

MINUTES

Region 2050 Advisory Policy Board
EWEB Training Center, 500 East 4th Avenue, Eugene

November 16, 2005
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Faye Stewart, Vice Chair (Lane County), Mike Fleck, Gary Williams (Cottage Grove), David Kelly (Eugene), Warren Weathers (Lowell), Glenn Fortune (Oakridge), Christine Lundberg (Springfield), Neil Friedman (Westfir), Susan Ban (Lane Transit District), Erik Andersson (Governor's Economic Revitalization Team), members; Carol Heinkel, George Kloeppe, Jamon Kent, Scott Shine (Lane Council of Governments staff).

GUESTS: Lane Shetterly, Rob Hallyburton (Department of Land Conservation and Development), John Van Landingham (Land Conservation and Development Commission), Terri Harding (Oregon Department of Transportation), Anita Yap (Lane Transit District), Greg Mott, Bill Grile (City of Springfield Planning), Kurt Yeiter (City of Eugene Planning), Janet Calvert, Eleanor Mulder (League of Women Voters), Carlos Barrera, Rob Castleberry (Goshen Area Neighborhood Association), Marguerite Nabeta (Department of Land Conservation and Development), Amanda Ferguson (City of Cottage Grove), Steve Waddell (Pleasant Hill School Board).

1. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Stewart convened the meeting. Those present introduced themselves.

2. October 26, 2005 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Fleck, seconded by Mr. Kelly, moved to approve the minutes of the October 26, 2005, meeting as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Public Comment

Mr. Stewart read a letter from Millard Thomas of Pleasant Hill expressing his concerns about Measure 37 and its impact on rural urbanization and suburbanization. He distributed copies of the letter.

4. Regional Problem Solving Process

Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) Director Lane Shetterly and Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) Chair John Van Landingham joined the policy board in a discussion of the regional problem solving (RPS) process.

Mr. Shetterly said it would be useful to review from DLCD's perspective how the regional problem solving (RPS) process worked in terms of what it was intended to do and capable of accomplishing and the benefits to participating jurisdictions of continuing the process. He noted that representatives of Region 2050 had provided LCDC an update on the process. He said that RPS was a locally initiated and locally directed planning exercise that was not mandated by State law or DLCD but was available to communities that wished to participate. He referred to the RPS statutes attached to his memorandum of November 16, 2005, and noted that the statutes were not exhaustive and provided an opportunity for some flexibility because they were not entirely proscriptive. He said that RPS really began with communities that defined themselves as the region working collaboratively to develop a strategy for growth, adopt a preferred growth scenario, supporting maps and data and enter into agreements that reflected the regional growth strategy. He said the regional growth strategy would be reviewed by LCDC to determine that it, on the whole, complied with statewide land use planning goals. He said that determination was critical to the RPS process and once made it opened to the RPS process constituent jurisdictions the opportunity to adopt comprehensive plan amendments and other land use actions that implemented the regional strategy without having to comply with all of the administrative rules that would otherwise pertain to those comprehensive plan amendments land use actions, as long as they were implementing the approved regional strategy. He said once the implementation had occurred, the local comprehensive plans that were amended in conformance with the approved regional strategy would guide local land use decisions consistent with the regional strategy. He said that the RPS process consisted of a high level agreement on the regional strategy, separate, individual agreements between the state, the county and each individual city to implement that strategy and the actual land use actions, including comprehensive plan amendments, that implemented that agreed upon strategy, all driven by a regional vision of how communities had agreed to plan for growth.

Mr. Shetterly reviewed his memorandum of November 16, 2005 that responded to a series of questions posed by the policy board. He noted that the responses were the department's best efforts to answer the questions but had not been reviewed or approved by LCDC although he was confident that they reflected the commission's position. He said the questions had been addressed with the assumption that the policy board would be proceeding under Option B, the Urban Growth Management Agreement, rather than the more aspirational Option A or the metro model of Option C.

Is the adoption of a regional strategy a land use decision?

