

MINUTES

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

April 26, 2006
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Faye Stewart, Vice Chair (Lane County), Mike Watson (Coburg), Ron Pettiti (Creswell), David Kelly (Eugene), Warren Weathers (Lowell), Glenn Fortune (Oakridge), Marion Esty (Veneta), Neil Friedman (Westfir), members; Carol Heinkel, Byron Vanderpool, Jamon Kent, George Kloeppe (Lane Council of Governments staff).

ABSENT: Judy Volta (Coburg), Bill McCoy (Creswell), Kitty Piercy (Eugene), Dwight Coon, Barry Schweigert (Junction City); Peter Sorenson (Lane County), Ken Larson (Lowell), Sue Bond (Oakridge), Tim Brooker (Veneta), Susan Ban, Mike Eyster (Lane Transit District), Erik Andersson (Governor's Economic Revitalization Team).

GUESTS: Marguerite Nabeta (Department of Land Conservation and Development), Jim Bruvold, (Veneta), Eleanor Mulder (League of Women Voters), Susan Muir (City of Eugene Planning), Bill Mason (Department of Environmental Quality), David Helton (ECONorthwest), Jim Babson (Land Watch), Bill Welch (East Lane Water Conservation District), Stephanie Schulz (Lane County Planning).

1. Welcome and Introductions

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

2. February 22, 2006, Meeting Minutes

Mr. Kelly noted that the date on the first page was March 24, 2005, instead of February 22, 2006.

Mr. Fortune, seconded by Mr. Pettiti, moved to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2006, meeting as corrected. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Public Comment

Mr. Stewart determined there was no one wishing to speak.

4. Revised Regional Growth Concept and Revised Draft Coordinated Population Allocations

Ms. Heinkel said that changes to the development type assumptions resulted from meetings and exchanges with city staff, planning commissions and elected officials over the past two months. She used a map of the region to illustrate the following changes:

- Veneta – changes to the development type assumptions by more closely reflecting the employment land assumptions and aligning some of the major roadways with employment land
- Junction City – minor adjustments
- Coburg – initial density assumptions too high for a small city, different assumptions made about development of residential land resulting in a slight reduction to the population and removing most of the agricultural land from the boundary
- Oakridge – no change
- Lowell – extended growth area to the road and added employment land, adjustments to population and employment numbers would be calculated based on changes
- Cottage Grove – told LCOG staff they want to use historic trends instead of the capacity model to make population projections, and they identified potential future growth area to the south for employment land
- Springfield – removed assumptions regarding potential future growth area, not included in capacity analysis, used existing Comprehensive Plan designations and nodes in the adopted TransPlan

Ms. Heinkel summarized the letter from Director Lane Shetterly to Commissioner Stewart. She said the letter was received that day and handed out to the Policy Board. She said that, as expected, Regional Problem Solving (RPS) was no longer a viable tool. She said the letter confirms that all of the desired outcomes of the cities', and of Pleasant Hill and Goshen, could be achieved under existing state law and administrative rules; so that, for those outcomes, RPS was not essential and the Region 2050 process could continue. She said that, based on the meetings she has attended in the past two months, local officials in the remaining jurisdictions have indicated their interest in continuing with the process.

She said that RPS was a tool uniquely suited to greater flexibility in locating residential uses on rural lands, and, since it could not be used in the current phase of the Region 2050 project, the following changes were required:

- Alvadore – returned to its original community boundary and densities
- Lowell area farm and forest lands - Allowing rural residential uses on farm and/or forest land around Lowell area
- Small scale farming on outskirts of urban growth boundaries and growth areas – would not be allowed except where already allowed.

Ms. Heinkel said that the recommendation of the Farm and Forest Committee to allow some small scale farming on the outskirts of the growth areas and urban growth boundaries (UGB) to serve as a buffer between large commercial farming activities and urban areas would require an administrative rule change. She said both that concept and the idea of examining rural residential possibilities in the Lowell area could be separate and more focused RPS projects and up to local participants to determine if they wished to proceed.

