

## DRAFT 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), Pat Patterson for Mike Fleck (Cottage Grove), David Kelly (Eugene), Warren Weathers (Lowell), Glenn Fortune (Oakridge), Christine Lundberg (Springfield), Neil Friedman (Westfir), Erik Andersson, (Governor's Economic Revitalization Team), members; Carol Heinkel, Byron Vanderpool, Jamon Kent (Lane Council of Governments staff).

**ABSENT:** Judy Volta, Mike Watson (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), Gabrielle Schiffer (Governor's Economic Revitalization Team).

**GUESTS:** Stephanie Schulz (Lane County Planning), Stefano Viggiano (Lane Transit District), Greg Mott (City of Springfield Planning), Chuck Arrera (Springfield Utility Board), Eleanor Mulder, Janet Calvert (League of Women Voters), Deb Brewer, Brad Taylor (EWEB), Carlos Barrera (Goshen Area Neighborhood Association), Marguerite Nabeta (Department of Land Conservation and Development).

### **1. Welcome and Introductions**

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

### **2. February 9, 2005 Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Kelly, seconded by Mr. Fortune, moved to approve the minutes of the February 9, 2005, meeting as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

### **3. Public Comment**

There was no one wishing to speak.

Mr. Stewart announced that the Water Facilities evaluation would be presented first, followed by the Education evaluation.

#### **4. Draft Evaluation Results**

##### **Water Supply and Facilities**

Ms. Heinkel pointed out that a large group of participants representing many different agencies were involved in the evaluation of water facilities, including local governments, LCOG, local government engineering consultants, public utilities and water district, Oregon Water Resources Department, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Health Division, Army Corps of Engineers, and a consulting hydrologist. She said the group's discussions were in the spirit of cooperation and very invigorating. She introduced Deb Brewer and Brad Taylor of Eugene Water & Electric Board (EWEB) to present the evaluation results.

Ms. Brewer emphasized that while EWEB participated in the evaluation project, EWEB was contributing its expertise to the project but that it in no way presumed that EWEB would be the water provider for the region. She drew the board's attention to *Table 1: Water System Capital Costs and Capacity Issues to Serve 2050 Alternative Growth Scenarios* and said that Brad Taylor, EWEB Water Department lead staff, would summarize the key points. She said that changes in the State's water rights rules would make a major difference in the sources of water for local governments in the next 20 years. She said that regardless of which growth scenario was considered there would have to be regional cooperation in order to allocate water rights.

Mr. Taylor said there were three key points to be derived from the table:

1. Because of restrictions on water rights due to water availability issues regional cooperation among local service providers would most likely be needed to provide adequate and cost effective supplies of quality water to meet future growth. Over half of the water providers in the Region 2050 area identified a need for additional water supplies to meet the projected Region 2050 population growth.
2. Even without considering cost issues associated with supplying water there were issues that related to limitation of the resource. Under the compact urban growth scenario a significant assumption was that some growth centers such as Alvadore, Goshen, and Pleasant Hill were absorbed into the urban growth boundaries (UGB) of the Eugene and Springfield area. Under the satellite scenario it was assumed that Creswell, Veneta, and Coburg would be able to obtain additional water rights that were economical and viable.
3. There were major costs associated with all three scenarios. The cost to provide service for each new person coming into the system was between \$3,000 and \$3,500 to fund the type of system necessary to provide water to the scenarios. The costs would be borne by developers or ratepayers and there was value in working together on the investment in infrastructure.

Mr. Patterson observed that watershed councils were not represented in the water quality evaluation participants. He said it was important to consider the councils' perspectives as they monitored the availability of water and were knowledgeable about water rights issues. He expressed concern about HB 3038, the Community Planning Act, which related to mineral and water rights and its impact on land use and development.

Mr. Kelly asked if the estimated costs under each scenario took into account the need to extend main trunks. Mr. Taylor said the maps determine infrastructure needs relative to the location of growth centers. He said the assessment relative to the compact urban scenario skewed the costs because it involved large diameter transmission mains to serve outlying areas such as Pleasant Hill, Goshen and Alvadore.