Mr. Shetterly said that the separate agreements between the County, each city, and state agencies were not land use actions, they were ORS 190 agreements because the agreements themselves do not result in any changes to land. He said the land use actions that each jurisdiction decides to take to implement the Strategy, such as comprehensive plan amendments, would be land use actions.

1. Does the regional strategy need to be found consistent with applicable statewide planning goals?

Mr. Shetterly said that the strategy did have to be consistent with statewide planning goals and pointed out an editorial error in the title of ORS 197.656 that referred to compliance with goals instead of administrative rules. He referred to language in ORS 197.656(2)(c) that addressed compliance with the statewide planning goals but did not require full compliance with the rules of the commission implementing those goals if certain criteria were met under the RPS process. He clarified that RPS required consistency with statewide goals but allowed more leniency on consistency with administrative rules.

2. What are the consequences of a participating government taking an action inconsistent with the adopted regional strategy and what recourse do other governments have when another government takes action inconsistent with the adopted regional strategy?

Mr. Kelly offered a hypothetical situation in which a participating local government had adopted plan amendments implementing the regional strategy but in the future wanted to do one thing that was inconsistent with the strategy but was consistent with statewide land use goals and administrative rules. He asked if that government could pursue the action using the traditional process rather than the RPS process.

Mr. Shetterly said that under RPS, local governments could adopt comprehensive plan amendments to implement the regional strategy and the amended plan was now the “going forward” document; that, just as with any other adopted comprehensive plan provision, land use actions need to be consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan or the comprehensive plan must be amended.

3. When a government makes a land use decision, will consistency with the adopted regional strategy be a standard of review?

Mr. Shetterly said that once the local governments’ comprehensive plans have been amended to implement the regional strategy, they reflected the strategy and any future land use decisions would be measured against that amended comprehensive plan.

Mr. Fleck commented that the group’s earlier discussions had suggested that governments could choose to use either the RPS process or administrative rules to implement land use actions after

the regional strategy was approved and comprehensive plans amended, but it now seemed, based on DLCD's responses, that governments were locked into the regional strategy. Mr. Shetterly replied that he would think that the communities would want to take the land use actions that they choose to include in the strategy because that was the straighter path, but DLCD was less concerned with the process than with the outcome, which must be consistent with the comprehensive plan that implemented the regional strategy.

Rob Hallyburton, DLCD Community Service Division manager, said it was important to distinguish what is a local decision from what is a state decision. He commented that the local governments would consider whether future land use actions were consistent with the agreements they had signed and their comprehensive plans; the State would consider whether those actions were consistent with the statewide goals and internally consistent.

Mr. Fleck asked how a community could accommodate an unexpected event such as a large employer locating in a community and generating more growth than was projected for that community under the regional strategy. Mr. Hallyburton replied that major unanticipated events should be addressed regionally with or without the RPS process to adjust growth and employment projections. Ms. Heinkel pointed out that, unlike population figures, jurisdictions' employment did not need to equal the regional total.

Mr. Fleck remarked that there could be other consequences to diverging from the regional plan. He asked if the policy board would have to be consulted in that type of situation. Mr. Shetterly said that would depend on how tightly jurisdictions constrained themselves in their agreements. He said the State wanted to see as much flexibility as possible. He reminded them that the agreements would be individual agreements between each city, the county, and the state agencies; that no city would enter into an agreement with another city in this process.

4. (A) *When the participating cities and Lane County undergo periodic review, will the adopted strategies be subject to this process?*
- (B) *If the adopted strategies are subject to periodic review, what involvement will the other cities not under periodic review have in this process?*
- (C) *Will the state recognize the Regional Growth Management Strategy and the Preferred Growth Scenario Map as meeting state requirements in the place of other state mandates, such as periodic review?*
- (D) *Is the adopted regional strategy subject to future rules changes, particularly regarding the exception process?*

Mr. Shetterly pointed out that currently only Eugene and Springfield, of the participating RPS jurisdictions, were subject to periodic review. He said that periodic review would not entail going back and reviewing or renegotiating previously approved actions in the RPS process. He said there was a monitoring element in the RPS statute and the regional strategy and implementing land use actions could inform periodic review in the future. He emphasized that period review was a process while the regional strategy and preferred growth scenario map were products and

the strategy itself was not subject to renegotiation during periodic review of an individual jurisdiction.