She said the letter from Mr. Shetterly also discussed Alvadore, Goshen, and Pleasant Hill in detail. She said the letter correctly reflects the recent changes made to development type assumptions in the Draft Concept for Alvadore and Goshen, based on conversations with DLCD and communications with Lane County Land Management staff. She said the letter says state law does not prohibit the expansion of rural community boundaries and states, "Once a boundary of a rural community has been established, the county may designate or apply zoning within the boundary and set residential densities in accordance with OAR 660-022-0030. The primary considerations in the rule for zoning of residential lands (within

communities) are the carrying capacity of the land and water, adequacy of transportation facilities, and compatibility with adjacent farm and forest uses.” She said the letter goes on to state that it would be up to Lane County to make positive findings that the desired outcomes for Pleasant Hill and Goshen are consistent with the administrative rule for Rural Communities, and state law does not prohibit the expanded boundary in Pleasant Hill and the change in uses in both Pleasant Hill and Goshen, as revised. The revisions for Goshen now use the existing rural community boundary, and base development type assumptions on existing Lane County zoning for employment land, with increases to medium density residential on residential land resulting in increased population but no change to employment assumptions.

Mr. Kelly asked why Alvadore’s situation was different than Goshen and Pleasant Hill. Ms. Heinkel replied that Alvadore had a more concentrated area of residential in its rural community boundary—RR-2—and the area outside of that was RR-5. She said the administrative rule indicated if there was that type of differentiation it defined the boundary; that situation did not exist in Pleasant Hill where the area proposed for expansion of the boundary has identical zoning to the adjacent area inside the boundary and in Goshen, no boundary expansion was proposed.

Continuing, Ms. Heinkel reminded the board that the growth concept and population allocations were not fixed and staff was willing to work with jurisdictions to make whatever changes they wished. She said the Regional Growth Management Strategy included the Regional Growth Concept and optional measures and matrices were provided to assist with decisions at the technical and policy levels. She emphasized that the Regional Growth Concept was a planning tool—an optional and voluntary path to meeting State Planning Goals, based on land capacity and community visions instead of past trends and a growth footprint to help guide infrastructure investments. She said the concept was not a regional plan, property-specific land use map, comprehensive plan or comprehensive plan map. She listed the Regional Growth Concept components:

- Regional Growth Concept map of potential future growth areas based on land capacity analysis with development type assumptions
- Population and housing density targets and coordinated population allocations
- Employment targets
- Development type mix targets

Ms. Heinkel emphasized that the growth areas shown on the map were consistent with ORS 197.298 in State law. She said Eugene had the smallest and Creswell the largest expansion areas, population and housing densities in all cities increased with the exception of housing densities in Junction City and Coburg, growth area densities were higher than the UGBs in Eugene, Coburg and Veneta and lower in Junction City and Oakridge with little change in Creswell. She said that population targets were higher in the Regional Growth Concept than forecasted historic populations in all cities except Eugene and Junction City, with the greatest differences in Creswell, Lowell, Oakridge and Veneta. She expected Eugene’s population in 2055 to be almost 50,000 less in the concept than forecasted historic trends.

Mr. Weathers asked for an explanation of growth area densities higher than UGBs. Ms. Heinkel replied that UGB density was lower than in the expansion areas in some cities because of predevelopment patterns or “underbuild” in existing cities within the UGB; while, in others, the growth area may be less dense than UGBs due to constraints, such as steep slopes, in the growth areas.

Ms. Heinkel said the coordinated population allocations in the aggregate, were slightly lower but still consistent with projected State Office of Economic Analysis projections for Lane County. She said the lower figure could perhaps accommodate additional population that might locate in rural areas due to Measure 37. She stated that regional employment was about equal to the number of housing units and the number of jobs increased in all cities, with the largest increase in Eugene.

