

MINUTES

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

February 9, 2005
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Dwight Coon, Chair (Junction City); Mike Watson (Coburg), Mike Fleck (Cottage Grove), Tim Demanett (Creswell), David Kelly (Eugene), Faye Stewart (Lane County), Warren Weathers (Lowell), Glenn Fortune (Oakridge), Christine Lundberg (Springfield), Marion Esty (Veneta), Neil Friedman (Westfir), Susan Ban (Lane Transit District), Marguerite Nabeta (Department of Land Conservation and Development) for Erik Andersson, members; Carol Heinkel, Byron Vanderpool, George Kloeppel, Tom Schwetz, Jamon Kent, Lane Council of Governments staff.

ABSENT: Judy Volta (Coburg), Matt Bjorn (Cottage Grove), Ron Hanson (Creswell), Kitty Piercy (Eugene), Barry Schweigert (Junction City); Peter Sorenson (Lane County), Sue Bond (Oakridge), Fred Miller (Veneta), Erik Andersson, Gabrielle Schiffer (Governor's Economic Revitalization Team).

GUESTS: Stephanie Schulz (Lane County Planning), Stefano Viggiano (Lane Transit District), Greg Mott (City of Springfield Planning Manager), Eleanor Mulder, Janet Calvert, Barbara Newman, (League of Women Voters), Deb Brewer (EWEB), Carlos Barrera, Rob Castleberry, (Goshen Area Neighborhood Association).

1. Welcome and Introductions: Recognition of Outgoing Members and Introduction of New Members

Mr. Coon convened the meeting. He expressed the group's appreciation to outgoing Lane County Commissioner and former Regional Policy Advisory Board chair, Don Hampton for his contributions to the Region 2050 project and welcomed new Lane County Commissioner Faye Stewart and Creswell City Councilor Tim Demanett.

Those present introduced themselves.

2. November 29, 2004, Meeting Minutes

Mr. Weathers, seconded by Mr. Fleck, moved to approve the minutes of the November 29, 2004, meeting as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Public Comment

There was no one wishing to speak.

4. Appointment of New Chair and Vice Chair

Mr. Vanderpool facilitated the appointment of officers. He asked if Mr. Coon, currently vice chair, was willing to serve as chair. Mr. Coon indicated he was.

Mr. Weathers, seconded by Ms. Ban, nominated Mr. Coon as chair. There being no other nominations, Mr. Coon was unanimously elected chair.

Mr. Weathers, seconded by Mr. Fleck, nominated Mr. Stewart as vice chair. There being no other nominations, Mr. Stewart was unanimously elected vice chair.

Mr. Coon moved the agenda item related to the Farm and Forest Resource Lands Committee ahead of the item related to transportation without objection.

5. Farm and Forest Resource Lands Committee

Stephanie Schulz, Lane County Land Management Division Planner, reported that staff had requested the Lane County Board of Commissioners to appoint a Farm and Forest Resource Lands Committee to provide technical expertise in these topic areas for the Region 2050 process and the Board of County Commissioners had directed staff to develop the concept and provide greater detail regarding the committee's purpose, function, and relationship to the Board and the Region 2050 project. She distributed a committee vacancy notice that was the recruitment notice for the Region 2050 Farm and Forest Committee Task Force and a copy of the application form. She said that the Board would review application packets and make appointments to the committee. She said there was particular interest in recruiting members from the private sector and asked for referrals of potential members. She indicated that the committee would meet twice in the spring of 2005 to review the three growth scenarios and again to review the resource impacts of the preferred scenario; the committee would be dissolved once its work was completed.

In response to a question from Mr. Stewart, Ms. Schulz said she would be contacting four individuals who were recommended for membership now that the application packets were available.

Mr. Kelly referred to an earlier discussion that the committee's expertise might also be used to define some of the terms used to evaluate the scenarios. Ms. Schulz agreed that was a good use of the committee.

Ms. Nabeta agreed that the committee would need to identify the commercial base as per statute requirement to address elements of agriculture and forest industries to respond to the scenarios and final solutions.