Mr. Kelly cited DLCD's response that periodic review was intended to ensure compliance with statewide planning goals and administrative rules and said that he understood the RPS process was supposed to provide relief from the administrative rules. Mr. Shetterly replied that plan amendments and other actions to implement the regional strategy were the actions that had relief from the administrative rules but that did not address new adopted rules or changes to the law that could have bearing in the future.

Mr. Kelly offered the example of Eugene deciding not to expand its urban growth boundary (UGB) under the regional strategy until average residential density reached a certain point and asked if that would conflict with the 20-year residential land supply requirement during periodic review. Mr. Shetterly replied that RPS did not excuse compliance with statutes so during the implementation phase jurisdictions would still need to comply with statutory requirements; to the extent that the implementation had excused strict compliance with administrative rules he did not see periodic review being an end run around that initial authority.

Mr. Hallyburton remarked that first the region needed to identify what rules were inhibiting it from meeting its local goals, and it was difficult to do that hypothetically. He said if an administrative rule was identified that prevented a community from realizing its desired future, then there could be regional agreement on a strategy that complied with the goal of sufficient urbanization without complying with that rule. Subsequent plan amendments would implement the regional strategy. He said that, during periodic review, the comprehensive plan, already approved by LCDC, could be used to demonstrate substantial compliance with statewide goals. He said a likely area for exceptions and flexibility would be designation of urban reserve areas (which would not need to be re-justified at periodic review), and while a city would still be required to have an adequate buildable land inventory, the requirements for that inventory would be defined by the regional strategy rather than administrative rules.

Mr. Van Landingham compared LCDC to a State planning commission that was directed by the legislature and required to comply with statutes; RPS was in the statutes as was periodic review and the 20-year residential land requirement. He said LCDC adopted goals and administrative rules and the hierarchy was first statutes, then goals followed by administrative rules. He said that RPS was in the statutes, although there were no administrative rules for the RPS process and it was LCDC's responsibility to interpret and apply the RPS statutes.

5. How is the adopted regional strategy amended? Does this require consensus of the participants and LCDC, just the participants or just LCDC?

Mr. Shetterly said the State's position was that a material amendment to the regional strategy constituted a new strategy and agreement. He stressed the importance to all participants that the regional strategy went forward as agreed upon and was not amended by the other participants, leaving a jurisdiction with a strategy to which it had not agreed. He said that an amendment of

the regional strategy would bring all parties, including LCDC, back to the table. He said that once a jurisdiction amends its own comprehensive plan consistent with the strategy, and the amendment is acknowledged by the state, that action cannot be “undone.” He said the key is for the jurisdictions to decide what actions they want to take in the strategy, take those actions, and then move on. Future amendments to the strategy would then be done as part of a new regional problem solving process.

6. (A) *The statute says that the Commission “may” acknowledge amendments to comprehensive plans and land use regulations that do not fully comply with the agreements in the collaborative regional problem solving process. The statute also says that the Commission has exclusive jurisdiction for review of amendments processed using the periodic review method. How do we know at the time we adopt the regional strategies that we’ll be able to amend our comprehensive plan without taking an exception if the process is otherwise required?*

(B) *If we don’t have a pre-commitment from the Commission to an “exception-free” process, what advantage do we gain from adopting a regional strategy?*

Mr. Shetterly stated that the statute said the commission may approve comprehensive plan amendments and land use actions that might not be consistent with administrative rules but were otherwise consistent with statewide planning goals if those actions implemented an agreed upon regional strategy approved by the commission. He recommended that comprehensive plan amendments be adopted after the commission’s approval of the regional strategy to achieve the greatest level of certainty that they would be acknowledged; the amendments could be submitted concurrently with the regional strategy but that presented an element of risk at the local level if actions were taken based on the presumption that the strategy would be approved.