According to Ms. Heinkel, the development type mix would transition over time from a comprehensive plan to the Regional Growth Concept depending on each jurisdiction's approach. She said the concept reflected less low density residential and more mixed uses in Eugene, Creswell and Oakridge and more mixed uses in Veneta.

Mr. Kelly asked about the source of the population figure for Springfield. Ms. Heinkel replied that as adjustments were made over the past two months, with the withdrawal of Springfield from the process the population was under-allocated. She said that methodologies were revised and population was allocated everywhere else first, leaving a buffer for the rural area, and the remainder was allocated to Springfield knowing that Springfield desired growth. She said that eventually all Lane County cities had to agree to the coordinated population allocations and then they would be adopted by the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) Board, but there needed to be an initial methodology.

Mr. Kelly pointed out an error in the spreadsheet with Eugene's population growing three percent more than it did. Ms. Heinkel said the table would be revised.

5. Proposed Process for Endorsement and Implementation of Regional Growth Management Strategy

Mr. Vanderpool contrasted standard planning and regional planning processes. He said that standard planning provided a number of tools and a set of rules that were applied within a UGB while regional planning provided an additional tool kit to accomplish community goals. He reviewed the history of the Region 2050 project beginning in 1999 through the present. He said the legislature had approved RPS as a tool after Region 2050 began and it was added to the tool kit to deal with regional issues, but was no longer available since Springfield's withdrawal. He said that did not mean that the Region 2050 project could not continue with other regional planning tools, but that there were a couple of rural outcomes that could not be achieved without RPS, as already discussed.

Mr. Vanderpool reminded the board that a motion to endorse the strategy was not a land use decision, participation was voluntary and agreement to endorse the strategy had local and regional benefits by making additional tools and data sets available to cities. He said the Region 2050 project was almost completed and individual agencies would need to decide what they wanted in their parts of the strategy; LCOG would take that information and compile the draft strategy. He said each city would need to endorse the strategy and agree to its specific implementation steps. He emphasized that even though all cities needed to endorse the strategy in order to use the tools, that did not imply that any one city's actions were binding on another city, although some actions would be done collectively.

Mr. Vanderpool said that staff suggested a revised Regional Growth Strategy be presented at the May 2006 meeting along with scheduled reports: Economic Analysis—Part III, Housing Analysis and Environmental Evaluation. He said recommendation of a Regional Growth Concept and draft Regional Growth Strategy

could occur at the June 2006 meeting, at which point Region 2050 as a project was completed and funding exhausted.

Mr. Kelly said it would be difficult to decide on a concept and strategy at the June meeting as the transportation modeling work was not due until June. He noted that transportation modeling was not listed as an outstanding report. Ms. Heinkel said that the transportation modelers were relying on information from the State model that was being developed, but it was not available. She said it would require a significant amount of work on LCOG's transportation model in order to model the Preferred Scenario and the State was not willing to provide funding. She said the State's position was that the modeling work done on the Alternative Scenarios identified sufficient detail that was useful to the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) for moving forward with projects. She said the State was willing to fund development of the implementation measures, particularly amendments to the comprehensive plans and transportation system plans.

Mr. Kelly remarked that land use and transportation were inevitably linked and he did not see how land use patterns could be adopted without modeling them to identify things such as cross-city commuter patterns. Ms. Heinkel said there was considerable transportation modeling work done on the alternatives analysis and it identified necessary improvements under any scenario, such as Highway 126 in Veneta. She said the State did not see Region 2050 developing a 50-year transportation plan at that level of detail and the information generated in the alternatives analysis was sufficient to meet State needs and local needs would be met through updates to local transportation system plans.

Mr. Kelly said that if Eugene endorsed the strategy it was most interested in Eugene land use but was affected by land use in surrounding communities and in order for the City Council to support the strategy it would need some sense of how people would move between communities.

