

# MINUTES

Region 2050 Advisory Policy Board  
EWEB Training Center, 500 East 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene

March 24, 2005  
5:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Dwight Coon, Chair (Junction City); Faye Stewart, Vice Chair (Lane County), Mike Watson (Coburg), Mike Fleck (Cottage Grove), David Kelly (Eugene), Warren Weathers (Lowell), Glenn Fortune (Oakridge), Christine Lundberg (Springfield), Neil Friedman (Westfir), members; Carol Heinkel, Byron Vanderpool, George Kloeppel (Lane Council of Governments staff).

**ABSENT:** Judy Volta, (Coburg), Matt Bjorn (Cottage Grove), Ron Hanson, Tim Demanett (Creswell), Kitty Piercy (Eugene), Barry Schweigert (Junction City); Peter Sorenson (Lane County), Ken Larson (Lowell), Sue Bond (Oakridge), Marion Esty, Fred Miller (Veneta), Susan Ban (Lane Transit District), Erik Andersson (Governor's Economic Revitalization Team).

**GUESTS:** Rob Hallyburton (Department of Land Conservation and Development), Stephanie Schulz (Lane County Planning), Anita Yap (Lane Transit District), Bill Grile, Greg Mott (City of Springfield Planning), Janet Calvert (League of Women Voters), Deb Brewer, (Eugene Water & Electric Board), Lauri Segal (1,000 Friends of Oregon), Terry Connelly (Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce), Roxie Cuellar (Lane County Homebuilders Association), Mona Lindstromberg (Land Watch).

## **1. Welcome and Introductions**

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

## **2. November 16, 2005, Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Stewart, seconded by Mr. Fortune, moved to approve the minutes of the November 16, 2005, meeting as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

## **3. Appointment of Chair and Vice Chair**

Mr. Stewart and Mr. Coon indicated willingness to continue in office, with Mr. Coon suggesting that Mr. Stewart assume the chair. There was unanimous support for the nominations, and Mr. Stewart was elected to be chair of the advisory board and Mr. Coon was elected vice chair.

Mr. Stewart assumed the chair.

#### 4. Public Comment

Mona Lindstromberg, 87140 Territorial Road, Veneta, asserted there was a “huge disconnect” between what she heard at the community meetings and the “tone of the topics of conversation” at the advisory board. She had been energized by the community meetings and the passion of those attending, and gratified by the citizen involvement. She asserted that the citizen involvement was now being used to lend credence to the outcome of the Region 2050 process, which she termed a vision with no integrity. Ms. Lindstromberg found the discussion of new growth areas in Veneta fascinating, particularly in light of the concerns residents had about Veneta’s ability to support the new growth areas with infrastructure and concerns about wetlands which are now included in the growth areas but were not part of any of the scenarios. Its projections for sanitary system capacity had already been overwhelmed by incredibly rapid growth in the area. She found the lack of attention to those concerns disturbing, and asked when people would be given an opportunity to comment on the real direction the Region 2050 project was taking.

#### 5. Draft Regional Growth Concept

Ms. Heinkel provided a PowerPoint presentation on the agenda item, noting that the RTAC recommended that the Preferred Growth Scenario be renamed the Regional Growth Concept. She reviewed the recommendation of the RTAC related to the Regional Growth Concept, which was for the board to review and comment on the concept and approve the concept for further evaluation. She emphasized the board was not taking final action as the concept would be further evaluated and revised. After the board’s May review, the draft concept would taken to the elected officials and the public for further input; a revised draft would be presented to the board in October 2006.

Ms. Heinkel identified the Regional Growth Concept as an optional, voluntary path to meeting statewide planning goals. It was based on land capacity and community visions, rather than on a projection of historic trends, and served as a growth footprint to guide infrastructure investment. The concept was not a regional plan, a property-specific land use map, a comprehensive plan, or a comprehensive plan map. The concept identified potential future growth areas, population and housing density targets and coordinated population allocations, employment targets, and development type targets. She called attention to a map illustrating the Regional Growth Concept and identifying potential growth areas in yellow. Ms. Heinkel noted that Alvadore, Goshen, and Pleasant Hill were 100 percent exception lands and no exceptions to statewide goals were necessary.