Mr. Weathers pointed out that the definitions used to assess scenarios impact on farm and forest lands could differ depending on the discipline. He urged that definitions should be based on what best represented the view of citizens and should not establish such a low threshold that everything was protected. He said the committee could help to identify economic reality.

Ms. Schulz said the county commissioners had expressed initial concern that the committee composition was too agency-heavy. She again encouraged members to refer any interested applicants and said that

committee vacancies would be advertised for 30 days. She said that the Board of County Commissioners would then review all of the applications and make appointments to the committee, which would meet in April 2005 to review the growth scenarios and again in the spring of 2006 to review the preferred alternative analysis. Mr. Coon said that he thought the committee membership looked good as far as the agriculture industry; that he was familiar with the names in the agricultural community and that they were good people to have on it.

6. Transportation Facilities and Services: Alternative Regional Growth Scenarios Evaluation

Tom Schwetz, Lane Council of Governments transportation planner, provided a framework for thinking about transportation options as applied to the three growth scenarios. He said that characteristics of a regional transportation system included a variety of modes of travel operated by multiple jurisdictions with impacts and interrelationships with the environment, economy, and land use. He indicated that policy choices related to system regulation and improvement included air quality and speed regulation, design standards, and prioritization of improvements. He said in planning for transportation it was likely that at least one major technological or behavioral shift would be overlooked.

According to Mr. Schwetz, accessibility was a distinguishing, infinitely scalable feature of a transportation system and he used examples to define the concept at the neighborhood and regional levels. He noted that from a commercial standpoint accessibility also included freight.

Mr. Weathers observed that accessibility to goods and services for rural residents should be characterized as “want” instead of “need” as typically people choose to live close to those things that were important to them.

Mr. Kelly commented that a transportation system also had to balance other things beside accessibility such as environmental and financial factors.

Mr. Schwetz illustrated the evaluation framework by using a focal issue such as increasing accessibility in the Region 2050 study area and demonstrating how that was influenced by key factors, policy variables, and driving forces. He used 1990 census data to show the percentage of small city residents who commuted to jobs in the Eugene-Springfield area and the percentage of Eugene-Springfield residents who commuted to jobs in small cities. He stated that 2000 census data had not been released yet.

In response to a question from Mr. Stewart, Mr. Schwetz said he expected to see shifts in inter-city travel patterns with the 2000 data because of changes in the local economy due to mill closure and other factors. He said that somewhat more recent information from the 1994 household activity survey and from the State could be used in the modeling. He listed alternative transportation solution packages that could be fit to alternate growth scenarios at appropriate:

- Roadway capacity options
- Virtual accessibility options
- Bicycle and pedestrians options
- Transit system options
- Mobility technologies
- Transportation demand management options

Mr. Schwetz suggested a system approach that would provide flexibility to meet any of the three alternatives and could move forward incrementally to match investments to what was actually happening on the ground.

Mr. Coon asked if transportation planning would take into account that many jobs in the region were resource-based and generated support businesses. Mr. Schwetz and that forecasts by development type were addressed in the model, but it was difficult to predict changes in a 50-year timeframe. Mr. Coon replied that the geography of the region was unlikely to change much over that period of time and there would continue to be resource-based jobs and related businesses. Ms. Heinkel responded that actual employment projections developed by the State for counties considered those factors and staff had allocated the state projection in development types on GIS maps in the different scenarios.

Mr. Kloeppe commented that while it was wise to stress maximum flexibility in assessing the transportation component of the alternatives, over-designing the system should be avoided. Mr. Schwetz responded that his point was to think more broadly in terms of moving forward with investment strategies that did not foreclose on future alternatives that might be reasonable. He briefly reviewed the steps in the evaluation process and discussed the travel forecasting model. He said the model was a systematic process for translating forecasts of population, land use, transportation, supply and travel costs into estimates of future travel demand. He used charts to illustrate the modeling flow and characteristics that influenced traveler choices.