Mr. Vanderpool challenged the assertion that there was no intercity modeling and while there was not the level of detail that might be desired, he agreed with the State that within the planning horizons being addressed the patterns that were analyzed would cause some very predictable problems.

Mr. Kelly asked if a report could be generated that would identify those problems. Ms. Heinkel said that report would be provided and that the draft strategy would be revised, including intercity commuting and the transportation element, to reflect updated information; it was just that additional application of the transportation modeling would not be conducted. .

Mr. Weathers asked how the reports related to the strategy. Mr. Vanderpool replied the reports were information that supported the implementation strategies that agencies might choose to use. He used the *Decision Matrix for Endorsing and Implementing the Regional Growth Management Strategy* to illustrate how each agency would indicate which parts of the strategy it was interested in taking advantage of. He pointed out that certain steps, such as endorsement, had to be taken by all agencies but beyond that an agency could chose any or none of the components.

Mr. Weathers remarked that there had been no revisions to any of the reports to date and wanted assurance that endorsing the strategy did not mean a city was also adopting reports with which it did not agree. Ms. Heinkel explained that the technical evaluations of alternative scenarios that were completed were informative only and that the local elected officials would not be asked to endorse or adopt those reports. She said what the board would be considering at its May meeting was a revised strategy and new data to support that. She said the Board should make any corrections at the June meeting. She said the current

concept was a blend of the three scenarios and different from any one of the alternatives evaluated in the reports. She said the board would be presented with a proposed draft strategy that contained the background information on which that specific document was based.

Continuing, Mr. Vanderpool proposed that the Region 2050 project end in June 2006 and if the board wished for it to continue beyond that point additional funding would need to be identified. He indicated LCOG was aware that jurisdictions would require funding for implementation and that LCOG staff were researching funding sources.

Mr. Kelly felt the compressed timeline was not adequate for him to consult with his policy body and be prepared to make a decision by the end of June. He was not comfortable with making a decision about the strategy until it had gone before the planning commission and City Council for consideration. Several board members agreed with Mr. Kelly with respect to their own policy bodies.

Ms. Heinkel asked if board members would prefer the schedule set forth in her April 18, 2006, memorandum under the section on Next Steps, which would have the board making a decision in October 2006.

Mr. Stewart asked what options were available for individual jurisdictions endorsing the strategy. Ms. Nabeta said that endorsement of the strategy would depend on how a jurisdiction wished to use the regional database and the crux of the project's efforts relied on the coordinated population projection.

Mr. Watson left the meeting at 6:35 p.m.

Mr. Stewart offered the hypothetical example of Oakridge adopting the Regional Growth Strategy and wishing to move forward with implementation but none of the other policy bodies had adopted the strategy. Ms. Heinkel replied that the decision matrix provided a sense of the legal implications of the strategy. She said if a jurisdiction wanted to use the regional database to accomplish certain things such as revising the population allocation or housing and employment then it would be included in the capacity analysis and every jurisdiction included in the capacity analysis would need to endorse the strategy. She said the Coordinated Population Allocations would be agreed to by jurisdictions through adoption by the LCOG board.

Mr. Kelly urged that discussions commence immediately with those jurisdictions—Springfield, Cottage Grove, Florence and Dunes City—that were not participating in Region 2050 but would need to agree to the coordinated population allocations.

Mr. Weathers asked what issues were required to be addressed in the strategy. Ms. Heinkel said it was entirely up to each city and the county. She gave the example that if Lowell wanted to use the regional database to designate urban reserves, the City Council would need to endorse the strategy, agree to the Coordinated Population Allocations, and incorporate the data from the Land Capacity Model into its comprehensive plan. The City could then amend its comprehensive plan to designate urban reserves and use the population allocations for planning public facilities. If Lowell also wanted to use the results of the regional housing needs analysis and regional economic opportunities analysis to help plan for residential lands and commercial and industrial lands, the City would need to incorporate that technical data into its comprehensive plan. She emphasized that each jurisdiction would only include in the strategy for implementation those things it wanted to accomplish and the tools it would need.

