of this language is to respect the 100% consensus rule when it reflects the expressed wishes of the governing bodies or adopted local policy but to allow that one or two individual Policy Board members may chose to vote according to their personal views on any one action.

As stated in the Groundrules, the ultimate decision to approve the Strategy rests with the decisions of the individual elected bodies:

"The Regional Policy Advisory Board is an intergovernmental committee created to guide the Region 2050 process, lead the discussion of regional issues, and

recommend to the region's elected bodies a strategy to improve and sustain quality of life over the next 50 years."

LCDC approval of the Regional Growth Management Strategy is governed by ORS 197.656. By approving the Strategy, LCDC also approves the implementing measures it contains. In this way, DLCD approval of actions reflected in the Strategy will be done through a facilitated process that will not require taking a later exception to the Statewide Planning Goals, as stated in ORS 197.656:

ORS 197.656:

- (1) Upon invitation by the local governments in a region, the Land Conservation and Development Commission and other state agencies may participate with the local governments in a collaborative regional problem-solving process.
- (2) Following the procedures set forth in this subsection, the commission may acknowledge amendments to comprehensive plans and land use regulations, or new land use regulations, that do not fully comply with the rules of the commission that implement the statewide planning goals, without taking an exception, upon a determination that:
 - (a) The amendments or new provisions are based upon agreements reached by all local participants, the commission and other participating state agencies, in the collaborative regional problem-solving process;
 - (b) The regional problem-solving process has included agreement among the participants on:
 - (A) Regional goals for resolution of each regional problem that is the subject of the process;
 - (B) Optional techniques to achieve the goals for each regional problem that is the subject of the process;
 - (C) Measurable indicators of performance toward achievement of the goals for each regional problem that is the subject of the process;
 - (D) A system of incentives and disincentives to encourage successful implementation of the techniques chosen by the participants to achieve the goals;
 - (E) A system for monitoring progress toward achievement of the goals; and
 - (F) A process for correction of the techniques if monitoring indicates that the techniques are not achieving the goals; and
 - (c) The agreement reached by regional problem-solving process participants and the implementing plan amendments and land use regulations conform, on the whole, with the purposes of the statewide planning goals."

3. What happens if the “public outreach” results in no consensus for any of the three scenarios, or even a rejection of the three scenarios? Would this 2050 process halt? If not, who decides what “Preferred Regional Growth Strategy” would be forwarded to the Board of Commissioners?

The Regional Policy Advisory Board and the RTAC are not asking the public to choose one scenario over another and they do not expect the Preferred Growth Scenario to look exactly like any of the three alternatives. They expect that the Preferred Growth Scenario will be a hybrid that contains elements of all three.

There may be general support for one scenario over another, but certain aspects of that scenario may not be acceptable either to the residents of a specific area or because it does not meet the evaluation criteria. The Preferred Growth Scenario would incorporate adjustments to address those aspects; for example, population and/or employment may be shifted from one area to another. This is a common step in all consensus-building processes.

The alternatives are a consensus-building tool that helps the public and local officials to understand and address the complex relationship among population and employment growth, the carrying capacity of the land, water, and air resources, and public facilities. They help inform the dialogue about growth. The ultimate questions are: what are the consequences of growing in this manner rather than another? Is this form and level of growth acceptable to the community? If yes, how, when, and where will the growth occur and how will it be served? In other words, the process provides for a careful, responsible, pro-active approach to managing growth in a way that preserves the region’s quality of life, in a way that avoids regional problems experienced in other regions in the country.

The Preferred Growth Scenario that will be forwarded to the Lane County Board of Commissioners for approval will be the scenario that is agreed to by all participating local governments and state agencies. The Policy Advisory Board will agree on the Strategy, based on acceptance by each of the participating elected bodies, and the Strategy will then be submitted to each of these bodies for formal approval.

4. Similarly, what if there is not consensus among the eleven jurisdictions for any of the three scenarios?

Please see the response to #3 above for a discussion of how the alternative scenarios relate to the Preferred Growth Scenario. The likelihood of reaching consensus on a Preferred Growth Scenario is high because the Regional Growth Management Strategy that is recommended by the Regional Policy Advisory Board will reflect the visions of each of the participating entities. All of the participating entities will potentially benefit from Region 2050 and no local government can be harmed by the process because it is consensus-based. In the event one or more of the participants do not agree on a Preferred Growth Scenario, the Regional Policy

Advisory Board would make a determination as to the next steps in the process, based on the desires of their respective elected bodies.