Mr. Kelly asked if the evaluation considered what percentage of the costs would be SDC (system development charges) eligible. Mr. Taylor replied that he was not certain if all of the water utilities within the Region 2050 area had SDC policies but all capital costs were SDC-related because SDCs covered costs associated with capital costs to meet a growing demand.

Mr. Kelly asked if the amount of SDCs now collected was designed to meet the needs under any of the scenarios, including a spike in demand under one of the scenarios. Mr. Taylor replied that EWEB's SDCs were designed to meet the costs of increasing supply in the system but there was a concern that over time SDCs would need to change in response to new demands.

Continuing, Mr. Taylor raised several points regarding the water assessment matrix on page 12 of the evaluation report.

- The compact urban and satellite scenarios were about equal in terms of meeting the defined criteria.
- The satellite scenario availability was not rated as high because of uncertainty around the ability of Creswell, Veneta and Coburg to obtain needed water rights for expansion.
- Even under the compact scenario cooperation among neighboring water utilities, state, and federal agencies would most likely be required to meet needs.
- Capital costs in the compact scenario were more predictable and slightly higher than the satellite scenario because it was difficult to put a price tag on development of an unknown.
- The rural scenario rated lower for meeting the criteria because costs were much more difficult to predict and uncertainties and reliability surrounding the individual water systems that people relied upon.

Mr. Weathers remarked that *Table 1* showed lower capital costs for the rural scenario than for the compact scenario but the matrix did not reflect that lower cost in the rating of capital costs. Ms. Heinkel replied that the matrix would be corrected to accurately reflect the projected costs. Mr. Taylor added that the costs were based on assumptions but it was difficult to quantify costs.

Mr. Patterson asked if the evaluation had taken into consideration loss of wells due to septic tanks as development occurred under the rural scenario. Mr. Taylor said that issue would be addressed during the wastewater evaluation.

Mr. Weathers asked if sewage treatment in rural areas had changed over time and whether the wastewater evaluation would consider alternatives to septic tanks. Mr. Taylor said that sewage treatment had not changed significantly and the evaluation would address the current rules, not the treatment method used. He asked that any suggestions be forwarded to the wastewater evaluation group.

Mr. Weathers commented that water supply and facilities and septic systems were so interrelated in the rural scenario that perhaps they should be considered together.

Mr. Coon said the board would have to address the issue of wastewater when choosing a preferred scenario and possibly technology could make rural septic systems more viable in the future. He asked how the board would be able to decide which scenario was preferable when there were so many variables.

Mr. Taylor noted that the water evaluation was just one piece of the Region 2050 process. He said that many rural residents did not test their well water or notice when a septic system was failing; consequently there was not much data available linking those issues to health. He agreed that new treatment mechanisms could be developed that affect how the scenarios were rated and the associated costs.

Mr. Kelly said there were unknowns around both technology and geo-political issues and the board would do the best it could with the current assumptions. He said one of the most interesting things about the water evaluation was the fact that several of the scenarios needed new water rights that might not be achievable at a reasonable price. He said that could be a dominant factor in the decision-making process.

Mr. Weathers reported he had met with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers regarding the possibility of Lowell purchasing water from the Corps and asked how that differed from water rights. Mr. Taylor replied that if Lowell wanted water from a reservoir it would take an act of Congress to authorize as reservoirs were created and funded to provide water for agricultural uses.

Ms. Heinkel pointed out that one of the benefits of having state and federal agencies at the table was that it fostered a spirit of cooperation among them and local jurisdictions. She said the Corps representative at the Water Assessment Meeting stated that if the eleven local governments jointly approached Congress for policy shifts that would address water needs in the region to serve growth, it would be the most effective way for that to occur and would be much more powerful than Corps staff making the request. She also reported that the State representative in the meeting stated a willingness to seek state funds to help implement the desired solution. Mr. Taylor emphasized that the cost per acre to buy into a storage facility system was extremely high and

reservoirs were not currently managed for municipal use; those issues would have to be addressed in the process.