Mr. Van Landingham acknowledged that he can’t bind LCDC now or in the future, just as the policy board could not bind elected bodies now or in the future, but said that LCDC was very supportive of the RPS concept and liked the idea of governments working together to develop a regional approach. He said the statute required LCDC to assure that the regional strategy complied with Statewide planning goals but the commission was very supportive of regional planning. He said that two RPS strategies had been submitted to date; the strategy from Bend was approved, but the Polk-Yamhill strategy was rejected because Yamhill County had withdrawn from the agreement. He said that related to earlier discussions about a jurisdiction withdrawing from the process, which would result in a partial regional problems solving that did not meet the requirements of the statute. Mr. Shetterly stated that the role of DLCD and LCDC was to provide guidance that would help the Region 2050 participants reach a successful outcome.

7. *Will the RPS process streamline the land use planning process at the local and state levels? In what ways? How can the collaborators develop more of a “system of incentives and disincentives to encourage successful implementation of the techniques chosen by the participants to achieve the goals?”*

Mr. Shetterly said that the Region 2050 process was creating data, maps and materials that would make jurisdictions' decision-making, both with respect to actions implementing the strategy and future land use actions, easier by providing information that could be relied upon as part of the approved regional strategy. He did not want to oversell the streamlining aspect as he felt the major benefit was more local control over the future of communities in the region.

8. *What level of detail is needed for the land use actions at the local level to be acknowledged by the state with no subsequent state approval required?*

Mr. Shetterly said the work accomplished in developing the regional strategy would provide a resource of information that could be relied upon and incorporated in future land use decisions that implemented the strategy.

Mr. Fleck asked if building the databases and developing a preferred scenario map were in essence a buildable land study and therefore a land use action. He was also concerned about potential inconsistencies between the regional strategy map and comprehensive plan maps. Mr. Shetterly replied that the agreement and the strategy were not the land use action; the comprehensive plan amendments to implement the strategy were the land use actions. Ms. Heinkel commented that the regional land capacity analysis map and population analysis developed in the Region 2050 process would be used by communities as part of the technical data for comprehensive plan amendments. She noted that the preferred growth scenario map was not parcel specific but did provide guidance on how to achieve community goals. She said the map showed development types but did not designate zoning and that LCOG GIS staff was in the process of developing the format of the map so that it is clear that it is not a comprehensive plan map and is not intended for parcel-specific application. She said the map only showed development types, it did not designate zoning and was intended to be used as a tool or general guide.

Ms. Lundberg said she still questioned how the RPS process would benefit local planning and local control when it would require considerable agreement among policy board members. She compared it to the *Metro Plan* process, which she found cumbersome rather than helpful. She used a hospital as an example of an unanticipated scenario that might need to be addressed in the future and did not see how RPS would make that process easier. She also questioned how much time an effort a community should invest in RPS when there was a possibility that in 30 years it might have a very different vision. She appreciated the data that had been developed to date in the regional process but expressed concern with committing ongoing resources to the project, being locked into another layer of agreement but still being required to pursue a traditional path for land use decisions, particularly if Springfield had very different goals in the future. Mr. Van Landingham replied that the RPS process could help Springfield decide where it might grow in relation to other communities in the region, but was not necessarily an easier process.

Ms. Lundberg questioned the need to formally adopt an agreement when the information generated by the process was available for jurisdictions to use. She was not certain that she wanted to be locked into an agreement and bound to the other jurisdictions. She noted that the

participating jurisdictions had diverse opinions about the process and was not certain she wanted to proceed to the next level of the process that would take a great deal more time and could impede things that Springfield might want to do. She interpreted local control to mean that she did not need to tie herself anymore than necessary to everyone else to have anyone else feel they were locked into what Springfield was doing or have to check in with Springfield. Mr. Shetterly replied that the RPS was a local initiated process and it was entirely a local decision whether to continue. He urged participants to weigh the benefits and burdens of any contract or agreement.