Ms. Schulz suggested that the matrix could be revised to illustrate, similar to the more technical staff work program matrix, to help elected officials understand what actions were necessary in order to implement an element of the strategy.

Mr. Stewart suggested that staff provide an explanation of what was entailed to achieve each of the outcomes on the matrix. He said, for example, if more rural residential development on farm or forest land in the Lowell area was the outcome it could involve several lengthy and expensive exemption processes and not just endorsement of the strategy. He wanted cities to clearly understand the benefits of endorsing the strategy and what could and could not be achieved through endorsement. Ms. Heinkel referred to an April 26, 2006, letter from Lane Shetterly, Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) director discussing that what was no longer possible without RPS were rural residential uses on farm and forest land and allowing small scale farming outside UGBs in rural areas.

In response to a question from Mr. Weathers, Ms. Schulz said that small scale farming was defined as the person residing on the property was doing the farming and it was not at the level of large commercial farms. Ms. Heinkel said that prohibition was based on State law and there would need to be another RPS to vary from that.

Ms. Heinkel said there seemed to be agreement that the strategy would be reviewed by each of the local governments first and the Policy Board would reconvene at a later date to make its recommendation. Mr. Vanderpool noted that the County was a different player in the process because each jurisdiction was required in any land use action to coordinate with the County but not with each other, with some exceptions such as Metro Plan amendments.

Mr. Vanderpool and Ms. Heinkel summarized the Strategy endorsement process expressed by the Policy Board and asked for confirmation that this was what they wanted to occur:

- LCOG would work with cities to clarify the implications of strategy elements
- Cities would identify strategy benefits and coordinate with the County so the County recognized what cities wanted to achieve through endorsement
- Staff would present a Draft Strategy in June, along with a critical path for obtaining endorsement on the strategy from the jurisdictions that would include:
 - presentations to policy bodies about the implication of implementation measures and how they could be achieved
 - determine with each jurisdiction if it was ready to endorse and if not, what changes to the Strategy were desired (process with Eugene and Springfield would include a separate collaborative process with each other and Lane County to assure goals were achievable and feasible at the metro level)
- Staff would return to Policy Board in October with a revised Strategy that contained input from all jurisdictions and agreement with Eugene and Lane County
- Policy Board recommends Strategy for endorsement at its October meeting
- Formal endorsement of the Strategy by the cities and the county would follow

Ms. Heinkel indicated it was important to determine at this point which jurisdictions were interested in using the regional data and being included in the capacity analysis. Mr. Vanderpool suggested that LCOG would work with each jurisdiction to help them answer those questions. He said staff would revise the next steps schedule and distribute it to members.

6. Wastewater Evaluation: Pleasant Hill, Goshen and Alvadore

Mr. Mason said that a year ago the Department of Environmental Quality was asked to evaluate relative potential effects of onsite wastewater systems in the Rural Growth Scenario. He said the purpose was to evaluate how onsite septic systems might affect human health and the environment. He said the conclusion of that analysis was that if densities increased above one or two acre lots there could potentially be impacts. He said the updated evaluation focused on three specific areas within the unified Regional Growth Concept that had changed growth concepts slightly since the initial evaluation and whether community wastewater systems were appropriate:

Alvadore – retain a more rural character with lower density – probably would not need a community-wide wastewater treatment solution, onsite systems adequate as long as properly sited

Goshen – low density urban residential and including more commercial and industrial uses – recommend either community-wide wastewater system or at least neighborhood level systems instead of onsite systems on every lot

Pleasant Hill – small city residential densities along with additional commercial uses– recommend either community-wide wastewater system or at least neighborhood level systems instead of onsite systems on every lot