Mr. Coon stated that Junction City required 100 gallons per day per person and asked how stream flows could meet that standard in the future with the projected population growth if there were successive drought years. Mr. Taylor said the evaluation looked at individual community susceptibility to drought. He said that access to water had the potential to be denied if the water right had a priority date that was junior to an in-stream water right. He said whether the State would shut down a municipality was subject to discussion and there could be some leverage with respect to the statutes and declarations of drought, but it was important to understand community susceptibility in terms of a long-term water supply strategy.

### **Education**

Ms. Heinkel related that schools districts were involved in three meetings to provide input on the methodology and to review and provide comment on earlier drafts of the evaluation. An earlier draft of the evaluation was reviewed by the RTAC and Policy Board and the current draft responds to comments received in that process. She said, as requested by the Policy Board, the school districts were asked for any available information on school building capacity and economic impact or suggestions on how the education study could be conducted. She had not yet received any information but would continue to explore those issues as the evaluation process continued. She pointed out an error in the matrix on page 11 of the draft evaluation. She said the Lowell School District should be rated “L” under the compact urban growth scenario, “L” under the satellite scenario, and “H” under the rural scenario.

Ms. Heinkel summarized some of the trends that informed the analysis:

- Over the past ten years the percent increase in the total population was more than double the percent increase in the school age population.
- The availability of alternatives to public schools also affected enrollment in public schools.
- Declining enrollment in rural schools districts reflected a decline in the number of households with children in those districts.
- An increasing Hispanic population in the Southern Willamette Valley would impact school enrollment rates because that population tended to have larger families, and thus, more school age children, than the non-Hispanic population.
- Families with children in the Bethel and Springfield school districts were more likely to reside in single family and duplex units, although a significant number of students in the Springfield School District resided in apartments.

Continuing, Ms. Heinkel said that the evaluation provided district-specific enrollment information under each scenario as an alternative to the more general format that summarized results and did not impart nuances. She said that *Table 1: Enrollment in 2050 Scenarios Based on Adjusted Enrollment/Dwelling Unit Ratios* reflected adjustments for trends that were identified in census

data for the school districts of Lowell, Marcola, Pleasant Hill, and South Lane. She reviewed the evaluation results for school districts under each of the growth scenarios. She noted that the rural growth scenario would increase enrollments for all school districts in the region, although it would not increase very much in Bethel in that scenario. She said that the school district staff provided guidance on the methodology and strongly urged that the analysis consider single family housing on relatively flat land because it was more likely to be developed with the type of housing to attract families with children. She said their reasoning was that housing developed on sloped land was more expensive and not necessarily affordable as starter homes for young families. She said that the draft evaluation had been sent to school districts for comment but none had yet responded.

Responding to a question from Mr. Weathers, Ms. Heinkel explained that the last two columns on *Table A-6: Dwelling Units on Lands with Slope Equal to or Less Than Five Percent, All Residential Land and Residential Inside UGBs* gave the percentage of dwelling units on all residential land and residential land excluding rural residential land. She said the table was provided for comparison purposes only.

Mr. Patterson expressed the concern of smaller, outlying communities with loss of autonomy and income sources to support schools. He asked what type of flexibility would be built into the planning effort to address the “boom or bust” economy and encourage development of a stable business base. He suggested that aspect of the scenarios be evaluated. Ms. Heinkel replied that the scenarios did speak to economics, in that the project employment was allocated to employment land in the scenarios and the allocation of employment land to each of the small cities in the satellite growth scenario was at a much higher rate than projected by past trends.

Mr. Coon asked how “starter home” was defined in terms of a price range, noting that could be somewhere between \$85,000 and \$150,000. Ms. Heinkel said that she would find out but that trends in the last ten years showed a significant increase in enrollments in the Bethel School District, which had a lot of flat land where many subdivisions were developed.

Mr. Coon suggested that the evaluation include a price range for starter or affordable homes.

Mr. Kelly asked for an explanation of why the percentages of change for households with and without children did not equal the percentage of change for total households in *Table A-2*. Ms. Heinkel said she would have Kay Bork, the staff person who developed the table, provide the Policy Board with a response.

Mr. Fortune asked what effect trends in the Hispanic population had in the evaluation. Ms. Heinkel replied that it was included in the qualitative but not quantitative analysis because Hispanic families tend to have more children and, therefore, it is good to note that these trends may impact future school enrollment in certain districts.