Ms. Heinkel briefly noted the criteria for including land in potential growth areas.

Ms. Heinkel called the board’s attention to a table entitled *Acres in Current UGBs and 2055 UGBs with Potential Future Growth Areas in Regional Growth Concept, Draft 2/24/06*. She reported that, under the scenario, Eugene’s urban growth boundary (UGB) would expand the least (10 percent), while Creswell would expand the most (214 percent).

Ms. Heinkel reported that under the concept, population and densities in all cities increase, except housing densities in Junction City. Growth area densities were higher than UGBs in Eugene, Coburg, Lowell, and Veneta, lower than UGBs in Springfield, Junction City, and Oakridge, and about the same as UGBs in Cottage Grove and Veneta.

Mr. Kelly noted growth projections for the Lane Community College basin, which he believed was too physically constrained to accommodate the projections. Ms. Heinkel said that physical constraints were

taken into consideration in the projections; she attributed the projections to the basin's location near I-5 and its proximity to Eugene.

Ms. Heinkel contrasted the Regional Growth Concept population targets to historic trends, noting that the concept targets were higher than forecasted historic populations for all cities except Eugene and Junction City. The greatest percent differences were seen in Creswell, Lowell, Oakridge, and Veneta. Eugene's population in 2055 was almost 50,000 less in the concept than in forecasted historic trends. Ms. Heinkel said that when added together, the concept targets equaled the State's historic trend projection.

Mr. Fleck said that it appeared the process had skipped a step. The allocations indicated the board had adopted a satellite growth scenario and he did not recall it taking such an action. Ms. Heinkel explained the methodology used by staff, saying that the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) had worked extensively with each community to establish the allocations. That process was different for each city. In some cases, the outcome looked a great deal like a satellite growth scenario; in the case of Eugene and Springfield, it reflected the compact growth scenario, except that in Eugene, the population was nearly 50,000 less than assumed historic trends. Ms. Heinkel termed that an extremely significant finding. Mr. Fleck did not support the allocations being proposed and did not think that other participants from Cottage Grove would either. He said that the allocations appeared to be based on a small level of community input that his city council had not seen.

Mr. Kelly agreed that the board had not decided on a general direction, and the concept represented the next step. Assuming that one of the main drivers of the allocations was input from the community meetings, Mr. Kelly asked how it was possible the allocations came out as they did for Cottage Grove. Mr. Fleck responded that Cottage Grove staff had provided the data used by LCOG. However, he reiterated his concerns that the participants at the community meeting held in Cottage Grove had largely been opposed to two new developments and they were unlikely to support additional growth.

Addressing Mr. Fleck's concerns, Ms. Heinkel suggested that Mr. Fleck and other concerned board members work with their staffs and elected and appointed officials to ensure they were comfortable with what was being proposed in the Draft Concept. She said the RTAC did not expect the board to "rubber stamp" the proposal and if more discussion and input by the communities was needed prior to the evaluations, that she agreed that should occur. She pointed out that the next step was the evaluation of the concept, which was time consuming, and she did not want to go through the evaluation with something that the communities could not support. She noted that Cottage Grove staff had reviewed the input received at the community meeting and had to make a difficult judgment as to whether it was weighted toward the compact growth scenario or satellite growth scenario.

Ms. Lundberg concurred with the concerns expressed by Mr. Fleck. She said the population allocation was redistributed without any review by the Springfield Planning Commission or City Council. She reported that a joint council-commission work session had been scheduled on March 6 to discuss the project. Ms. Lundberg said she needed to hear feedback from her council before she could vote to move the concept forward.

Mr. Kelly recommended that all board members take the concept back to their elected bodies for review before any money was spent on the evaluation. He indicated that the item had not been scheduled for his council and thus the evaluation for Eugene would need to proceed without that input.

