

MINUTES

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

May 30, 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), Neil Friedman (Westfir), members; Carol Heinkel, George Kloeppe, Tom Schwetz, Susan Payne, Bill Clingman (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), Marion Esty, Tim Brooker (Veneta), Susan Ban, Mike Eyster (Lane Transit District), Erik Andersson (Governor's Economic Revitalization Team).

GUESTS: Stephanie Schulz, Janet Calvert, Eleanor Mulder (League of Women Voters), Kurt Yeiter (City of Eugene Planning), David Helton (ECONorthwest), Jim Babson (Land Watch), Anita Yap (Lane Transit District), Carlos Barrera (Goshen Area Neighbors), Lauri Segel (Friends of Eugene).

1. Welcome and Introductions

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

2. April 26, 2006 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Friedman, seconded by Mr. Fortune, moved to approve the minutes of the April 26, 2006, meeting as corrected. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Public Comment

Mr. Stewart called for public comments.

Jim Babson, Land Watch, commented that that the draft strategy indicated the Policy Advisory Board would review and approve a public outreach plan for spring of 2006 and local jurisdictions would schedule public meetings. He asked for clarification of Phase 3 of citizen involvement. Ms. Heinkel said that originally it was hoped an extensive coordinated public outreach effort for the draft strategy would be possible. She said that Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) had sought grant funding for that effort but was not successful. She said that within each jurisdiction and in the rural area there would be public meetings to allow people to speak to the local elected officials and planning commissioners and those would be structured according to the approach each community wished to take.

Mr. Babson urged that the public outreach phase be done well.

4. Regional Growth Management Strategy Next Steps, Implementation Strategy, and Endorsement Process)

Ms. Heinkel reviewed the document entitled *Regional Growth Management Strategy Next Steps, Implementation Strategy, and Endorsement Process*, which reflected direction from the board at its last meeting and comments received from board members on the initial draft. She said the document included a matrix of which implementation strategies each jurisdiction believed it might move forward with in the future. She noted additional information had been received since the agenda packet was mailed and said the matrix should reflect “maybe” for outcomes #4, #5 and #7 for Westfir. She said that the “maybe” shown for Junction City under #15 should be deleted. She also noted that #2 related to adoption of population allocations into comprehensive plans was technically a land use measure and should be moved to that category. She reviewed the critical path scope of work and estimated resource requirements to accomplish it and said that LCOG was suggesting a pooled fund from each jurisdiction and utility. She said that the Veneta City Council had already taken action on that.

Mr. Stewart asked for an update on what resources had been secured and the impact on the work plan if funds were not received. Ms. Heinkel said there were tentative commitments from Eugene Water & Electric Board (EWEB) staff for \$10,000, Veneta City Council approved \$2,500 and LCOG for \$25,000 to complete to the draft strategy phase. She was waiting to hear from the other jurisdictions and LCOG would do as much as it could to assist with getting the strategy through the endorsement process.

5. Revised Regional Growth Concept, Coordinated Population Allocations, and Draft Housing Needs Analysis

Ms. Heinkel reviewed the agenda attachments that included a regional growth concept map, tables on population and employment, proposed coordinated population allocations and a comparison between adopted allocations for 2025 and 2030 and the proposed allocations. She noted that revised coordinated population allocations were the most definitive product of the strategy and based on assumptions about development types. She said the allocations would be used in both the housing needs analysis and the regional economic opportunities analysis. She said the methodology for Springfield projections was based on historic trends back to 1950. She said that totaling the population for each of the urban growth boundaries and growth centers and placing the remainder in Lane County added approximately 20,000 people to the County than would otherwise be expected and was a cushion for the unanticipated consequences of Measure 37. She said that could always be revised and updated in a few years.

Mr. Clingman stated that work with the housing needs analysis was still preliminary, but would discuss the data that would be put into it and the type of information it would provide. He said the model was developed by Richard Bjelland of the Oregon Department of Housing and Community Services and consisted of a series of Excel spreadsheets, templates, formulas and graphs to allow each community to assess its current inventory of housing and future needs for housing by type of housing structure and price. He said an analysis of each community would be completed and for purposes of the model’s application to the Regional Growth Concept the results would be aggregated to provide a picture of housing needs across the region and options for meeting those needs. He reviewed some of the spreadsheets in the model and explained how they were interrelated and functioned to calculate the needs for various types of housing. He said that “out factors” included people, both owners and renters, who could afford housing in a higher price bracket but chose to secure housing in a lower price bracket. He said that many of the factors in the

model required significant research, such as determining whether a dwelling was a rental or owner-occupied. He used maps to illustrate the distribution of owner-occupied and rental properties in the Eugene-Springfield area and distribution of housing by price. He noted that similar maps of smaller communities were also available. He said values in the model were tied to 1999 dollars.

Mr. Kelly arrived at 6:05 p.m.