Mr. Weathers commented that St. Vincent dePaul was working with Lowell to develop affordable homes on land with ten percent slope. He said that in the Lowell area land with a five percent or

less slope was generally considered good farm land. He asked if changing the data in *Table A-6* to reflect dwelling units on lands with slope of ten percent or less instead of five percent would affect the evaluation. Ms. Heinkel replied that *Table A-6* was developed at the request of school districts. She said the evaluation results were based on the data in Table 1 and that none of the information contained in *Table 1* would be affected by a change in Table A-6. She said the only evaluation result that was affected by the data in Table A-6 was that Junction City would have more enrollment in the Satellite when slopes are taken into account. Otherwise, the evaluation was not effected by the analysis of slope data. She suggested that language could be added that would identify the situation in Lowell, where affordable single family dwellings were being developed on a ten percent slope. Mr. Weathers agreed.

## **5. Public Outreach**

Ms. Heinkel summarized that the policy board had reviewed, revised, and approved the public involvement plan. The plan calls for a four-page color insert to be included in all newspapers in the region and community workshops in each of the cities in the rural areas. She said that staff was working with cities to schedule workshops and the newspaper insert would provide information about dates and locations. She noted that some communities had expressed an interest in using the Region 2050 project to assist with their own visioning and long-term planning efforts. She said the process would not end with the workshops but continue with an open dialogue in and among communities throughout the summer and early fall.

Mr. Patterson said it was important to be able to provide participating city councils with information that explained how the Region 2050 process was an improvement over the existing Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) process. Ms. Heinkel said that staff was developing a chart comparing the differences between the administrative rule process and the regional problem-solving statute that governed the Region 2050 process and highlighting the benefits of regional planning.

Mr. Kelly asked if the public involvement process would provide opportunities for “free form” comments and not be limited to checking boxes in response to questions. Ms. Heinkel said that an interactive website to accept public comments was being developed. She commented that previous experience with the Metro Diagram had indicated that while participation at public workshops was lower than anticipated, website activity was extremely high. She said that having accessible and easily understood information on a website encouraged participation and response from people who ordinarily might not attend a public meeting.

Mr. Kelly suggested that local television stations be approached about the possibility of a town hall meeting. He asked whether the transportation evaluation would be completed prior to commencement of public outreach efforts. Ms. Heinkel replied that the transportation models would be developed and applied to scenarios to determine impacts on the capacity of the current system before outreach began. She said that during outreach and before the end of June 2005 the solution packages would be identified and then models run again in the summer.

Mr. Stewart shared several examples that demonstrated the successful use of an interactive website to promote public participation and input.

Janet Calvert and Eleanor Mulder of the League of Women Voters explained that their organization had been used as a test group for the Region 2050 survey instrument.

Ms. Calvert stated that the League had approximately 250 members and monthly meeting attendance was about 120. She said that the Region 2050 process was discussed with members two years ago and recently members were given an update and asked to provide feedback by completing a draft survey form. She noted that League members tended to be more aware of and informed about land use planning than the average citizen.

Ms. Mulder related that League units were mostly in Eugene although there was one in Cottage Grove. She said that the survey response rate was higher from the Cottage Grove unit. She said the survey asked for each scenario to be rated on a scale from very desirable to very undesirable. She stated that a better response rate was achieved when the survey was completed at the meeting instead of submitted at a later time. She remarked that units in both Eugene and Cottage Grove like the satellite growth scenario. She said that more space for comments was requested and one respondent asked about the impact of the scenarios on the senior population. She said that information packets were mailed to members and discussed at meetings and the information was generally well comprehended. She pointed out that the higher level of knowledge and awareness of land use planning issues by League members may have somewhat skewed the results.

Mr. Weathers presented a letter from the City of Lowell formally requesting policy board action to remove the evaluation matrices from the 2050 website and from outreach materials and staff presentations and to prohibit the dissemination of 2050 survey results to the public until those materials had received unanimous board approval. He explained that he understood from discussions at the November 2005 policy board meeting that there was consensus to remove the evaluation matrices from outreach materials but they were still included in information on the website. He said the concern was that the H-M-L ratings in the matrices implied that all members agreed on the conclusions and he felt that Lowell's interests were not being considered. He stated Lowell's position was that the evaluation matrices characterized the rural growth scenario as bad and negated the purpose of the survey.