Mr. Van Landingham, from his perspective as a local resident and a commissioner, acknowledged the challenges of working together. He said that while Springfield might wish that Eugene did not exist, he did not see the sense in ignoring its existence and felt it was preferable to participate in the RPS process so that jurisdictions would be aware of what their neighbors were doing. Mr. Shetterly added that any limitations in agreements were mutually applicable.

Mr. Kelly said the critical benefit for the City of Springfield was that agreement on a strategy by the participants only needed to happen once and when the regional strategy had been agreed upon, Springfield could then move forward without the other jurisdictions, including Eugene and Lane County, being able to complain or criticize.

Ms. Lundberg reiterated her concern with the time and effort spent to date and the ongoing resources, particularly staff time, required to develop a preferred growth scenario that was of doubtful benefit if an agreement could not be reached and she was not certain that an agreement could be reached after further work by policy board members and staff. Mr. Van Landingham said that LCDC recognized the challenges of the process and was deferential to regions that were going through RPS. His experience was that postponing things that were difficult only meant they would be harder several years down the road. He said that even without a plan, jurisdictions would impact each other. He gave the example of Cottage Grove being unable to accommodate a growing population but Eugene resisting expanding its UGB until it reached a certain density rate. He said that jurisdictions in the region had to work together to solve problems.

Ms. Heinkel reminded members that the last agenda item would review the remainder of the process and identify where local staff needed to be involved. She noted that the majority of the work had already been accomplished in the last five years of the process.

Mr. Shetterly agreed that the RPS process was not easy and that was not its benefit, but it helped a region to deal with difficult issues to the benefit of all participating jurisdictions.

Mr. Yeiter said that between options A and B he could begin to see benefits from the RPS process. He asked at what level in the process was a regional problem considered to be solved; did it require some detail in a preferred scenario map or could it be conceptual in nature in terms of meeting certain goals. Mr. Hallyburton replied that the options referred only to the governance and not the content of the strategy. He said that a city would only agree to what it would actually implement. Mr. Shetterly replied that nothing in the statute defined a minimum standard for what constituted the regional problem solving exercise. He felt that the problem solving occurred

when all jurisdictions agreed to something, that agreement was approved by LCDC and comprehensive plan amendments were acknowledged.

Mr. Grile asked when administrative rules for the RPS process would be adopted. Mr. Van Landingham replied that LCDC realizes that RPS would benefit from rule making, but it cannot move forward on its 2005-07 work plan until the Measure 37 issue was resolved; realistically it would be at least two years before rules were promulgated.

Mr. Grile asked if it would constitute a Goal 2 violation if a regional strategy was agreed upon and one or more jurisdiction refused or failed to take actions to implement the strategy, resulting in an uncoordinated County plan. Mr. Hallyburton responded that the consequences should be spelled out in the local agreements. Mr. Shetterly said the agreement would include a commitment from each city that it would take actions to implement the regional strategy and would therefore be a contractual obligation and in accordance with ORS 197.656(2)(b)(D) would also include incentives and disincentives to encourage successful implementation by the participants.

Ms. Heinkel acknowledged the difficulty of discussing an agreement in concept only without seeing the actual product. She said if a city was unable to accommodate the growth it had agreed to under the regional strategy, the remedy was no different than what would happen currently in the region under the requirement for coordinated population.

Mr. Shetterly urged participants to trust each other but verify intent by taking the approach of bringing all comprehensive plan amendments to implement the strategy forward as a package.

Mr. Weathers pointed out that the goals to which the policy board had agreed contained compromise language and that participants had different interpretations of those goals. He said that forest management might mean cutting trees to one person and preserving trees to another. He asked how a regional strategy could be agreed upon with if there were different interpretations of its meaning and impact. Mr. Van Landingham replied that the State would decide if a land use action was consistent with statewide planning goals with or without an RPS process.

