

DRAFT MINUTES

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

April 27, 2005
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Dwight Coon, Chair (Junction City); Faye Stewart, Vice Chair (Lane County), Mike Watson (Coburg); Marion Esty (Veneta); Mike Fleck (Cottage Grove), Tim Demanett (Creswell); David Kelly (Eugene), Ken Larsen (Lowell), Glenn Fortune (Oakridge), Neil Friedman (Westfir), Susan Ban (Lane Transit District Board); Erik Andersson, (Governor's Economic Revitalization Team), members; Carol Heinkel, George Kloeppe, Byron Vanderpool, Jamon Kent (Lane Council of Governments staff).

ABSENT: Judy Volta (Coburg), Matt Bjorn (Cottage Grove), Ron Hanson (Creswell); Kitty Piercy (Eugene), Barry Schweigert (Junction City); Peter Sorenson (Lane County), Warren Weathers (Lowell), Sue Bond (Oakridge), Fred Miller (Veneta), Gabrielle Schiffer (Governor's Economic Revitalization Team).

GUESTS: Stephanie Schulz (Lane County Planning), Kurt Yeiter (City of Eugene Planning); Stefano Viggiano (Lane Transit District), Greg Mott (City of Springfield Planning), George Walker (Springfield Public Works), Mike Wolf and Bill Mason (DEQ), Eleanor Mulder, Janet Calvert (League of Women Voters), Deb Brewer, Brad Taylor (EWEB), Tim Duy (UO), Carlos Barrera (Goshen Area Neighborhood Association), Marguerite Nabeta (Department of Land Conservation and Development).

1. Welcome and Introductions

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

2. March 24, 2005 Meeting Minutes

The minutes were approved unanimously.

3. Public Comment

There was no one wishing to speak. Mr. Coon noted that no minutes recorder was in attendance. Ms. Heinkel and Mr. Vanderpool offered to fill the gap.

Mr. Coon asked Ms. Heinkel to share a recent request. Ms. Heinkel asked the Board if they would approve Mr. Stewart signing letters to the directors of state departments to thank them for the work performed by their staff. The Board agreed.

4. Draft Evaluation Results: Economy

Ms. Heinkel introduced Tim Duy, UO Economics Professor and Director of the Economic Forum at the UO. Mr. Duy presented the results of his recent evaluation of the alternative growth scenarios. He began by reporting that there is an old story that where you have three economists, you have opinions because economists don't always agree. Mr. Duy described limitations of analysis – compared statistical analysis of other regions – not analysis within SMSAS – no systematic way to say how Eugene – Springfield region relates to other metropolitan regions. Analysis is critical on: Variety of consumer goods, Deep marriage market, Quality of public services; and Speed of transit. Other point made by Mr. Duy were:

- Hard to say what information technology will do for us.
- What can we say about these scenarios?
- Likely risks associated with different scenarios.
- No one scenario will be selected – what works for Lowell may be one scenario and for another area, another scenario.
- Read through assumptions in report.
- Economic criteria from Regional Goals. Looked at criteria and evaluated whether it was worth the risk to the regional economy. Talked about the example of the Royal Caribbean and idea that you didn't want to take the risk of spreading firms throughout region. Risked firms locating outside the region.
- Pointed at that 87% of new residents moved to Eugene-Springfield area – even though % growth in small cities has been higher in recent years.
- Need to recognize preferences. Given preferences and firms location decisions, Compact most clearly matched preferences and firm behavior. Don't want to mess with that pattern of growth.

- Satellite – No reason to believe that outlying communities can't be very livable places. However, there are potential risks – because data assumes we will guide firms to outlying areas. If you do that, you run risk of firms leaving area all together.

- Even in Satellite scenario, none of small cities are very big – about 25,000. May be able to support single industry. Run risk that economy vulnerable to downturns in that scenario.

- Rural – least consistent with the way things are. Particularly Goshen area which has high potential for economic development and in Rural Scenario Goshen stays a rural residential area.

- Infrastructure will not be able to support movement of goods and people in Rural.

- That is not to say that one scenario might work well in one area and others work in other areas.

Conclusions:

- Don't force people to live and firms to locate where they don't want to be.
- What if there are conflicts between new and existing residents?
- What if the impacts fall disproportionately on low income groups – Boulder for example?
- We want to allow preferences to be expressed without risk to regional economy.

Ms. Esty stated that she did not care if Veneta develops as an economic center; lots of people are moving there and want to be there. She agreed that companies may not want to locate in Veneta. She stated that citizens may want Veneta to be a bedroom community and she hopes Veneta will have young and old, not like Boulder.