Mr. Weathers said that the census data could provide information on household ages. Mr. Schwetz agreed that the model did not capture age as a factor to the extent he would like to see.

Ms. Ban asked if the model would consider pockets of retirees in looking at travel patterns and choices. Mr. Schwetz said that overlays would account for population concentrations.

Mr. Kelly asked if Region 2050 could be the engine for obtaining updated household survey data. Mr. Schwetz said that an effort would begin in early 2006 to update the household activity survey and could include a panel survey that was an ongoing survey of the travel of a group of people in the community. He said that the categories of performance measures had been defined and specific measures would be developed in each category to capture as comprehensively as possible all of the potential benefits, costs, and impacts that the transportation system could generate. He noted that models should be used as tools to provide insight for policy direction; they were decision-aiding, not decision-making.

Mr. Weathers asked if the model measured or placed value on use of a personal vehicle for travel not related to employment as compared to rapid transit. Mr. Schwetz replied that the model captured the average of household trips by mode and that density would be a factor in determining whether a rapid transit system would work.

Mr. Weathers expressed concern that a rural growth scenario would be discounted because it could not support a rapid transit system.

Mr. Stewart asked if the model would factor in people who worked at home and the impact of school-related trips. Mr. Schwetz said that the state had models that would help with some of that data.

Mr. Fleck commented that people would not be willing to give up their automobiles and while he was in favor of promoting alternate transportation modes, it was important to also discuss improvements to the infrastructure and plan for personal vehicle use.

Mr. Kelly pointed out that automobile use could change if the price of fuel dramatically increased or population growth created serious congestion. He asked if the model would project traffic patterns and potential congestion in areas within the metro area. Mr. Schwetz said that congestion maps would be produced.

Mr. Demanett said that he commuted several time a week to Portland and the funds that were spent on mass transit in the Portland area would have been better spent on adding to roadway capacity to avoid congestion. He said people would continue to prefer the independence of personal vehicles. Mr. Schwetz reiterated that the model would not assume a policy position, only provide information for the group to use.

Mr. Coon asked if the model would consider the addition of new bridges. Mr. Schwetz that new connections could be explored.

7. Region 2050 Goals, Process, and Ground Rules

Collaborative Regional Problem Solving Program

Mr. Vanderpool reviewed, particularly for new members of the group, the decision-making framework that had been established at the beginning of the Region 2050 process. He said it was the role of staff to collect and analyze data and provide information to help inform the policy board's decision-making.

Ms. Nabeta, speaking in her role as the Southern Willamette Valley regional representative from the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCDC), reported that representatives from the Region 2050 policy board had made a presentation to the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC). She said the commission was impressed with the sustained, voluntary, collaborative approach to regional planning and looked to the Region 2050 project to provide a model methodology that could be used elsewhere to get to the intent and purpose of the State's land use program. She said that DLCDC was particularly interested in Region 2050 because it is using knowledge-based decision-making and gathering viable citizen input and shows willingness of partners to take risks and work through issues in order to make decisions that would be available for implementation by all participating communities.

Ms. Nabeta, responding to a question from Ms. Lundberg, noted that state agencies working with cities recently to get industrial sites ready for development are finding several common factors: the sites do not have needed wastewater, water, and transportation either in place or planned for; the sites are not annexed and do not have wetland issues on sites resolved. This impedes the ability to move quickly when economic development opportunity occurs. Region 2050, by defining issues such as regional transportation system, needed workforce capabilities, capital improvement programs, and other tools for infrastructure development will put this Region ahead in competing for industry location, growing industries and lobbying for Congressional funding.

Ms. Heinkel noted that Region 2050, as a regional problem solving initiative, might develop solutions that did not adhere strictly to administrative rules and that the Commission did not express objections to several

actions in the scenarios that would not adhere to the rules but would be consistent with the intent of the statewide planning goals.

Ms. Nabeta said that Region 2050 staff would have to provide findings that show how a solution met the intent of statewide planning goals if it did not comply with administrative rules. She also stressed the successful completion of development of viable solutions is very dependent on leadership provided by the Policy Advisory Board.