Mr. Pettiti commented that the dollar value of housing seemed very low; it was not possible to buy a house for \$56,000.

Mr. Kelly said that perhaps prices were based on the last time properties were sold. Mr. Clingman said that data was obtained from the Lane County Assessor's database and the intent was to give the board a sense of what information could be generated. He said an inventory for each community and aggregate for the region would be presented at the next board meeting. Ms. Heinkel added that the model could identify regional housing needs and each community could determine how those needs were met within its urban growth boundary.

Regarding the critical path scope of work, Mr. Kelly said he hoped that meetings, particularly with nonparticipating jurisdictions, would be held well in advance of October 1, 2006. Ms. Heinkel said those meetings were included in tasks for the time period April through June and that process had begun. She said that coordination is needed now only with the City of Springfield because the population allocations of the other non-participating jurisdictions – Florence, Dunes City, and Cottage Grove – are the same as the currently adopted figures, thus no action is requested of those cities; but that Springfield does not have an adopted coordinated population allocation figure apart from the metro figure and, since Eugene's allocation figure will most likely be reduced significantly, the City of Springfield will need to inform the regional partners what figure it wants to use.

She said that Springfield officials have stated publicly that they are embarking on a residential lands study and that whatever figure the city uses in that analysis could be plugged into the table prior to adoption of the revised figures by the LCOG Board. She said the figure for Springfield in the table in the Strategy was calculated based on past trends back to 1950. She said that coordination with Springfield will also be needed prior to implementation of any land use measures for Eugene that require a Metro Plan amendment. She said that Springfield planning staff were invited to and attended the last RTAC meeting to begin the coordination process.

6. Revised Transportation Element

Mr. Schwetz distributed a revised version of the transportation element and a chart showing commuter patterns between Eugene-Springfield and outlying communities. He said conclusions from the preliminary transportation analysis were that regardless of the growth scenario there was a series of significant transportation issues to address across the region. He said the analysis provided a broad perspective from a transportation planner's perspective of how the regional growth concept affected the transportation system from a regional context. He said there would be a need for significant improvements to County roads that would provide connectivity throughout the region and improvements to the State system would also be necessary, although many of those had already been identified in the Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) regional transportation plan and other plans.

Mr. Schwetz stated that the detailed analysis examined the region in four categories: the metro area, the south-southeast area, the northern area and the western area. He said spreadsheets contained all existing local and regional transportation plan projects and added other projects. He noted that the plans only extended to 2025 or 2030 and the projects identified that were beyond the planning horizons of existing plans were meant to serve for illustrative purposes only. He said the analysis should point to solution sets rather than specific projects and encourage expansion of viable transportation choices and new types of partnerships to allow better planning, development, financing and management of the transportation system. He used a toll road project in the Newburg-Dundee area south of Portland as an example of an innovative partnership.

In response to a question from Mr. Fortune, Mr. Schwetz said that the eastern most boundary of the Pleasant Hill area was defined as Jasper Road.

Mr. Fortune commented that by 2050 population in that area would warrant a four-lane road all the way to Lowell Junction. Mr. Schwetz agreed.

Mr. Friedman asked if the tables in the report were the same as in the last version. Mr. Schwetz said they were and it had been obvious during the review that most of the projects would be needed regardless of the growth scenario.

Mr. Kelly asked if the transportation element was a technical report in the sense that whatever strategy was adopted the reported would be considered background information but not adopted. Ms. Heinkel said it was and would help inform amendments to transportation plans at the individual community level.

Mr. Kelly expressed concern that there was a land use diagram that postulated a certain population but building the transportation needed to move that population was an exercise that the board would leave to its successors. He felt that adoption of the strategy should make clear that the land use element would not work if the transportation improvements were not made. He asked if the transportation model indicated the year of failure or only modeled 2055. Mr. Schwetz said only 2055 was modeled.

Mr. Kelly asked if an analysis could be done to determine when various components would fail in five year increments. Mr. Schwetz said that it would take an extensive amount of data for each incremental model run and suggested that engineering analyses could be used to determine capacity and identify deficiencies. He said a more rigorous analysis had been done within the 20-year time horizon of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Mr. Kelly noted that dollar amounts had not been attached to transportation investments and felt that there should be some statement about transportation infrastructure impact at the time of endorsement. Mr. Schwetz said that the technical group estimated \$2-4 billion in projects beyond the existing plans could be added between 2005 and 2050.

Mr. Stewart commented that toll roads had been used to fund transportation improvements in the eastern part of the country for some time. Mr. Schwetz agreed, but said the Dundee project was unique because of the level of private sector participation.

Mr. Stewart questioned how the region could pay for billions of dollars in transportation projects with a population increase of only 100,000. He asked if the analysis included examination of alternative transportation programs. Mr. Schwetz said there had not been an exhaustive review of alternative modes,

although some consideration was given to that during the Metro Plan update. He said that the Portland metro area was conducting an analysis to consider, with a budget in mind, what could be done in terms of transportation.

