



Sustaining Quality of Life in the Southern Willamette Valley

October 18, 2005

TO: Regional Policy Advisory Board Members and Alternates

FROM: Regional Technical Advisory Committee (RTAC)

SUBJECT: Regional Growth Management Strategy Decision-Making Framework Options

This memo presents three optional decision-making approaches to create a framework for the Policy Advisory Board's discussion about the final products of the Region 2050 process and discusses the extent to which each approach satisfies the selection criteria identified by participants. It is conceivable that none of these options will match precisely all participants' desired process; but perhaps one of these will serve as a starting point for the discussion with the understanding that more discussion over the next several months could result in a variation of any of these or to an entirely new process.

Action Requested: Discuss decision-making options and clarify desired outcomes for the Regional Problem Solving process in preparation for the November 16, 2005 Policy Advisory Board discussion with Lane Shetterly, Director of the Department of Land Conservation and Development.

Assumptions

For the sake of this discussion, it is assumed that the Strategy itself will be a desirable outcome that all participants will support; and that the Preferred Growth Scenario Map achieves the goal of incorporating each community's vision while meeting regional population projections and Regional Goals and Objectives. Regardless of which approach the jurisdictions ultimately devise for endorsing the Strategy and the map, these assumptions are necessary in order to proceed with the discussion of the decision-making framework simultaneously with the development of the Strategy.

Background

Over the past five years, the Region 2050 process has been engaged in gathering data, projecting past trends, developing a base case scenario and alternative growth scenarios, and creating a forum for discussion among the local governments and local, state, and federal agencies. The public outreach process now underway seeks to broaden the dialogue to citizens and interest groups throughout the region. While this visioning and

public outreach progress, it is important to take the next step to define the desired outcomes for the product and process in preparation of this final phase of the project.

Policy Direction

Resolutions

Policy direction for the Strategy came initially from the resolutions (see sample attached) adopted in 1999 by the 11 participating local jurisdictions. Key phrases in the resolution that help define the intended desired outcome of policy makers are:

- *a Coordinated Growth Management Strategy for the Southern Willamette Valley*
- *an intergovernmental agreement*

The resolution lists the following types of agreements:

- *to cooperatively address growth management and public facility issues, including transportation;*
- *to use certain principles to guide growth management efforts, jobs/housing interactions, and transportation improvements in the region;*
- *to establish target population and density levels for each urban growth boundary (UGB);*
- *to implement provisions to protect transportation facilities, open space, watershed health, and agricultural land; and*
- *to implement provisions to minimize/guide development in areas outside and between UGBs.*

Regional Strategy Goal and Objectives

Further definition of the Regional Growth Management Strategy is written into the goals and objectives for the Strategy and for Land Use and Development that were unanimously approved by the Policy Advisory Board on October 24, 2001. In the summer and fall of 2004, the ten city councils and the Lane County Board of Commissioners held joint work sessions with their planning commissions to review and comment on the Region 2050 process, public outreach, and these goals and objectives. No objections or changes to the goals and objectives were requested through that process or through the extensive public outreach process to follow.

Regional Strategy Objective

- Identify regional needs, compare community visions with regional needs, identify gaps and conflicts, develop an action plan, and review periodically.
Implementation Action: Meet every four years to review relevancy of the action plan.

Land Use and Development Objective

- Identify the appropriate future distribution of population and employment throughout the region based on the vision of the region and the individual communities.

Over the past five years, the Regional Technical Advisory Committee and Regional Policy Advisory Board have provided direction on all products and have recommended and approved detailed work programs laying out the process for carrying out this policy direction. As the process enters its final phase, Strategy Development, with a Draft Strategy and Preferred Growth Scenario scheduled to be recommended by the Regional Policy Advisory Board by June, 2006, it is critical that participants begin the dialogue about the form of the final products. The options below are intended to aid in that dialogue.

Decision-Making Framework

Selection Criteria

The following criteria for developing a decision-making framework for the Regional Growth Management Strategy have been identified by participants over the course of the last five years. Recently, many of these criteria were reiterated by members of the Springfield City Council and Planning Commission in a joint meeting on Region 2050.

1. Modify an existing intergovernmental agreement rather than “re-invent the wheel.”
2. Retain local autonomy, and, if possible, increase local autonomy in land use decision-making.¹
3. Clearly define the roles and responsibilities of city, county, and state participants.
4. Maximize the flexibility of local governments to take actions not included in the Strategy when policy shifts or other conditions change.
5. Provide that any local government can initiate a change to the Strategy to address dramatic shifts in policy or other conditions.
6. Use the Strategy in place of, rather than in addition to, a state-mandated planning process, specifically periodic review.
7. Streamline the land use planning process at the state level and, if possible, at the local level.
8. Revisit the Strategy periodically to ensure its continued relevance and clearly define a process for monitoring and adjustment. Don’t let it be a document that “sits on a shelf.”