Mr. Kelly said he enjoyed reading the paper; that, at end, the report says small communities might back out but overall tone is that big cities will have most of the growth. Bedroom communities will have impacts on metro cities.

Mr. Duy replied that the best rewards could have the greatest risks. Not saying one would work better than another – just that Compact would be least risky. – No comparisons are available because most edge cities in the rest of the country are so much bigger than small cities in this region.

Mr. Kelly agreed that high risk is worth considering – he was reading “better” or “worse” but agrees that Mr. Duy is talking more about risk strategy. - Forcing firms? Just land supply not “forcing”. Welfare issue – is my life convenient in terms of commuting? But also are my taxes too high? Could have counter-balancing forces.

Mr. Duy replied that new well water facilities a lot more expensive than expanding regional system. Smaller lot sizes – lower cost of infrastructure.

Mr. Andersson said he recognized difficulties in analysis, Compact would allow outlying areas to attract businesses – scenarios are not mutually exclusive.

Mr. Duy said they would not want to limit development in core or to prevent firms from moving to outlying region.

Mr. Andersson asked what about regional approach to economic development – are there advantages over each of the 11 local governments acting independently?.

Mr. Duy agreed that a regional approach would have advantages to the regional economy over each jurisdiction acting independently. He cited enterprise zones as an example of making it competitive.

Mr. Fleck said from a small town perspective, he appreciates Mr. Duy's evaluation of Rural Growth Scenario. He has always thought that scenario is not realistic; need to consider realities of where businesses are going to go.

Mr. Steawrt said Monaco did not choose to expand in Coburg because they were better off economically. They did it because they liked Coburg. He thinks rural areas or small cities may attract some firms because that is where they want to be.

Mr. Duy said to look at the map of the Rural Growth Scenario – a lot different from satellite or compact – huge tracks of residential development. Not to say some firms may locate outside metro cities, especially small cities. Essential consideration is that major economic activity will be in metro cities.

Mr. Friedman said he really appreciates the analysis. Economics trumps everything and this carries more weight than anything produced so far in Region 2050. Most important of all evaluations.

Ms. Ban asked Neil if the reason it is important is because it considers people's preferences. She suggested that all the other evolutions were important and addressed economic as well as education, water, wastewater and others. Mr. Kelly agreed. Mr. Friedman agreed that was probably why he thought this was so valuable.

Mr. Coon said he thought the evaluation was drawn more to Compact and wondered if in other studies he's done has time of travel distance to metro cities factored in? Given how close Junction City is to Eugene would it fit more with Compact philosophy?

Mr. Duy said that "30 minutes" was considered convenient commute but people would prefer even shorter but if infrastructure doesn't work well and urban core is dense it might be faster to commute to small cities than within big cities. When you get to finer levels of detail you can take a different view.

Mr. Fortune asked Isn't commute issue regional? In L.A. they commute more than here one way.

Mr. Duy agreed commuting preferences can change, but there is still a high level of commuting over other preferences in L.A. and other areas.

Mr. Fleck said he did not mean to sound negative about the Rural Scenario but cautioned that we need to be careful.

4. Draft Evaluation Results: Wastewater Facilities

Ms. Heinkel introduced George Walker and reminded Board that they reviewed an earlier assessment and that Mr. Walker would present survey results and findings.

Mr. Walker handed out the evaluation; he recognized all the people who were involved in the analysis and said he'd speak to highlights.

He read summary of findings and table 1 with survey results. Dollar values are not a huge difference in scenarios – there is a range, but doesn't eliminate the possibility of any of the scenarios. Satellite is most expensive but not that much difference. Rural has lowest initial capital costs.

- Operations and maintenance will be an important factor that has not yet been considered.
- Regulatory requirements also not considered.
- Eugene, Springfield, Oakridge, Cottage Grove – ready to serve growth.
- Have done engineering analysis and made plans.

- Oakridge and Westfir - plan to share regulatory facility but are now on two separate ones.

- Difficult for many small cities to estimate costs because they don't have engineering studies, but supportable data.

- Coburg has put a lot of effort in their studies and money reflected in table.

- Rural residential is assumed to have on-site systems because we didn't have data to estimate which areas would have community systems.

Mr. Coon asked about population capacity. Numbers for Junction City don't seem right – Ms. Heinkel offered to check with City staff.

Mr. Walker said no capital value on a per unit basis – no O & M costs were addressed in the analysis. Ownership of facilities not addressed.