Mr. Weathers stated that he was supportive of people living outside of UGBs in traditional rural settings. He was concerned with the definition of forest land as high value and the impact that could have on rural homebuilding and felt that it should be permissible to build a home on ten acres of lower value forest land. Mr. Van Landingham replied that the issue could arise if the RPS came forward with a specific proposal to allow the type of development Mr. Weathers had described; it would be the commission's responsibility to decide whether that was consistent with State goals, assuming that participating jurisdictions had agreed to the strategy. He reiterated that the commission was allowed flexibility with the administrative rules under RPS but not with respect to the goals applicable to forest land.

Mr. Fleck said that one of the options for the intergovernmental agreement the group had talked about was a 60-day notice by a jurisdiction to withdraw, but based on the discussion it sounded as

though that could be problematic. He asked if LCDC would accept such an option and what the consequences would be to the rest of the region if Cottage Grove decided in two years to withdraw from the agreement. Mr. Van Landingham said that withdrawal of a jurisdiction before the agreement was approved would be a problem, but the statute did not address withdrawal of a jurisdiction after approval. He said that LCDC would have concerns if a jurisdiction withdrew and proposed comprehensive plan amendments that were not consistent with the regional strategy. Mr. Shetterly added that comprehensive plans would be acknowledged based on the strategy; however, if circumstances changed in the future then review of comprehensive plan amendments would default to consistency with statewide planning goals. He noted the State was not saying that jurisdictions were bound to RPS forever.

Mr. Stewart observed that the individual jurisdiction would not be able to evaluate how they were impacted by a regional strategy until they could see a specific plan. He said that communities needed to be clear about their goals for the future and regional planning was a way to achieve that.

5. Draft Citizen Involvement Report

Ms. Heinkel said the media had been requesting copies of the final report and that she told them she would let them know when the policy board reviewed it. She said she would work with the chair and vice chair on releasing the report to the media after she incorporated feedback from the policy board. She illustrated the regional distribution of citizen involvement on a map. She gave a slide presentation that summarized the draft *Citizen Involvement Report*. She referred to two appendices that contained newspaper articles on the Region 2050 project and written comments submitted in response to the *Design Your Future* survey. She reviewed the outreach strategies and results of the 14 community meetings held throughout the region, including a summary of responses from meeting participants and survey respondents by community.

Ms. Heinkel reported that she had met with almost all of the small cities and in each case the community's preferred growth scenario map was new and represented a hybrid of the growth scenarios based on community meetings and evaluation results. She said that was exactly how the RPS process should work with each community's map consistent with the RPS goals and the framework of the statewide goals. She said that meetings had been scheduled with the remaining small cities. She said it was clear from the process that the preferred growth scenario would be a blend of the three growth scenarios that reflected community preferences. She summarized the general actions to protect quality of life that community participants and respondents agreed upon and noted that most people were familiar with and supported the concept of nodal development. She said that each community had received a very detailed list of comments from participants about how the highest-rated scenario map should be changed. She said that the next steps in the process would be addressed in the following agenda item, including the need for local staff involvement. She asked if any changes were needed to the *Citizen Involvement Report*.

Mr. Fleck noted that Cottage Grove community meeting participants had given high ratings to both the compact urban and satellite communities growth scenarios and should be listed under

both in the Executive Summary of the report, not just under the compact urban growth scenario. Ms. Heinkel asked if the way it was presented in the slide presentation was ok and Mr. Fleck confirmed that it was.

Mr. Kelly asked that the terms “citizen panel” and “general participants” referring to those who attended the community meetings be defined in the Executive Summary.

Mr. Stewart commented that the reactions of community meeting participants and survey respondents indicate that the preferred scenario would be a blend of the three growth scenarios as pointed out in the report.

6. Preferred Growth Scenario – Next Steps

Ms. Heinkel stated that the Regional Technical Advisory Committee (RTAC) asked that the policy board be provided with information about the next steps. She said the community meetings had been concluded and each community was using its report, along with other information, to help guide how the community was portrayed in the preferred growth scenario and what actions should be included in the regional strategy, which would be a compilation of each “Future Community” and “Actions.”