Mr. Stewart asked if there was consensus to remove the matrices from website materials. Ms. Heinkel replied that Mr. Weathers' understanding was correct, that Mr. Weathers did raise the issue at the November meeting and that staff had been struggling with how to respond. She said staff had not yet removed the matrices from the evaluation on the website because staff was not certain what the Policy Board wanted to do instead. She asked if the education evaluation, which provided greater detail by district instead of a blanket statement, was more acceptable.

Mr. Weathers said the education evaluation approach was acceptable.

Mr. Kelly recognized concerns with reducing the analysis results to H-M-L ratings. He suggested that all materials be prominently marked as draft to indicate that the policy board had not formally approved the results. He concurred with the request to eliminate the matrices while retaining the existing text.

Mr. Weathers stated that Lowell was also concerned with survey results that could be generated by leading questions that carried a negative connotation about a particular scenario or aspect of a scenario. He said the policy board should approve all materials that included a conclusion.

Mr. Coon noted that some councilors from Junction City had reacted to them as though they were conclusions of the policy board. Ms. Heinkel replied that the matrices were intended to give a snapshot of the evaluation document. She said staff agreed that the matrices were limited as a tool and agreed with Mr. Weathers' request to remove the H-M-L ratings.

Mr. Friedman remarked that there was a strong push in society, not just on the policy board, to redefine sound reasoning to suit a particular perspective. He urged the policy board to assure that definitions were understood by members and residents of the region so that everyone was speaking the same language and had the same understanding, which was especially important for public outreach. He said that the board had initially agreed upon definitions but perhaps it was time to redefine the H-M-L ratings so that all members had the same understanding and the process could proceed and not be held hostage. He was not in favor of removing the evaluation matrices as it would also remove the public's frame of reference.

Mr. Patterson observed that change was frightening, especially if their experience with it was negative, and most policy board members were protective of their communities. He urged that the survey results in Lane County were often skewed by people who had an agenda and monitored the process; it was essential to obtain responses from representatives of all communities in the County to assure the work of Region 2050 was meaningful.

Mr. Vanderpool asked if it was the consensus of the policy board to approve the survey instrument before it was issued.

Mr. Weathers said that the board should also see the survey results and any analysis of the results before they were issued. He was concerned about value judgments being made.

Mr. Vanderpool clarified that direction to staff was to remove the matrices from the evaluations and presentations and post them on the website without the H-M-L designations.

Mr. Weathers said it was not just H-M-L that concerned him. He also had concerns about items like desirable goals, which did not address facilitating people living in rural areas.

Mr. Vanderpool restated the consensus of the group that the H-M-L matrices would be moved in their entirety from the evaluations, evaluations would be marked prominently as draft and no other alterations would be made to the documents at the current time. He said the board's review

of an evaluation would indicate it was acceptable to post it on the website but would not indicate approval, which would require a more extensive process. The Board indicated agreement.

## **6. Report from Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC)**

Mr. Stewart reported that he and Lane County Commissioner Anna Morrison had met with LCDC Director Lane Shetterly to discuss the Region 2050 process. He said that Mr. Shetterly was positive about the process and wanted it to be successful in order to be used as a model for other regional planning efforts in the state. He said Mr. Shetterly provided assurance that he would assist in getting the plan approved by the State. He was pleased to hear that the comprehensive plan for the region that resulted from the 2050 process would govern land use in Lane County instead of the State's land use goals in the current process.

Ms. Nabeta added that Region 2050 was an alternate path to address the State's land use goals by providing an opportunity for local jurisdictions to collaborate in a process that was not state-driven to solve land use and growth management issues.

Mr. Stewart indicated that he was encouraged by the 2050 process and while there were concerns being expressed about the three growth scenarios, he reminded the board that they were tools to achieve a preferred scenario. He encouraged board members to work together to make the process successful and assure a comprehensive plan that met the needs of individual communities.

