

MINUTES

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

June 29, 2006
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Faye Stewart, Vice Chair (Lane County), Ron Pettiti (Creswell), Mike Watson (Coburg), David Kelly (Eugene), Warren Weathers (Lowell), Glenn Fortune (Oakridge), Marion Esty (Veneta), Neil Friedman (Westfir), members; Carol Heinkel, George Kloeppe, Byron Vanderpool, 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), Tim Brooker (Veneta), Susan Ban, Mike Eyster (Lane Transit District), Erik Andersson (Governor's Economic Revitalization Team).

GUESTS: Stephanie Schulz (Lane County Land Management), 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).

1. Welcome and Introductions

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

2. May 30, 2006 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Weathers, seconded by Mr. Kelly, moved to approve the minutes of the May 30, 2006, meeting as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Public Comment

Mr. Stewart called for public comments.

Jim Babson, Land Watch, expressed his continuing concern about the citizen involvement for Phase 3. He said the board should not rush to get it done as little happens during the summer. He asked if the involved jurisdictions had the time or money needed for citizen involvement. He said that now there was something to look it, now was the time for public scrutiny, and he was discouraged as he did not see that happening.

Referring to page 12 of the Draft Regional Growth Management Strategy, Mr. Babson said that the last sentence on that page had been changed from the previous draft, when its focus was on the policy advisory board's review of a public outreach strategy for Phase 3. He did not think the revised sentence, which read that the board would review and recommend endorsement of a final strategy to their elected bodies in fall 2006, did not have anything to do with citizen involvement.

4. Regional Housing Needs Analysis

Mr. Clingman invited questions about the model used in the analysis.

Ms. Ban asked if the data would be shared with the City of Eugene's Housing Policy Board. Mr. Clingman indicated staff would like to share the data with that group, which was an appropriate body for further discussion. He was unsure how that could work in the current schedule.

Mr. Kelly expressed surprise that templates 4 and 10 did not show more change given changing demographics. The only significant change was in ownership at the highest income level, which went down slightly. Mr. Clingman said he had not compared those numbers that carefully as they were calculations based purely on demographic distribution. The only change he anticipated was more old people and fewer young people, but it was broken into so many groups the changes were hard to see. Mr. Kelly said he would have expected more of a shift in the age of the population. He determined from Mr. Clingman that the numbers in templates 6 and 12 contained the same mix of housing as existed today, and that more work needed to be done on the model as each community thought about and discussed their future mix of housing. Mr. Kelly suggested that Template 12 be footnoted to that effect.

Mr. Kelly questioned why the gross analysis was not carried out to 2055. Ms. Heinkel said that both the housing analysis and economic needs analysis were done to assist local communities in meeting their Goal 9 requirements. The analysis identified a regional need, not necessary by type of housing but by level of affordability to give a picture of what was needed regionally. When LCOG staff sat down with each community it could make adjustments as needed. Mr. Kelly acknowledged that was one intent of the model, but he was disappointed that the model was not run to 2055 as a "gross sanity check." He wanted to be able to look at the total number of housing units compared to the total acres of residential land to determine an average density, which would then "map back" to the density numbers and land use section. Ms. Heinkel said that could be done because the land capacity model was run for both the urban growth boundary (UGB) and the growth area separately, and staff had that data. Mr. Kelly asked that the reason for the omission be highlighted in the text.

Mr. Weathers said that the model left out 25 percent of the population because it failed to address those who lived outside of the incorporated areas. He said that Goal 10 spoke to the need for flexibility in housing locations and density. Rural living was an important part of the culture and those who lived in rural areas would also need a place for their children to live. In addition, some of those living in urban areas might prefer the rural lifestyle and the board needed to ensure that opportunity was given to them on an affordable basis. He said that the analysis spoke to cities and not to the need for rural housing.

Mr. Clingman acknowledged the model aggregated housing inside the UGBs and did not address the rural areas. Mr. Kelly expressed concern about that. Mr. Clingman said the model lacked data regarding the tendencies of rural households in regard to renting and owning. He said that additionally, LCOG envisioned the model would be used to assist communities in the implementation of their strategies and possibly expansion of their UGBs; there was no similar process for rural areas. Mr. Weathers pointed out that 2/3 of the school population lived outside the UGBs, and it was important to ensure that those who wanted to live outside UGBs could do so. Mr. Clingman pointed out there was nothing to disallow that in the model; if one examined the table of coordinated population allocations, it was clear that the share of rural population was declining. Mr. Weathers suggested that was because there was no where for people to

live. The board needed to address residential land demand in rural areas as well as urban areas. Otherwise, the rural areas will lose diversity. Mr. Clingman observed that the rural areas were generally less affordable than the urban areas, which was a general trend. Mr. Weathers responded that was a change from the past, and the trend was driven by land use regulations. He said that Oregon needed to accomplish what was intended by land use planning without the unintended consequences that were occurring.