- 5. There needs to be baseline UGB numbers using the most current data. 2050 references total acreage for UGB's in 2000. However, that doesn't tell us how much of that land is already consumed for residential, employment, or public purposes. We need to know what's on the ground today in order to plan for the future. An argument could be made this should halt until Lane County, Eugene, and Springfield complete their land survey for commercial and industrial lands.**

The baseline data for the Region 2050 scenarios is the data available as of April 2003 when the scenarios were developed. It is correct to say that more current information will be available over time as the Regional Strategy is being developed. This is true not only in Eugene and Springfield but in all the small cities. In order to maintain a consistent methodology, the capacity analysis for the UGBs is conducted at a specific point in time rather than constantly updated; and the need projected into the future. Adjustments to the population projections and UGB capacity will be made at the Preferred Growth Scenario stage when the project moves from conceptual diagrams to a more property-specific proposal.

- 6. Region 2050 is not mandated by the state. Will it result in any better outcome than if each of the eleven jurisdictions simply followed the letter and spirit of Oregon's 19 land use planning goals?**

It is correct to say that Region 2050 is not mandated by the state and that the process is not required to follow the letter of the administrative rules (as explained in detail above). However, Region 2050 will follow the spirit and intent of the Statewide Planning Goals; and yes, regional collaboration (both among the local governments and between the local governments and the state agencies) provides benefits far beyond what could be achieved by each local government acting independently of each other and acting only within the strict application of administrative rules written for statewide application. Some key benefits are as follows:

Regional and Community Visions

Region 2050 provides an opportunity for the elected officials in the region to exercise leadership in developing a vision for both their community and the larger region of which it is a part. The alternative is the base case or "business as usual" scenario: a projection of past trends and current policy. Region 2050 creates the information base and forum for deciding where the communities *want to be* in the future and what steps they need to take to get there. Many small cities do not have the resources to carry out this level of planning on their own and have expressed appreciation for the tools Region 2050 brings to their community.

Regional Collaboration

Region 2050 provides a structure and forum for the eleven local governments in the region to collaborate to achieve mutual growth management goals and objectives. Region 2050 allows local governments to recognize their inter-connectedness and collaborate on mutually beneficial planning. Through Region 2050, participating cities and the county will manage growth in a way that addresses inter-jurisdictional issues and rural development issues. No other process is available for this regional collaboration to take place. The Region 2050 process is voluntary and allows flexibility for local and state participants to agree on a Regional Growth Management Strategy that is custom-designed to respond to the specific needs of this region rather than to a generic statewide mandate.

Under the state planning system, growth is managed only within individual urban growth boundaries (UGBs) that are assumed to be separate and distinct from each other. In reality, growth in population and employment occurs within regions and growth trends in one community affect nearby communities. Over time, the geographic distinction between cities can be blurred by a continuous urban landscape unless conscious actions are taken to maintain community identities.

When one UGB is constrained, it forces growth into other UGBs. This is happening now in the small cities of Veneta, Coburg, Creswell, and Cottage Grove which are experiencing rapid residential growth. The lag between residential growth spurts and growth in businesses creates a financial strain in the small cities that are providing the facilities and services to house the workers who commute to places of employment in the larger metropolitan areas.

The state planning laws do not address these extra-urban issues. Through regional collaboration, the local governments participating in Region 2050 can address these regional issues and inter-relationships.

Growth Policy

Region 2050 provides the data and process for cities to grow in the way and to the size *they want to grow*, consistent with each community's vision. In Region 2050, coordinated population projections, now required by law for the county to adopt, will be *based on policy* set by the city instead of *past population trends*. This is especially important for small cities that have not experienced very much growth in the past who want to grow in the future and for any city that wants less growth than it is required by law to accommodate.

Growth in Jobs

Cities can work collaboratively with the other cities in the region to devote the type of land and amount of land each city wants to make available for employment. The Base Case Scenario, which is based on a projection of past trends in this region and on an examination of regional development patterns, shows most of the growth over the next 50 years in employment to be accommodated through very large UGB

expansions in Eugene. Through Region 2050, participating local governments may choose to work toward a different vision of job growth distribution.

Flexibility in Meeting State Administrative Rules

Region 2050 provides greater flexibility because it falls under the guidelines of the Regional Problem Solving Statute (ORS 197.652-658). As such, Region 2050 participants can agree to solutions that do not necessarily meet the letter of administrative rules as long as they meet the intent of the statewide planning goals and all participants agree. This gives these local governments unique flexibility in designing solutions. Agreement will be formalized in a motion or resolution by all local governments and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC).