Mr. Patterson pointed out that there was no guarantee, based on previous experience with LCDC, that the best plan supported by jurisdictions in Lane County would be accepted by the State. Mr. Coon indicated an earlier meeting he had with the State left him with the impression that LCDC was supportive of the 2050 effort.

Ms. Lundberg asked for a one page comparison of the State's administrative rule process and the Region 2050 process so that she could better understand and explain the impact of 2050 on Springfield. Mr. Stewart handed Ms. Heinkel a brief side-by-side list comparing the two processes which she shared with the Policy Board. She noted that she had just returned from a National Planning Conference in San Francisco that Mr. Kelley also attended. She said in this conference attended by 6,000 people, there was an entire track on regional planning and that her sense was that the kind of process used in Region 2050 was a new way of doing planning throughout the country. She said none of the efforts presented at the conference were as comprehensive as the Lane County effort.

Mr. Stewart commented that the side-by-side comparison was a useful tool for members and asked that it be expanded with more details. He said that another question frequently asked about Region 2050 was what type of flexibility it would provide to address situations that could arise in the future but were not anticipated in the plan.

Mr. Patterson emphasized the importance of regular review and public input on plans. Ms. Heinkel said that, over the next year, the Policy Board staff would be working on the

intergovernmental agreement that would establish provisions for reviewing, monitoring, and revising the plan generated by 2050.

Mr. Kelly agreed that a process for mid-course corrections was an important part of a long-term vision. He asked for an updated flow chart showing the rest of the 2050 process and timeline and some examples of how a community might address a situation that arose in ten years differently under the 2050 process than under State administrative rules.

## **7. Regional Strategy Interface with Ballot Measure 37: Issues and Impacts**

Mr. Vanderpool referred the board to information in the agenda packet containing information on the potential interface between Ballot Measure 37 and Region 2050. He said there was still uncertainty about how Measure 37 would be interpreted by the courts and there was a possibility of legislative action to clarify some of its provisions. He said the Attorney General had recently released an interpretation of Measure 37 and there were many differing opinions on the correct interpretation. He commented that it was certain land use regulation in Oregon would change but not be eliminated as Measure 37 did not affect most land use in the State. He indicated that many of the actions being considered as part of the 2050 process had the potential to increase property value and would not be subject to Measure 37, nor would many of the decisions regarding economic development, transportation, and other non-land use issues. He said that Region 2050 should not stop because of Measure 37 and the State was beginning to encourage regional collaboration as the future of land use planning in Oregon.

Mr. Stewart agreed and related that Mr. Shetterly had indicated that Measure 37 would have no affect on the 2050 process.

## **8. Project Updates**

Ms. Heinkel stated that she would provide an updated 2050 timeline at the next meeting. She said a subcommittee for public outreach had been formed and would meet the following week. She reminded board members that the April 27, 2005 Policy Board meeting would have an extensive agenda, including evaluations of wastewater, farm and forest land, and the economy, as well as a status report on transportation modeling and the final drafts of the public outreach materials.

Ms. Schultz distributed an update on the process to appoint the Farm & Forest Committee Task Force. She said a 30-day recruitment period had resulted in nine applications and the Lane County Board of Commissioners would make appointments at its April 13, 2005, meeting. She said that five other individuals who had expressed an interest had not applied and all nine applications received would be forwarded to the commission. She noted that there had been some discussion of having two separate committees but some applicants had experience in both farm and forest issues so that might not be necessary.

Mr. Friedman observed that it was good to have knowledgeable people on the committee but the list of applicants seemed heavily weighted toward resource extraction with little representation

from resource preservation. Ms. Nabeta pointed out that the purpose of the committee was to determine the impact of growth scenarios on industries relative to State goals 3 and 4.

## **9. Future Meeting Dates/Adjourn**

Future meeting dates were:

Wednesday, April 27

Wednesday, June 22

Wednesday, September 28

Wednesday, October 26

Wednesday, November 16

Mr. Stewart adjourned the meeting at 8:40 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)

*M:\2005\Lane Council of Governments\Region 2050\region2050 050324.doc*