Mr. Coon observed that a one-size solution would not fit all issues and LCDC had seemed sensitive to the fact that a solution might meet the intent if not strictly comply with administrative rules during the Region 2050 presentation. He said LCDC's reaction to the presentation was very receptive.

Regional Policy Advisory Board Role and Ground Rules

Mr. Vanderpool reviewed the role of the policy board and reminded members that they were liaisons between the Region 2050 project and their respective communities. He drew members' attention to the ground rules and decision-making process that was agreed upon at the beginning of the Region 2050 process. He said there were two types of decisions: decisions to amend the ground rules, and all other decisions. He reviewed the consensus-building approach to making decisions, which fell somewhere between majority rule and a single vote being able to stop the process.

Ms. Lundberg asked if the final product of the Region 2050 process would have the effect of law, such as the TransPlan, or provide guidance such as a parks and open space comprehensive plan might. Ms. Heinkel replied that currently urban growth boundary expansion was based strictly on past trends; the 2050 process would allow communities to look at different growth patterns within a regional collaborative process plan for urbanization of a community beyond a 20-year period. She said the format of the document was an intergovernmental agreement among participating jurisdictions and a community agreed to take certain actions to implement the plan when it signed the agreement. She said that it would streamline the process for communities by eliminating the need for further exceptions to statewide planning goals for actions that were consistent with regional strategy.

Mr. Weathers asked if there was a mechanism for mid-course changes. Ms. Heinkel said that the process for amending the agreement would be built into the agreement. Ms. Nabeta said the statute required that there be a process for monitoring implementation and making changes. Mr. Vanderpool added that nothing in the agreement would usurp the authority of the governing bodies.

Mr. Stewart asked if land use organizations such as 1000 Friends of Oregon had been involved in Region 2050. Ms. Heinkel said that the public outreach process would solicit the input of many groups throughout the region and that those groups had been sent materials on Region 2050 throughout the process. She said the town hall meetings scheduled as part of the public outreach process would offer an opportunity to identify any concerns those groups might have.

Regional Goals and Objectives

Mr. Vanderpool noted that the goals and objectives developed by the policy board had been included in the agenda packet materials.

Ms. Heinkel said that evaluation criteria were based on the goals and objectives, which were unanimously approved by the policy board and would establish the 2050 policy framework. She said the goals and objectives had been presented to each city council and planning commission throughout the region and no concerns or objections were raised.

8. Project Updates

Ms. Heinkel stated that a revised education evaluation would be presented at the March 2005 meeting, along with the water and wastewater evaluations. She said that the April meeting would include a presentation by an economist on the economic evaluation; the farm and forest and fire evaluations would also be presented. She was not certain that the transportation evaluation would be completed prior to commencement of the public outreach process.

Mr. Kelly suggested that the outreach process schedule should be delayed for two months in order to assure that complete work products were available to the public.

Mr. Fleck said he was concerned that further delays could create a backlash.

Mr. Stewart commented that none of the three scenarios was likely to be the preferred scenario and thought the public process could go forward.

Ms. Esty commented that the concerns of the citizens of Veneta would relate to growth and that it was not necessary to have the evaluations all complete prior to meeting with them.

Mr. Kelly said he understood the need for the project to move forward and urged that the public outreach process provide as much of a framework as possible for communities to understand the scenarios.

9. Future Meeting Dates/Adjourn

Ms. Heinkel said that the March and April 2005 meetings would have long agendas. Mr. Kelley offered that the meetings be noticed to run longer and that the members would be prepared for longer meetings those nights. Ms. Heinkel listed the 2005 meeting schedule and noted that all meetings would begin at 5:30 p.m. Meeting dates were:

Thursday, March 24
Wednesday, April 27
Wednesday, June 22
Wednesday, September 28
Wednesday, October 26
Wednesday, November 16

Mr. Coon adjourned the meeting at 7:50 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)

M:\2005\Lane Council of Governments\Region 2050\region2050 050209.doc