By entering into agreement to endorse the Strategy, the local governments avail themselves of the opportunity to devise innovative solutions that are customized to serve this specific region and certainty that LCDC will support the implementing actions (e.g., UGB amendments, urban reserves, facility planning agreements) that require their approval. This does not preclude local governments from taking actions that are not addressed in the Regional Strategy or requesting LCDC approval of such actions. Conversely, the Strategy will facilitate requests to LCDC that are demonstrated to be consistent with it. The Regional Strategy and the analysis that was used in formulating those solutions would become the basis for state decision-making rather than strict adherence to the administrative rules. This has obvious benefits for the local governments and for the state agencies because the decisions are based on the unique aspects of this specific geographic region rather than the more generic statewide application of standards.

Transportation, Water, and Wastewater Facility Planning

Region 2050 provides the 50-year planning horizon needed for effective, efficient delivery of water, wastewater, and regional transportation services. This is 30 years more than the 20-year horizon mandated in state planning law. Through Region 2050, public facilities can be sized consistent with each city's vision, *not past trends*. Public facilities are required by law to be sized consistent with coordinated population projections.

The capacity to grow is dependent on the ability to provide water and dispose of waste and on access to goods, services, and workers. If one city's capacity to grow is restricted by lack of adequate facilities, the growth will go into another part of the region that can serve it. This is particularly true of business growth which has high facility requirements. In the base case scenario, residential and employment growth is projected to occur primarily through very large UGB expansions in Eugene. Unmanaged growth at the regional level has been demonstrated to negatively affect quality of life in other regions, particularly the more mature metropolitan regions to our north and south.

Access to Quality K-12 Education

Region 2050 provides a forum for the administrators, board members, and students in the region's school districts to be part of the visioning process and to create a vision that improves and maintains access to quality K-12 education to all students in the region. This does *not* mean that all education services would be centered in Eugene. It means that the school districts will have information about future development patterns that will help them formulate long range plans for providing educational services in both rural and urban areas. Planning for education services is not addressed in the statewide planning goals.

7. Are there any budget implications to the eleven jurisdictions to complete the 2050 plan and/or to implement the strategy?

Region 2050 has sufficient funding to carry the project to completion and also to fund some implementation, primarily through federal and state grants which have been the major funding source for the project. Project staff continue to seek grant funding to address needs as they arise through the direction of the Regional Technical Advisory Committee and Regional Policy Advisory Board. This effort to seek state and federal grant funding, as requested, will certainly extend to funding for local jurisdictions to develop implementation tools.

Current revenues supporting the project include a \$133,000 state grant that extends to June 2007 to: prepare a regional transportation model, apply the model to the scenarios, develop a preferred growth scenario, prepare the list of capital projects needed to serve the region in the Preferred Growth Scenario, and to amend local Transportation System Plans (TSPs), one of the implementation measures. The target date for agreement on the Regional Growth Management Strategy is June 2006 and for adoption of implementation actions, June 2007.

The project has also been awarded \$35,000 in state grant funding for the public outreach on the alternative growth scenarios. At the last Policy Board meeting, the Policy Board directed that instead of conducting a random sample telephone survey, the \$8,000 committed for that purpose be used specifically for outreach to all of the rural areas, particularly those most affected by the strategy: Pleasant Hill, Goshen, and Alvadore.

In addition, the local utilities are continuing their support for the project and project staff are continually seeking funding from federal and state grant sources to provide the best available data and obtain the most public input and quality public input for the local officials to use in agreeing on the elements to include in the Preferred Growth Scenario and Regional Strategy.

Additional Information Requested

1. What has been the total cost for Region 2050 to date?

Please note that the following are estimates. The \$800,000 total cost is a round figure and the actual amount of in-kind services, particularly if state agency staff is taken into account, is most likely higher than estimated. The revenue received per category and funded products are listed on the next page.

Region 2050's estimated revenue from year 2000 to year 2007¹ is about \$590,000 in direct costs over this 7 year period. Examples of direct costs are staff and consulting services, Policy Board meals, meeting minutes, space rental, copying, mailings, postage, and printing. In-kind services from local staff and officials is estimated at about \$210,000 over the past four and one half years.