Mr. Weathers questioned the numbers for Lowell as he did not think they reflected what was planned in that community. He said that Lowell was not going to force twice the people onto the same amount of land. He said that Lowell had a three percent growth target. Ms. Heinkel indicated she would check with Lowell staff.

Mr. Stewart said that staff had taken the information provided by the cities and placed it on the map. He suggested that board members were experiencing a bit of “sticker shock” when trying to figure out where 50,000 people were going to live in Lane County in the future if they did not live in Eugene. He did not think the results were what members had envisioned, but it was a starting point for further discussion.

Continuing the PowerPoint presentation, Ms. Heinkel said Regional Growth Concept allocations were lower than forecasted Lane County adopted allocations; higher than adopted allocations in all cities except Eugene, Coburg, and Junction City; metropolitan projections were 40,000 lower than adopted allocations because Eugene grows much slower under the concept while Springfield grows faster; and concept allocations were about the same as the adopted allocation in Coburg and lower than the adopted allocation in Junction City.

Ms. Heinkel shared the concept’s employment targets, indicating that regional employment was about equal to the housing number. Job numbers in all cities increased except for Lowell, which maintained current levels. The largest employment increases would be seen in Eugene (35,000 jobs) and Springfield (17,000 jobs). She said these numbers were likely to be adjusted as a result of the Economic Opportunities Analysis by ECONorthwest.

Ms. Heinkel referred the board to the Land Capacity Analysis Map and bar charts to illustrate the development type mix assumptions under the concept, reporting that the land use mix transitioned to the Regional Growth Concept over time; there were less low-density residential and more mixed use development in Eugene, Coburg, Cottage Grove, Creswell, and Oakridge; and there was more mixed use development and more low-density development in growth areas in Springfield. She distributed a document entitled *Development Type Mix in Current Comprehensive Plan and Regional Growth Concept, Percent of Total Acres DRAFT 2/14/06*, which contained bar charts illustrating the information for each city.

Ms. Heinkel said the RTAC recommended board approval of the concept for further evaluation. She said the RTAC also recommended the board employ the collaborative regional problem solving process for regional problem solving. Ms. Heinkel noted two options for decision making, Option A being a motion to endorse the concept and Option B being separate agreements between each city, the county, and the State. She stated that the third option, “Regional Plan,” which was crossed off on the power point slide, was never a serious option and was on the slide merely to make it very clear that that was not a consideration in this process.

Ms. Heinkel called attention to the recommended process:

- All cities and County agreed to endorse strategy as one tool to help guide growth and development: not a land use action at local level
- Only action is taken by Land Conservation and Development Commission—to acknowledge strategy to be in compliance with intent of State planning goals
- Implementation of strategy by local governments is voluntary and incentive-based

Referring to the third bullet, Mr. Kelly suggested that the strategy only worked to the extent that all cities agreed to it. He referred to the November minutes, in which Lane Shetterly of the Department of Land Conservation and Development was quoted as saying the agreement between the cities, County, and State would include a commitment from each city that it would take action to implement the regional strategy as a contractual obligation under State law. He asked how that commitment related to the voluntary, incentive-based implementation mentioned in the bullet. Mr. Kelly interpreted Mr. Shetterly's statements as meaning that for the State to approve the strategy, the cities must commit to it through implementation actions. Mr. Hallyburton said that he could not confirm that at this point as the discussion now was different than the discussion that occurred in November. Ms. Heinkel noted that the language in the draft had been in place for some time, and the RTAC continued to recommend a voluntary approach.

Mr. Weathers perceived a conflict. He asked what would occur if Lowell ultimately decided it did not want to participate in the strategy; would it be held to the standards nonetheless?

Mr. Kelly said that he interpreted the discussion of November as stating that if the cities signed on to the strategy, they had agreed to do something to implement it, such as revise their comprehensive plans. Ms. Heinkel said the statute indicated that the strategy would have optional measures and incentives and disincentives, at the option of the local government, to implement the strategy. She interpreted optional measures as voluntary and said that incentives were simply that.