- For example, Compact does not try to address extending municipal facilities to Coburg (Mike W. interjected) No comparison of larger regional system examined other than as shown in Compact.

- Mr. Walker walked through remainder of the paper that describes different types of wastewater systems and discussed the information. .

- George Ehler provided information on the five models for on-site systems published by EPA. – page 4 of report.

- Mr. Walker discussed assumptions and objectives and noted they were same as those used for other facilities criteria from goals and objectives.

Mr. Kelly asked if costs to serve are not for existing residents?

Mr. Walker replied yes except that some money for MWMC are increments that provide facilities for existing – has to do with function of facility itself.

Mr. Kelly asked in issues column, was it extrapolated beyond 20 year planning period.

Mr. Watson, Coburg, said for Coburg this is key, saying: Coburg's population and employment does not vary in scenarios – reality is – without sewer, Coburg does not grow; when you calculate \$26,000,000 and 1,000 people you see our challenge; was interested to hear Mr. Walker say MWMC looking at other communities and that for Coburg, this is key.

Mr. Walker noted that the political arena would need to adjust for regional facility to be considered as a solution.

Mr. Watson talked about how Coburg provides jobs for the region and needs regional cooperation for wastewater to serve its small population.

Mr. Fleck said the dollars reflect current need – plans also address future capacity. He asked if others are dealing with new TMDLs and what about storm water?

Mr. Walker said one of the assumptions is that we base analysis on regs in force today – no way to crystal ball what future requirements will be and don't yet know impact of TMDLs. Stormwater is addressed in another evaluation.

Mr. Vanderpool said they are waiting for next set of regulations on TMDLs.

Mr. Friedman said the numbers for cost are astronomical especially Eugene's. For Westfir should say 166 in capacity not 460.

Mike Wolfe, DEQ presented.

Evaluation of On-Site Facilities in Rural Growth Scenario:

Mike Wolf and Bill Mason, DEQ, presented.

Mr. Wolf gave a broad overview of the topic of septic system issues and considerations of cumulative impacts of systems.

- Not to be outdone by the University at the beginning of Mr. Duy's presentation, for this exercise, DEQ brought together 2 hydrologists, resulting in 4 opinions and a conclusion that "more research needs to be done"!

- He indicated that Bill Mason will follow with more specific results of an evaluation of impacts to groundwater from on-site septic systems, including considerations under increasing densities of systems.

- On-site septic systems are intentionally designed to discharge wastewater below the surface and as such, by nature, they discharge pollutants.

- "Failing" septic systems are generally those where sewage reaches the surface of the ground and can come in contact with people.

- The task that was intended to be addressed here was to evaluate the anticipated cumulative effect of on-site septic systems on ground water at densities suggested under the Rural Growth Scenario.

- Proximity to surface water, depth to ground water, hydrology, soils, density of septic systems are all important factors that can influence the cumulative impact of septic systems on ground water quality.

- A rule of thumb is: the higher the densities of systems or the shallower the depth to ground water, the greater the risk of adverse impact.

- The Policy Board requested refinement to the general rule of thumb, hoping to have perspective on where, within the region, the risk to ground water from on-site septic systems would be expected to be relatively less.

- In order to provide perspective on the above question, Mr. Mason evaluated existing methodology, and tested that methodology to estimate nitrate impacts in the Coburg area. Results of application of the methodology closely matched results of actual ground water monitoring for bacteria, so the methodology was accepted as reasonably valid for the purposes of this exercise.

- He then applied the methodology to selected other areas of the region – based on ideas from the Policy Advisory Board – in an effort to estimate or coarsely predict expected levels of nitrates in ground water as a result of relatively dense placement of on-site septic systems. Results indicate that lot size is a much more influential determinant on expected nitrate levels than the design/technology of the on-site systems themselves.

- The tool/methodology is very limited in application, and the results are useful for comparing the anticipated impact of one area to another, but the results it gives are by no means absolute. One of the critical factors that is quite variable is the differing hydrogeology of areas being compared – e.g.. Pleasant Hill, Lowell, Goshen, Alvadore.

Recommendations:

- Carefully place higher densities of on-site septic systems, especially when going from 5 to 1 or 2 acre lot rural development.

- Use existing information – well logs, NRCS soils data, DEQ source water assessments, groundwater vulnerability maps to help evaluate and compare areas for risk to surface and ground water.

Mr. Wolf indicated that for this exercise, DEQ did not evaluate community septic systems, and only looked at risk for groundwater contamination from nitrates. There are other issues that should ultimately be evaluated, e.g. pharmaceuticals from home-based products that are introduced to septic systems, etc.