Region 2050 addresses seven categories of quality of life in a region that encompasses 1,000 square miles, includes 11 local governments, and houses 315,000 people. Costs for Region 2050 break down to about \$54,000 direct costs and \$4,000 in-kind staff and official costs per jurisdiction. Relevant cost comparisons would be to the costs for each of the 11 local governments to prepare individual comprehensive plans or to the cost to prepare one comprehensive plan or one growth management strategy for a city the size of Eugene.

Another perspective on the cost is that almost all of the products produced through Region 2050 have had an immediate and on-going utility to participants, in addition to informing the development of a Regional Strategy. For example, the updates to the Regional Geographic Information System data layers have provided updated data for all local planning applications; the information in the community profiles has had a wide range of uses from individual grant applications to City Administrator recruitments; and the transportation modeling now underway will provide urban transportation models for four small cities in addition to the regional model and updates to local Transportation System Plans. All products delivered to date have been delivered on time and within budget.

2. What are the other Regional Problem Solving Projects in Oregon besides Region 2050?

Jackson County Greater Bear Creek Valley Project

The Jackson County Greater Bear Creek Valley Project started in 1995. It became a Regional Problem Solving Project in 1999. It involves seven cities and the county in a process of determining future areas of urban growth, the preservation of important agricultural areas, and protection of community identity. The project is at a stage

¹ Note that the TGM grant extends to year 2007 to cover the full range of products from the transportation modeling, i.e, it extends beyond the development of the Strategy and includes funding for implementation.

Direct Revenue 2000-2007		Products and Processes
Cities	\$63,000	<input type="checkbox"/> Community and Regional Profiles <input type="checkbox"/> Lane County GIS Update (\$45,000) <input type="checkbox"/> GIS data layers Update (development constraints throughout region) <input type="checkbox"/> Formation and staffing of RTAC meetings <input type="checkbox"/> Formation and staffing of Policy Board meetings <input type="checkbox"/> Web Site Development and Maintenance <input type="checkbox"/> Regional Tour <input type="checkbox"/> Scenario Modeling Development and Application <input type="checkbox"/> Base Case Scenarios <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation of Base Case Scenarios <input type="checkbox"/> Public Outreach on Base Case Scenario <input type="checkbox"/> Regional Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Alternative Scenarios Visioning <input type="checkbox"/> Alternative Scenario Evaluations <input type="checkbox"/> Report "Environmental Resource Protection in the Southern Willamette Valley" <input type="checkbox"/> Public Outreach on Alternative Growth Scenarios (to be completed) <input type="checkbox"/> Urban Transportation Models for Veneta, Creswell, Cottage Grove, and Junction City (to be completed) <input type="checkbox"/> Regional Transportation Model (to be completed) <input type="checkbox"/> Application of Transportation Models to Alternative Growth Scenarios (to be completed) <input type="checkbox"/> Development of Preferred Growth Scenario (to be completed) <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation System Improvements to Serve Preferred Growth Scenario (to be completed) <input type="checkbox"/> Local TSP amendments to incorporate transportation improvements (to be completed)
Eugene	50,000	
Coburg	2,000	
Junction City	2,500	
Creswell	2,500	
Veneta	3,000	
Cottage Grove	3,000	
Utilities	32,500	
LTD	5,000	
DLCD	230,000	
OECD	75,000	
TGM	133,000	
EPA	53,000	
Sony	1,000	

that would be similar to the Preferred Growth Scenario stage in Region 2050, although the two processes used different approaches from the start.

South Redmond Regional Problem Solving Project

The South Redmond Project is a joint project to solve land use issues regarding the airport industrial park, including conflicts with federal land and access to Highway 97. The process resulted in land trades between federal and county governments and transportation plan adoptions to secure an industrial land base and adequate, safe access to Highway 97.

Early Pilot Projects

Under HB 3482 (Feb., 1996 Special Session), the Land Conservation and Development Commission sponsored four pilot projects to address unusual (sometimes acute) growth issues in various parts of Oregon:

- ❑ Two of the projects addressed compounded problems of unplanned growth in southern Deschutes County (La Pine area) and the Clatsop Plain. Planning issues in these areas included septic contamination of groundwater and financing of basic services;
- ❑ A third project addressed transportation and other growth-related impacts in the Grande Ronde-Willamina area after construction of the Spirit Mountain gaming facility;
- ❑ The fourth project developed community plans for unincorporated hamlets, and completed recreational, watershed and aggregate resource planning in Josephine County.