She said that ECONorthwest was preparing a regional trend of industries likely to locate in the region in the next 50 years and other tools that would help identify generally the categories on the preferred growth scenario map. She emphasized that the map was not a comprehensive plan map for zoning or designating specific parcels; but that the map was intended to be used as part of the methodology for calculating the capacity of the land to accommodate growth and that the data outputs from the analysis would be used for the allocation of population. She said some jurisdictions also want the map to show the location of urban reserves so that they can use the findings in the Strategy to demonstrate compliance with Statewide Planning Goals when they amend their comprehensive plans. She said the map would be part of a technical supplement to the comprehensive plans and be part of the technical data. She said LCOG staff were working on the format of the map so that it is general enough so that it will not be construed as a parcel-specific zoning map and she believed they would be able to accomplish this to the satisfaction of the local governments.

Mr. Kelly asked if Ms. Heinkel’s meetings with communities to discuss the preferred growth scenario map included staff and elected officials or only staff. Ms. Heinkel said that it varied by community; for example, in Junction City, she met with staff and the Policy Board member and the Planning Commission Chair. She said that in any event she anticipated that local staff would need policy direction from their local officials before presenting a draft scenario for public input. She said that meetings with Eugene and Springfield officials would be a more involved process than in the small cities.

Mr. Andersson asked if the information was being coordinated with individual community economic opportunities analyses. Ms. Heinkel said that LCOG is contracting with Eco Northwest to complete an Economic Opportunities Analysis of the Preferred Growth Scenario concept so that the information can be used to make findings of compliance with Goal 9 in the Strategy.

Ms. Heinkel reviewed the list of steps remaining to develop the preferred growth scenario and said those tasks with an asterisk would require the involvement of local staff:

- Review and modify development type and constraint assumptions in land capacity analysis model*
- Identify preliminary development types in UGB and urban reserves*
- Run land capacity analysis model to estimate population and employment; trend from 2000 to 2050
- Run housing needs analysis model to estimate housing needs (Statewide Goal 10)
- Perform economic opportunities analysis (ECONorthwest) (Statewide Goal 9)
- Make adjustments to map*
- Re-run land capacity analysis model, trend from 2000-2050
- Create draft preferred growth scenario map (AKA land capacity analysis map – February 2006)
- Evaluate preferred scenario based on alternative scenarios evaluation results and reconvene farm and forest committee (Statewide Goals 3, 4, 11 and 12)
- Identify actions to include in strategy*
- Conduct public outreach*
- Create draft regional growth management strategy* - June 2006, including findings of goal compliance

Mr. Weathers asked if affordability of housing would be a factor in the housing needs analysis. Ms. Heinkel replied that income was included in the model.

Mr. Kelly asked where elected officials and the public would be included in the process for Springfield and Eugene. Ms. Heinkel said the RTAC had discussed that any preliminary information would be presented to the policy board and after February 2006 presented to the planning commissions and elected officials.

Mr. Kelly pointed out that the Eugene City Council's agendas were being filled now for the early part of 2006.

Mr. Yeiter pointed out that Region 2050 activities were not on the Eugene planning staff's work plan and expressed concern that the map would need to be reviewed by the public.

Mr. Fleck asked at what point in the process the policy board would decide whether it would pursue Option A or Option B. He said it appeared there were some assumptions that it would be Option B but a specific decision should be made by the policy board. Ms. Heinkel suggested that

decision could be made after completion of staff work and before the strategy and agreement were presented to elected officials.

In response to a question from Ms. Lundberg, Ms. Heinkel listed the work tasks associated with the intergovernmental agreement and adoption process:

- Agree on form for the intergovernmental agreement (IGA)*
- Work with DLCD and other state agencies on legal structure for IGA and strategy
- Prepare draft IGA, revise based on feedback from RTAC and policy board*
- Present draft strategy and IGA to local planning commissions and elected officials*

Ms. Lundberg said that the policy board did not have a list of what might be in the preferred growth scenario and the policy board would have to reach agreement on what those elements were before a strategy could be developed. Ms. Heinkel said that in order to move forward it would be necessary to meet with local staff to determine which elements were appropriate from the community's perspective.