Ms. Heinkel suggested that Mr. Weathers' issues could be addressed in the strategy rather than the model.

Mr. Kelly agreed with Mr. Weathers, saying that the analysis should be published with a title page that contained several caveats, including the fact that housing units outside the UGBs were not included, that the model did not go to 2055, and that the housing type mix was assumed to be the same in 20 years as it was now. Mr. Clingman agreed. He noted that there were other assumptions, such as assessed market value, that if applied as a correction would make the affordability issue even look worse than it already does.

5. Regional Growth Concept Environmental Evaluation

Ms. Payne provided a PowerPoint presentation entitled *Regional Growth Concept: Environmental Evaluation and Future Directions*. The presentation included data that compared the built and natural environment for the Today Scenario and the Preferred Growth Scenario and indicated the Preferred Growth Scenario reduced urbanization impacts on key water and habit resources that could be expected as a result of current trends and policies. She highlighted the likelihood of future stress on environmental resources and that challenges to limit impacts would increase, in part due to denser urbanization. Ms. Payne suggested ameliorating technologies and strategies may be developed, including cleaner automobiles and better pollution controls. However, she emphasized that environmental challenges were here to stay and that ecosystem services formerly provided by nature were being degraded. There was a loss of open space and natural areas that affected quality of life. Ms. Payne stressed that environmental protection and restoration were not luxuries but necessities.

Ms. Payne discussed future strategies and approaches, including prevention and protection at the site of impact and regional collaboration on impacts that require large areas to mitigate. She reviewed a list of possible local initiatives and included best planning practices, building standards, land use and zoning regulations, and health and safety ordinances. She emphasized the need for a proactive and positive approach to problem solving. Ms. Payne then discussed potential regional initiatives, including mitigation banks, pollutant trading, and rural cluster development. She provided an overview of how cluster development worked in rural areas.

Ms. Payne reiterated that the Preferred Growth Scenario appeared to have less impact than current trends and policies. However, increased land use translated into increased environmental impacts. She recommended the formation of working groups to investigate and prioritize strategic policy changes. Each community could then assess its own needs and consider what results and recommended actions it wished to pursue.

Mr. Stewart asked if cluster development was happening in the rural areas today. Ms. Payne said yes. Mr. Stewart observed that if the County could offer such a development pattern it could allow more intense rural development without much impact. Ms. Payne said that was the intent. She shared an example from

Virginia contrasting land consumption using the cluster approach. She said that the approach provided measurable benefits to developers, who saved from having to build fewer driveways and clear less land.

Mr. Weathers suggested that people liked to live in open rural spaces, and the development patterns shared seemed more urban in nature to him. He said that people live in rural areas because they want privacy and a buffer from their neighbors. Ms. Payne suggested that there could be other ways to cluster development, and acknowledged that the pattern might not be suitable for everyone.

Mr. Watson commended the information presented and said that the cluster development approach could attract young families with children to rural neighborhoods with a more limited impact. Ms. Payne said that a local test development would be useful to demonstrate the approach.

Mr. Kelly also commended the presentation, in particular the contrasts provided.

6. Draft Regional Growth Management Strategy

Ms. Heinkel solicited changes to the draft strategy. She first called attention changes made as a result of the board's previous discussions.

Ms. Heinkel reviewed next steps in the process.

Mr. Stewart endorsed the proposed plans for outreach and asked if those who attended the community meetings would be contacted. Ms. Heinkel explained that staff would mail postcards to those individuals with the Web site address. There would also be a media release. She said that the regional outreach would depend on funding. She said that staff had a firm commitment for funding from Veneta and tentative commitments for funding from other communities, and staff would do as much as it could to reach out to the public.

Mr. Kelly encouraged staff to make it clear on the Web site how input could be shared.

Mr. Weathers and Mr. Kelly offered several suggested editorial changes to the strategy, which Ms. Heinkel recorded. Mr. Stewart suggested that Ms. Heinkel circulate the amended strategy for member review prior to its distribution. Ms. Heinkel agreed.

Mr. Kelly, seconded by Ms. Esty, moved to release the draft strategy to the public. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Strategy Endorsement Process and Funding

Ms. Heinkel cautioned that staff would do what it could with the funding available to help with the endorsement process. She said that staff would contact members about the funding needs.

Ms. Heinkel noted that the next meeting was scheduled for October 30, followed by a meeting on November 29. She said that it was possible both meetings would not be needed.

8. Picture Taking and Celebration!

The board had its picture taken and members celebrated the release of the Draft Regional Growth Management Strategy.

9. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)