Mr. Fortune asked how long it typically took from the time a need was identified to when a project was actually completed in jurisdictions across the country. Mr. Schwetz replied that it was generally five to ten years from identification of a problem to a solution being built. He said that much of the transportation investment in the country over the last 20 or 30 years was focused on highways. He said one of the underlying principles was the concept of accessibility that transportation provided and the public policy question was how to provide that accessibility in a manner that best reduced the amount of time required for that access. He said factors in examining the issue included land use and density and doing things differently in the future.

Mr. Stewart said the discussion highlighted that when jurisdictions that struggled to find enough money to maintain the current transportation system were confronted with a list of projects necessary in the future it would force a search for different solutions.

Mr. Schwetz reviewed charts of commuting patterns in the region, including resident workers in small cities commuting to Eugene-Springfield and the percent of jobs in small cities held by Eugene-Springfield residents. He explained that the Census Bureau no longer provided data for individual small cities below a certain population threshold, like Coburg.

Mr. Watson pointed out that Coburg had a population of 1,000 but 3,500 people commuted into the community each day for jobs.

Mr. Schwetz pointed out the table illustrating the percentage of workers in each county who worked outside of their county of residence. He noted that Lane County was quite low at 4.1 percent and in some counties that figure was over 50 percent.

7. Draft Natural Resources Element

Ms. Payne distributed a revised natural resources element. She said the element provided both a regional perspective and local information to help jurisdictions identify what local initiatives could perhaps be pursued. She said the intent was to be proactive and look at natural resources differently than in the past. She said that conservation and restoration of habitat was not a luxury, but rather an essential component of maintaining a livable community and preserving amenities that attracted people to a place. A recent State Parks survey of recreational patterns indicated that most people spent their time in some form of passive recreation. She said that natural areas provided ecosystem services and acquisition and restoration of sufficiently large areas of good quality habitat could prevent economic disruptions when a species was listed as threatened or endangered. She listed three problems that required a regional solution:

- Loss of natural habitat and the Oregon landscape
- Recreational area use and need for more space as the population increased
- Degradation of water supplies

Ms. Payne said that habitat preservation could help address all of those issues from a regional perspective. She said that conservation banking was one technique that used a market approach to provide commercial value to habitat and encourage conservation and restoration through incentives.

Mr. Kelly asked how the banking approach could be applied to habitat when there was such a vast variety of habitat and much of it was specific to a species. Ms. Payne said that the concept needed to be addressed in greater detail but the intent was to develop areas in which conservation banks could be established and the bank in each area would represent a mixture of habitats that would provide options for restoring or replacing specific habitat. She agreed it was much more complicated to address habitat for individual species than to mitigate wetlands. She said the strategy would be to identify tracts of land large enough to hold multiple types of habitat with multiple species.

Mr. Weathers asked if the credits to mitigate for loss of habitat could be applied inside of city limits. Ms. Payne said she thought it was negotiable and gave several examples of how that might be used in an instance where development was proposed for a parcel with a Goal 5 resource on it.

Mr. Weathers asked if a city would have the opportunity to decide for itself whether public funds would be used to buy conservation easements within the city limits. Ms. Payne said that a city would have the authority to make that decision and could enact ordinances addressing natural resource preservation and conservation, although wetlands mitigation was governed by federal legislation.

Mr. Weathers questioned whether removing fir trees to create oak savannah habitat might conflict with the Forest Practices Act. Ms. Payne said a strategy would be required that would allow a property owner to choose to manage for habitat conservation instead of timber production.

Mr. Stewart asked if a region-wide inventory of existing natural resources could be developed. He said policy makers would need an understanding of existing resources in order to decide if conservation banking was an appropriate approach. Ms. Payne replied that an inventory could be developed but not with great certainty. She said the purpose of conservation banking was increase the amount or quality of existing habitat and property would have to be appropriate for banking. She said that banking could address recreational and water quality issues as well as habitat.

Mr. Weathers remarked that some species—such as elk, bear, cougar, eagle and osprey—thrived while the human population continued to grow. Ms. Payne commented that those species tended to be generalists and other species had much more specific habitat needs.

Mr. Kelly noted that examples of local initiatives had been eliminated from the document. Ms. Payne said those would be returned to the document.

Mr. Kelly questioned how much more developed the natural resources element should be until there was collective agreement on the general direction the board was heading. Ms. Heinkel agreed and said the same approach used for natural resources as with water; a number of implementation strategies could be identified for further action by jurisdictions. She said that Ms. Payne was developing a list of measures for each jurisdiction that would be informative for their individual planning efforts. Ms. Payne perceived the local initiatives as being embedded in the regional strategy.