7. Regional Economic Opportunities Analysis

Mr. Helton said that ECONorthwest had applied experience in conducting numerous analyses under Statewide Planning Goal 9 for jurisdictions across the State. His analysis looked at the potential of 50 years of growth in the southern Willamette Valley and was intended to determine what the demand for employment was likely to be, total employment growth in the region, the type of employment growth and distribution by community and type. He said that results of his analysis were then compared to the Regional Growth Concept. The economic opportunities analysis, consistent with Goal 9 requirements, considered national and regional trends, assessed the economic development potential of the area, identified the industries that were likely to expand in the area and their site needs. He said that ECONorthwest was currently, as a separate project, conducting a buildable lands inventory for Lane County and those results would be fed into the Regional Growth Concept results for a supply and demand comparison of industrial and commercial lands to meet statewide planning goal 9 requirements for those cities that indicated they wanted to use that analysis.

He reviewed the methodology used for the analysis as set forth in his written report and said one of the challenges of a 50-year forecast was that his initial forecast assumed that communities could expand their UGBs to accommodate forecast demand, although he did consider physical constraints on growth such as it was unlikely that Eugene would breach the ridgeline.

Mr. Kelly pointed out that the Regional Growth Concept did show Eugene breaching the ridgeline into the Lane Community College basin. Mr. Helton agreed and said his intent was to indicate that he did not consider land supply or the availability of buildable land as a constraint affecting distribution and the physical constraints he did consider were primarily locational.

Continuing, Mr. Helton said that unlike a shorter term analysis, a 50-year forecast included underlying assumptions that were subject to change. He highlighted some of those assumptions:

- No internal or external shocks to the economy
- Continuation of the business cycle that would generate periods of expansion and recession with net growth over the long run
- Increased costs for energy and natural resources that would compel conservation and diversification
- Continued innovation in electronics and communication technology applied to production
- Continued growth in global trade and globalization of business activity
- Increased mobility of households and businesses and importance of quality of life in location decisions
- Continued investments in infrastructure to support growth and maintain quality of life

Mr. Helton said based on methods and underlying assumptions he made projections of employment growth in the region. He said the LCOG was the source of base information about total regional employment in 2000 and its distribution in the County. He highlighted the major employment sectors—services, retail trade, manufacturing and government—that comprised almost 75 percent of employment in the region. He said in the analysis he also considered indicators of future growth such as historical growth of employment and population, projected population growth from the Regional Growth Concept and the State’s ten-year employment growth projections. He said a key factor was the ratio of population to employment in the County, which he did not think would continue to increase over time. Regarding population growth, he said historically 70 percent was the result of in-migration and 30 percent was natural increase and expected growth meant that people would continue to migrate to the area and increase the diversity of specialization in the economy. He said age was also an important consideration in the relationship of population to employment and he expected that an aging population would slightly lower the ratio of employment to population by 2055.

Mr. Weathers asked why agriculture, forestry and fishing numbers were low. Mr. Helton said that only employment that was covered by Unemployment Insurance was reported in data for an industry.

Mr. Helton said that forecasted employment growth in the area between 2000 and 2055 was based on the following assumptions:

- Employment would grow slightly slower than population at 0.7 percent annually, resulting in a total growth of 63,000 jobs
- Manufacturing would continue to decline as a share of employment but not as much as in the past
- Retail trade would remain at about the same share
- Services would continue to increase but not as much as in the past
- Government would grow with population
- Manufacturing, retail trade, services and government would continue to comprise 75 percent of the employment in the region, with most growth in services followed by retail trade, government and manufacturing

Mr. Helton said that a majority of growth in the services sector would be in businesses and health services, retail trade would see growth in all types, local government would grow and manufacturing growth would occur in transportation and industrial equipment, recreation equipment and apparel and food processing of

organics and specialty products. He thought there was also potential for large warehouse and distribution facilities to serve the growing population in the Willamette Valley.

