



REGION 2050

Sustaining Quality of Life in the Southern Willamette Valley

April 18, 2006

TO: Regional Policy Advisory Board Members and Alternates

FROM: Regional Technical Advisory Committee (RTAC)

SUBJECT: April 26, 2006 Meeting Agenda Item Summary

This memo provides a brief summary of the agenda items to be covered in the April 26, 2006 Regional Policy Advisory Board meeting. For questions or additional information, please contact the Regional Technical Advisory Committee (RTAC) member from your community or call Carol Heinkel, 682-4107.

Please review the attached materials prior to the meeting.

Meeting Purpose

This meeting is for Policy Board members and alternates to have an open, frank discussion about the commitment of their jurisdiction to the process for endorsing and implementing the Regional Growth Management Strategy and their desired outcomes. The Policy Board will review the revised draft Regional Growth Concept and coordinated population allocations, and review and comment on the wastewater evaluation for Goshen, Pleasant Hill, and Alvadore, and the Regional Economic Opportunities Analysis; and approve the next steps.

Agenda Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Meeting participants will be introduced and welcomed at the start of the meeting.

Public Comment

Five minutes is allotted on each agenda to allow members of the public to make brief presentations and/or to distribute written materials to the Policy Advisory Board. No written comments were submitted for inclusion in this packet.

Revised Draft Regional Growth Concept and Coordinated Population Allocations

At its February 22, 2006 meeting, the Policy Board reviewed a preliminary draft of the Regional Growth Concept, including the generalized map of Potential Future Growth Areas; population, employment, and UGB acre tables; coordinated population allocation tables; and development type mix bar charts. Most of the Policy Board members determined the need to bring these materials back to their respective planning commissions and or city councils for review and potential revisions. In March, the cities of Springfield and Cottage Grove took formal action to withdraw from the process. As of this writing, the remaining cities and Lane County are continuing their involvement. Most of the remaining cities held meetings in March and April and requested changes to the Draft Concept.

Almost all of the requested changes have been incorporated into the attached revised Draft Regional Growth Concept map and tables. Changes made to date include: reducing projected residential densities and population in Coburg by removing most of the farm land that was previously part of the growth areas; revising some of the employment development type assumptions in Veneta; adjusting the growth area in Lowell; making minor adjustments to development types in Junction City; removing Springfield, Cottage Grove, and Alvadore from the capacity model. **Additional changes are anticipated; updated tables and map with all adjustments will be brought to the meeting.**

As shown in the table, *Preliminary Draft Revised Coordinated Population Allocations, DRAFT 4/18/06*, and other tables attached to the Draft Regional Growth Concept, the revised Concept continues to be compatible with total regional population projections derived from forecasted population projections prepared by the state Office of Economic Analysis (OEA), thus meeting the requirements of ORS 195.036.¹ The draft Regional Growth Concept may be further refined based on input from the public and findings from the evaluations; and the Draft Coordinated Population Allocations are subject to agreement among all local governments, including those not participating in the Regional Growth Management Strategy.

The Concept was developed using the Land Capacity Model approved by the RTAC on September 29, 2005. The model methodology and assumptions were developed by LCOG and the RTAC and were reviewed by ECONorthwest. Feedback was incorporated prior to using the model to generate the population, employment, and acreage figures shown in the Draft Regional Growth Concept. The growth footprints and development type assumptions in the Concept were developed with input from the 14 Community Meeting Reports, information generated from the evaluations of alternative growth scenarios, the RTAC and, in some jurisdictions, local elected and/or appointed officials. The rural community wastewater evaluation and Regional Economic Opportunities Analysis will be presented at the April 26 Policy Board meeting;

¹ The year 2055 is used in the analysis in order for the Potential Future Growth Areas to contain the intended 50-year planning horizon.

additional evaluations will be presented in May, including the results of the Regional Housing Needs Analysis (see “Next Steps,” below).

Proposed Process for Endorsement and Implementation of Regional Growth Management Strategy

At the meeting, Policy Board Chair Commissioner Stewart and LCOG Assistant Director Byron Vanderpool will lead a discussion with Board members about the proposed process for accomplishing the work remaining to be done in the project and the local commitment for concluding work on the Regional Strategy and implementation measures. One key aspect of this discussion is assurances from DLCD that the outcomes desired by the participants are still achievable with the revised process. For several years, the Region 2050 participants sought the use of an innovative process in state law known as Collaborative Regional Problem Solving (RPS). This process was recommended by the RTAC as a tool for streamlining endorsement and implementation of the Regional Growth Management Strategy. The RPS process was believed to provide a host of benefits, in particular the ability for the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) to “sign off” on intended land use measures to implement the Strategy by adopting the Strategy’s findings of compliance with statewide planning goals; and, if needed, the ability for LCDC to approve measures which may not conform to the letter of administrative rules, provided they complied with the statewide planning goals.