Mr. Kloeppel observed that there could be a principle commitment that engaged multiple jurisdictions that shared a common need. He said there were ways to achieve success as the subregion level through collaboration of many types of jurisdictions, many of which were not at the table.

Mr. Kelly suggested having implementation strategies that were phrased on the level of “further researching the tool of conservation banking.” He said that would not be making a final decision on banking but would provide direction for further work and jurisdictions could choose to participate at a later point.

Mr. Friedman commented that conservation banking was not a new idea and had been used around the world for decades. He said there were many people with expertise and it would benefit the board to gain a better understanding of the tool.

Ms. Heinkel said that staff would propose strategies for the board to consider at its June 2006 meeting. In response to a question from Mr. Kelly she said that all jurisdictions had completed the planning matrix. She said that staff would be working with the County to conduct outreach to Goshen and Pleasant Hill and that would further inform the process. Regarding the coordinated population tables, she said that Florence and Dunes City were not being asked to take any action and staff was coordinating with Springfield on the housing needs analysis. She said the Springfield population projection was based on long-term historic trends and a cushion was built into the rural population in the event that Springfield desired more growth.

8. Regional Economic Opportunities Analysis: Part II

Mr. Helton said that the outlook for employment growth in the southern Willamette Valley was for continued employment growth over the long-term based on and reflected by the in-migration of population and firms, continued generation of new businesses and an aging population that would reduce the ration of employment to population. He said the leading sectors for growth opportunities included business and health services, retail trade, local government, especially schools and manufacturing/industrial. He reviewed a table of employment capacity for each community within the region based on population allocations in the regional growth strategy and concluded that the projected employment growth of 65,000 jobs could be easily accommodated within the region.

Mr. Kelly asked what capacity assumptions were made for the nonparticipating communities of Cottage Grove and Springfield. Ms. Heinkel said Cottage Grove requested that the existing comprehensive plan inside the city be used for development type assumptions and include an area to the south for industrial development. She said that for Springfield the existing comprehensive plan was used with nodal development assumptions retained. She said changes to the Eugene data resulted from revisions to the map that reflected current assumptions and modeling.

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. He said that a regional strategy would likely result in employment shifting within the region. He reviewed type of growth by community, the role of site availability and need for certain types of sites.

Mr. Stewart noted that growth of “big box” stores was predicted for Eugene, Springfield and Cottage Grove, but not Creswell, which was expected to growth significantly by 2050. Mr. Helton said he had reached his conclusion because it was unlike there would be another freeway interchange at Creswell and the current interchange was developed in a way that was not conducive to location of that type of retail.

Mr. Helton pointed out that his forecast included a range of potential employment growth but he thought there was a greater change that growth would be faster instead of slower. He said if employment growth was faster than projected the target of 200,000 could be reached by 2025 instead of 2050, which had implications for planning. He said the region’s capacity for employment growth was based on assumptions for density of development. He reviewed a table of existing density by community compared to density resulting from the regional growth concept. He noted that density varied considerably by type of employment, which made forecasting capacity challenging.

Mr. Kelly asked why Veneta’s net density was forecast to be higher than Eugene and Springfield. Mr. Helton replied that large manufacturing sites were low employment density and businesses like warehouses had a much higher density. The difference in densities among communities was a function of the mix of employment.

Mr. Kloeppe said it seemed that in 50 years there would be a substantial increase in commerce from home and asked how that was factored into the forecast. Mr. Helton said he did not assume any large shift in the mode of production or a significant increase in the percentage of the work force who would work from home; however, it was possible in a number of occupations. He said that people working from home were counted as employees and that actually increased employment density in an area.

Mr. Helton believed the density targets in the regional growth concept were attainable, particularly given the projected amount of commercial redevelopment, but there were still uncertainties with respect to both supply and demand. He said Region 2050 would guide the local comprehensive plans in the region and local jurisdictions were required to maintain a 20-year land supply. The key question was whether enough land had been designated to meet demand through the next round of comprehensive plan updates, not through the next 50 years. He said that jurisdictions could plan for growth early in the planning process or incrementally. He reviewed the key questions for Region 2050:

- Do we have enough land in the region to accommodate employment growth?
- Is the land we have in the right place and the right type to support employment growth?

Mr. Helton said the answer to both questions was yes, for now, within the context of regional planning through the next round of plan updates. He felt there would be enough land and diversity of sites to accommodate the economy, but that should be monitored to assure an adequate supply. He encouraged development of a better system to monitor the pattern of development and track buildable land in the region.

9. Adjourn

Mr. Stewart announced that the next Policy Advisory Board meeting was scheduled on June 29, 2006.

Ms. Heinkel said that the Regional Technical Advisory Committee would meet prior to the next board meeting to develop the draft strategy. She said the draft would be send to members in advance along with a description of any new material it contained.

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

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)