Mr. Kelly agreed with Ms. Lundberg that the policy board should review a list of components and discuss what should be in a regional strategy, such as urban reserves and UGB expansion triggers.

Ms. Ban suggested that the board could be provided an illustrative list, not exhaustive list of components.

Mr. Stewart suggested that communities could be given a list of components that could be in the strategy and then indicate which were important to them.

Mr. Fortune remarked that the challenge of the process was within each individual community to determine what it wanted from the process and from his perspective he was not interested in controlling what other communities did.

Mr. Fleck said that one community's actions did impact other communities and it was necessary to work together regionally to meet statewide goals.

Ms. Lundberg reiterated her concern with the use of Springfield staff resources and the amount of time required to develop a preferred growth scenario. Ms. Heinkel replied that to get to the next product she wanted local staff to review the assumptions used for the constrained lands and the development types. She said she has already sent those out for review and has received some comments from the staff of the small cities. She noted that the assumptions used for modeling employment and residential land were consistent with TransPlan and the metropolitan residential lands and industrial and commercial lands studies for the metro area, which should make staff's job in Eugene and Springfield easier.

Mr. Fleck agreed that the elected officials needed to evaluate whether the preferred growth scenario and regional strategy truly represented community interests, saying that he questioned

whether the 46 community meeting participants actually represented the desires of Cottage Grove's 9,000 residents.

Ms. Heinkel suggested that staff proceed with a first land capacity analysis model run assuming the compact model for Eugene and Springfield to save local staff time and provide something for consideration. Mr. Kelly said he would like the comments from the Eugene Community Meeting also considered in the first draft.

Ms. Lundberg said the question still remained at what point the policy board would decide on the components to be included in the strategy.

Mr. Yeiter recommended that a land capacity analysis map be generalized as he was not comfortable with addressing densities in specific neighborhoods without policy direction from elected officials. Ms. Heinkel agreed with the recommendation.

Mr. Weathers commented that the capacity analysis was based on value judgments. Ms. Heinkel said that the assumptions were different for each community and she had sent those assumptions to staff who would consult with elected officials on what assumptions should be in the first run of the model.

Ms. Heinkel indicated that if Eugene and Springfield were comfortable moving forward with the current assumptions, their staff did not need to take any action, but she needed to know what to include in the first model run.

Mr. Grile pointed out that the policy board had indicated last month it would proceed with Option B if it was satisfied with the answers from DLCD and LCDC but he had not heard that discussion or decision.

Mr. Stewart stated that the discussion and decision about how to proceed could occur at the next policy board meeting. Ms. Heinkel noted that the next meeting was scheduled for February 2006.

Mr. Kelly said he would be interested in the RTAC's reaction to Mr. Shetterly's responses. Ms. Heinkel offered that she would email RTAC responses to the policy board and try to schedule a policy board meeting in January 2006.

Ms. Lundberg said it was necessary to have a discussion of the options but she could be satisfied with Option A and a product that could be used as a tool for planning, such as the Rivers to Ridges plan. Ms. Heinkel pointed out that such a tool was not available at this time; that all that existed up to this point were alternative scenario maps; and those maps, in their current form, would not produce population or employment data. She offered that the next step was necessary to obtain these model results.

Mr. Stewart said that it would be possible to generate a product by using as a starting point the public input to date if that was what was necessary for the policy board to see if there were any benefits to the RPS process.

Ms. Heinkel asked if that was acceptable to the policy board. No policy board members objected. She said she would schedule an RTAC meeting in December, run the model based on Mr. Stewart's suggestion, and try to schedule a policy board meeting in January for presentation to the board at its next meeting.

7. Adjourn

Mr. Stewart adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)