Mr. Helton reviewed factors affecting the distribution of employment growth within the region, including quality of life, access to shipping services, areas of population growth, urban areas and availability of suitable sites. He presented a table of capacity for employment growth by community and said it indicated that there was apparently enough land at the regional level for the expected employment growth.

Mr. Kelly asked what drove the capacity numbers. Mr. Helton said it was based on the amount of land in the Regional Growth Concept, assumptions about redevelopment and infill and capacity of that land for employment density based on the type of land.

Mr. Weathers asked how loss of employers in a community was addressed. Mr. Helton responded that the figures only represented capacity. On the demand side he expected that employment in Lowell would increase and exceed historic levels because of population growth and quality of life characteristics. Ms. Heinkel added that the data would be updated based on input from communities and requested changes.

Mr. Weathers asked if the demographics of population growth, such as families, would be proportionately distributed between urban and rural areas. Mr. Helton replied that he had not explicitly attempted to model the demographic distribution and factor it into his employment analysis.

In response to a question from Mr. Pettiti, Mr. Helton said that the numbers represented actual employment in 2055, not employment growth.

Mr. Helton said that he considered distribution of demand by community and the two communities that might not have the capacity for projected demand were Coburg and Lowell. He said that updated information from Lowell would likely resolve that issue and Coburg, which was a viable location for industrial development, had expressed a desire to be smaller than its maximum capacity. He said there were two options for communities—expand the land supply to accommodate growth or shift the growth to other communities—and the question was whether the growth would go elsewhere in the region or outside the region altogether. He felt that it was likely employment would shift within the region.

Mr. Helton outlined a number of siting factors that would influence employment growth and presented the following conclusions:

Small Outlying Communities: Pleasant Hill, Lowell and Oakridge

- Retail and local services would grow along with the population
- Some specialty manufacturing and construction businesses attracted by quality of life

Central but Smaller Communities: Junction City, Veneta, Coburg and Creswell

- Retail and local services would grow along with the population
- Some specialty manufacturing and construction business attracted by quality of life, with some opportunity for larger manufacturers
- Traffic congestion between Veneta and areas to the east might limit the type of businesses that locate there

Eugene:

- Retail and local services would grow along with the population

- Some specialty manufacturing and construction business attracted by quality of life, with some opportunity for larger manufacturers
- Potential for larger manufacturers – 50+ acres
- Potential for larger commercial centers and big-box retail
- Demand for suburban office locations
- Growth creates opportunity for redevelopment of brownfield, retail and nodal development

Mr. Helton said that land supply was a critical issue in the potential for shifting industrial development within the region because availability of sites was the primary factor for businesses with very specific site needs. He said businesses with special site needs included those that were tied to the region such as big-box retail, services and local institutions and those that could be attracted to the region with suitable sites. He said there were other considerations not captured in the analysis, including:

- Planning for certain types of site needs for institutions
- Demand in the economy for high amenity sites for large employers
- Redevelopment in urban areas
- Heavy industrial sites for expansion and relocation of existing businesses
- Aspirational planning and regional competition

8. Next Steps/Adjourn

Ms. Heinkel and Mr. Vanderpool summarized the next steps and asked if the policy board agreed. Policy Board members nodded in agreement and none stated an objection:

- Continue with capacity analysis based on feedback from the board
- Proceed with Housing Needs Analysis and second stage of the Economic Opportunities Analysis and environmental evaluation of the Concept
- Revise the transportation element in the Strategy
- Provide the board completed reports, above, along with the updated transportation component at the May 2006 meeting
- Identify a critical path for input from local officials to occur over the summer and early fall and Strategy endorsement after October policy board meeting and present path at the May meeting
- Continue to work with the individual jurisdictions to help them identify issues they wanted in the draft strategy
- Bring revised Draft Strategy to June meeting that will be released for review and comment to local officials prior to October policy board meeting

Mr. Stewart adjourned the meeting at 8:27 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)