Mr. Mason indicated that some costs have not been considered in capital cost analyses of wastewater infrastructure among the scenarios, e.g. costs to replace domestic wells if they are contaminated. He indicated that agency help is generally not available for individual homeowners to evaluate/anticipate impacts to ground water, and that there are a number of risks in the Rural Growth Scenario that need to be considered carefully.

Mr. Mason closed with questions to the Policy Advisory Board about the adequacy of the analysis for the purpose of its discussion, reiterated the limitations of the analysis that was done, and asked if more information is needed. Several sections in the report that was handed out were left intentionally blank, awaiting information back from other sources. This will be incorporated, but will not substantially alter the conclusions drawn. Under the analysis that was performed, the Coburg area and areas similar in characteristics are highest risk for groundwater contamination.

Ms. Ban asked about location of on-site septic systems to rivers. Mr. Mason replied that while that question was not specifically addressed in this analysis, a standard recommendation is to avoid placement of the most dense on-site septic system developments near surface waters.

DEQ and the Department of Human Resources have been working for three years to develop Source Water Assessments, which are excellent sources of readily available information, though they are not as accessible as desired.

Mr. Coon said he liked the analysis, especially as it pertains to RGS – there is potential for rural development. If people can't find rural area here they like they'll move to another area that may be riskier.

Bill Mason said a site analysis could be done by a planning department, using existing information for starters. Cluster or community systems could be evaluated for certain areas.

Break

5. DRAFT Public Outreach Process and Materials

Ms. Heinkel handed out copies of the Draft Design Your Future newsletter.

She reminded the Board that staff was not starting from scratch - the newsletter reflects five years of work.

Ms. Heinkel listed several proposed edits she had received from staff.

She described the Community Meeting process and said this is the Cadillac of public process. More structure/process than is usual.

Ms. Heinkel pointed out the maps on page 2 to clarify distinctions between scenarios.

Mr. Kelly complemented the map makers. "The maps are great" There was general agreement.

Ms. Esty asked if these be in libraries.

Ms. Heinkel said yes, extras are being made to allow for that. She said staff wants to encourage people to fill out survey on-line.

Ms. Heinkel referred the Board to the language related to regional problem solving and indicated that was at Mr. Stewart's suggestion. .

She said it is important that people pre-register as much as possible and asked the Board to please encourage people to call and e-mail. This will allow us to send materials in advance.

Mr. Kelly, asked that it include info on draft evaluations and/or where more information to be found.

Mr. Fleck asked that staff double check on fold and size for newspaper inserts.

Mr. Vanderpool asked the Board to approve with edits and then group can double check that edits have been made via e-mail on Monday.

Ms. Heinkel handed out the RG editorial on growth in last Friday's paper.

She said she and Mr. Stewart and Mr. Coon (if available) meet with RG editorial board next week. She said that there will be an article in the RG the week before the insert is in the papers and that a news release will be reviewed by Mr. Stewart and Mr. Coon and then sent out to all the media and to the Policy Board for speaking points.

Ms. Heinkel said she will develop list of growth issues for each community to incorporate in each presentation.

She reported that she will be out of the country until May 31 and that Mr. Vanderpool and Denise Walters, LCOG Planner, will be LCOG contacts in her absence. .

Ms. Heinkel discussed the 3-hour Community Meeting process – Mayor welcomes, City Administrator/Manger presents growth issues for the community; she gives a brief presentation on Region 2050 and the meeting process; most of the meeting is in interactive small group discussions related to:

- Build your future community
- Draw preferred growth scenario.
- Protect quality of life.

Random Sample Citizen Panels will be separated out from community leaders group.

Mr. Watson advised that they need to watch out for developers and attorneys, may skew results – map showing where people live will help identify where people from.

Ms. Heinkel said there will be a report on the Veneta meeting at the June Policy Board meeting.

Mr. Vanderpool reported that LCOG has hired a new transportation modeler to help with the regional model work for Region 2050. .

Mr. Fleck asked if additional funding is needed on public outreach.

Ms. Heinkel reported that the Policy Board directed staff to seek funding for outreach and staff have been successful in obtaining it so far.

Mr. Friedman asked about continued involvement of Mr. Duy. Ms. Heinkel replied that Mr. Duy has agreed to return to the Board in September.

6. Work Program, Timelines, and Process

This agenda item was held over to the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned around 8:30 p.m.

Meeting notes taken by Byron Vanderpool and Carol Heinkel.