One of the drawbacks of RPS is the requirement for 100% participation. The withdrawal of two cities from the Region 2050 process necessitated a transition from use of the Regional Problem Solving (RPS) statute to use of a coordinated regional approach under existing state administrative rules. In order to ensure that all or most of the desired outcomes from the Regional Strategy can be achieved under existing state law and administrative rules, Policy Board Chair Commissioner Stewart sent a letter to DLCD Director Lane Shetterly requesting verification that the Strategy can move forward under a non-RPS legal framework. The letter and the supporting documentation of the legal framework are attached. DLCD staff have agreed to provide the requested written response prior to or at the time of the April 26th Policy Board meeting. The materials and legal analysis contained in the attached letter and discussion matrix were prepared based on preliminary discussions with Director Shetterly and DLCD staff on April 10, 2006.

As stated in the attached letter from Mr. Stewart, the assumed net impact of the transition from RPS to a regional planning framework in state law and administrative rules is that all of the “Desired Outcomes” and “Implementation Measures” for land use except Desired Outcomes #8, #11, and, possibly #10, in the matrix, *Regional Growth Management Strategy Process Discussion Paper*, Draft April 17, 2006 can be accomplished under existing state law and administrative rules.

Based on preliminary analyses and discussions with DLCD, it would appear that all of the Desired Outcomes for the urban areas can be achieved under regional planning provisions of existing state law and rules, where the specific land use measures can be

demonstrated to meet the criteria; and at least some rural concerns are particularly well suited to the RPS process and may not be achievable without RPS. One alternative approach would be to use the data already generated in Region 2050 and apply it to small, focused RPS projects which are recommended for Desired Outcomes #8, “to allow more rural residential development on farm- and forest-zoned land that is found to be unsuitable for these uses;” and #11, “to create more opportunities for local food production for local food consumption and small-scale, subsistence farming, and create buffers between urban areas and large-scale commercial farming activities.”

The letter also requests that DLCD address the questions and issues raised by City of Eugene staff and officials, and those presented by Lane County Land Management staff related to the legal framework for the three rural communities proposed for increased densities in the draft Concept. Specifically, DLCD is asked the questions “what, if any, administrative rules would require an exception(s) to statewide planning goals for the development type assumptions shown in the Draft Regional Growth Concept for Goshen, Pleasant Hill, and Alvadore?” and “If exceptions are not required, what procedures would the County need to follow to rezone these areas consistent with the Draft Concept?” The materials presented in the attached Regional Growth Concept revert Alvadore back to existing Lane County zoning because, based on the preliminary analysis of Lane County staff and confirmed by DLCD, that concept did not appear to be allowed under existing rules.

Wastewater Evaluation: Pleasant Hill, Goshen, and Alvadore

The attached memorandum from the Department of Environmental Quality summarizes findings of this analysis, and offers recommendations concerning the potential use of community wastewater systems in Goshen and Pleasant Hill, where higher-density development is proposed in the Draft Regional Growth Concept.

Regional Economic Opportunities Analysis

The attached report by David Helton, ECONorthwest, provides the analysis required by state law for cities to determine the demand for industrial and commercial lands in order to meet the requirements of Statewide Planning Goal 9. When final, this information will be available for cities to use as part of their buildable lands analyses. At the meeting, David will give a presentation on this report and be available for questions and discussion.

Next Steps

An outline of the next steps were presented to the Policy Board at the February 22 meeting. The outline below presents potential modifications and is subject to discussion and approval by the Policy Board on April 26. Note that state-local coordination is anticipated to occur throughout the process set out below.

April 2006 Policy Board Meeting

Review Revised Regional Growth Concept and Revised Process for Strategy Endorsement and Implementation and results of Regional Growth Concept Evaluations.

- Revised Coordinated Population Allocations
- Rural Community Wastewater Evaluation by DEQ
- Regional Economic Opportunities Analysis (Demand for Industrial and Commercial lands in UGBs. To be used for demand-side of findings of compliance with Statewide Planning Goal 9)

May 2006 Policy Board Meeting

- Environmental Evaluation: LCOG
- Housing Needs Analysis: LCOG and Oregon Housing and Community Services
- Regional Capacity Analysis: Residential and Employment Lands (For findings of compliance with Statewide Planning Goals 9 and 10)

June 2006 Policy Board Meeting

- Transportation Modeling Results
- State Agency Coordination (ODOT, DEQ, Water Resources) and agreement

July through September 2006

- Public comment period
- Funding sought for implementation and monitoring program

October 2006 Policy Board Meeting (Final Meeting)

Review revised Regional Growth Management Strategy and recommend endorsement.

October through December 2006

Request endorsement of Regional Growth Management Strategy by city councils, County Board, and state agencies.

January 2007

Begin implementation and monitoring program.