Mr. Kelly said that the measures and incentives were optional, but once a city agreed to take action to implement them, that was not optional. Ms. Heinkel said that was a nuance staff had not addressed. She noted that the strategy contained example options to illustrate what was available to each community. She anticipated that each community would take the optional measures appropriate for their jurisdictions, which represented a commitment but that commitment was voluntary and did not need to be accompanied by any action. She said there were incentives to take action, however.

Mr. Stewart emphasized the need for flexibility, pointing out that no community could predict the future and the interests of communities could change over time.

Ms. Heinkel continued the PowerPoint presentation, indicating the Regional Problem Solving process applied only to the optional land use measures. She briefly noted the potential risks and benefits of the process. Ms. Heinkel said the RTAC requested the board use the Regional Problem Solving process to allow those jurisdictions that opt to take land use actions consistent with the strategy to do so. She recommended the board review and comment on the process proposed in the draft strategy and next steps and approve the next steps.

Ms. Heinkel reviewed next steps in the process.

Ms. Lundberg indicated that she wanted the elected officials of the various communities sitting on the board to review the strategy before it was evaluated. She commended staff for its good work but said that the policy makers were the ultimate decision makers. Ms. Lundberg saw some "huge red flags" in the strategy and going forward at this time would presuppose the communities could come to agreement on several points of potential disagreement. Mr. Watson said the missing link for Coburg was the lack of a review by its planning commission and city council. He did not want to make commitments based upon assumptions without those assumptions being accepted by the council.

Mr. Stewart suggested that going forward with the evaluation might be useful because it might help identify if the concept was feasible. He questioned the quality of the input the Board of County Commissioners could provide if they lacked the supportive data from the evaluation against to weigh the strategy. He thought it would be easy for members to identify the “nonstarters” on the map and share that with staff. Mr. Coon concurred, directing staff to go ahead with the evaluation for Junction City’s portion of the concept.

Ms. Heinkel offered to assist with presentations to the elected officials.

Ms. Heinkel suggested that staff could do the evaluations for Junction City, Westfir, and Eugene, and would take any suggestions for changes from Mr. Weathers for Lowell and from the other cities who wanted their officials to comment on the draft concept. Mr. Fortune indicated he would ask his council to review the strategy.

Mr. Stewart asked Ms. Heinkel to clarify with the State the voluntary nature of the strategy in writing. Ms. Heinkel asked the board for verification as to whether the board generally endorsed the RTAC’s recommendation for the process laid out in the packet, including the voluntary approach. She emphasized the importance of the incentives to successful implementation of the strategy. The board nodded in agreement that the process laid out and the general outline of the Strategy was consistent with what they thought it should contain.

Mr. Kelly reminded the board that all jurisdictions were bound by the law and what members wanted did not matter if it conflicted with State statute. He recalled the ties between the strategy and consistency with jurisdictions’ comprehensive plans mentioned by Mr. Shetterly at the November meeting, and said he needed clarity about that issue as it regarded the voluntary nature of the strategy.

Members agreed to postpone the evaluation pending the elected officials review, and accepted a suggestion from Ms. Heinkel that she draft an Intergovernmental Agreement as a starting point for discussion.

Mr. Weathers indicated that Lowell would not be able to endorse anything unless its input was incorporated into the strategy.

## **6. Draft Regional Growth Management Strategy**

This item was not addressed.

## **7. Next Steps**

The board canceled the March meeting and acknowledged that the next meeting would be April 26, 2006.

Mr. Stewart reported that he had spoken before the House Land Use Committee the previous month and was asked by the committee what he felt about regional planning. He had responded that he believed it to be the future of planning. He pointed out that forest managers did not manage all forests the same way because of different site conditions, and suggested the same was true of land management because every place was different. He urged the board to stick with it and work through the issue that came up. He thought it was important to at least try, saying that the region could lead the state in that regard.

**8. Adjourn**

Mr. Stewart adjourned the meeting at 7:38 p.m.

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)