The matrix on the following pages describes how three options potentially match up against these criteria.

¹ Participants are particularly interested in not creating a process similar to the Metro Plan or Portland Metro.

Three Options

The three options presented in this paper are:

Option A: Motion to Endorse Option (“Rivers to Ridges”)

Option B: Urban Growth Management Agreement Option (Amend Joint Agreements for Planning Coordination to include provisions related to the Strategy and Preferred Growth Scenario Map)

Option C: Regional Growth Management Plan Option

As noted in the text below, the options range from the most flexible and least streamlined option (Option A) to the least flexible and most streamlined option (Option C). Option B comes closest to meeting most of the criteria for both flexibility and streamlining the land use process. To further illustrate these potential planning tools, staff have prepared a Draft Regional Growth Management Strategy Outline and Draft Intergovernmental Agreement (for Option B), included in this packet.

Option A: Motion to Endorse Option

This is the approach used to endorse “Rivers to Ridges – Metropolitan Regional Parks and Open Space Study Vision and Strategies” (June 2003). This vision and strategy were endorsed by motion of the Springfield and Eugene City Councils, the planning commissions of these cities plus the Lane County Board of Commissioners and the Willamalane Park and Recreation District as well as a number of advisory committees and public and private groups. The letter signed by the representatives of these groups explains the intent and impact of the endorsement (see attached sample letter). This process was, by definition, not a land use action.

Option B: Urban Growth Management Agreement Option

This option would result in 10 separate Joint Agreements for Planning Coordination, Regional Growth Management Strategy, and Preferred Growth Scenario Map among the Land Conservation and Development Commission, Environmental Quality Commission, Oregon Transportation Commission, Water Resources Commission, Boundary Commission, other state agencies, Lane County, and each of the 10 cities. This option also involves adoption of a jurisdiction-specific Preferred Growth Scenario Map and comprehensive plan amendments to reference the Strategy, as well as adoption of other measures each jurisdiction agrees to include in the Strategy.

For the 8 small cities in the region, the existing, adopted “Joint Agreements for Planning Coordination” between Lane County and each city will be amended or replaced; and new agreements would be developed for Eugene and Springfield because those cities are not currently party to Joint Agreements for Planning Coordination with Lane County (see Draft Intergovernmental Agreement, attached). These agreements satisfy the state requirements for Urban Growth Management agreements between cities and counties.

This approach uses the Regional Problem Solving Process to design solutions that would involve a land use action as part of the process. At the outset, each jurisdiction will adopt a Preferred Growth Scenario Map that is specific to their jurisdiction and a comprehensive plan text amendment that would defer to the Strategy rather than the comprehensive plan for compliance with Statewide Planning Goals, as specified in the Strategy. Over time, parcel-specific comprehensive plan map amendments and comprehensive plan text amendments adopted by individual jurisdictions in this process will be supported by the Region 2050 data base and the findings of compliance with Statewide Planning Goals contained in the Strategy. After LCDC adopts the agreement and acknowledges the Strategy and Regional Preferred Growth Scenario Map as consistent with the intent of the Statewide Planning Goals, no further action by LCDC will be required for local land use actions to implement the Strategy.² The agreements offer further opportunities to streamline the land use planning process at the local level as well as flexibility to take actions not included in the Strategy and flexibility to amend the agreement and the Strategy.

As shown in the matrix below, Option B has the potential to match most or all of the suggested selection criteria, assuming all can agree. For this reason, staff have provided specific examples of the form this option might take (see Draft Regional Growth Management Strategy Outline, and Draft Intergovernmental Agreement.)

Option C: Regional Growth Management Plan Option

This option would result in preparation of a parcel-specific regional plan and map that would be adopted by all jurisdictions. This option is similar to the Portland Metro region model. Regional oversight of the plan would be needed for continuity of implementation. This option would result in the least local autonomy and, thus, is not likely to be the favored option in this region. It is presented to illustrate the inverse relationship between flexibility and streamlining benefits.

² The Department of Land Conservation and Development is currently developing administrative rules that will clarify this.

Regional Growth Management Strategy Decision-Making Framework Options and Selection Criteria

Selection Criteria	Option A Motion to Endorse	Option B Urban Growth Management Agreement	Option C Regional Growth Management Plan
Modify an existing intergovernmental agreement.	No. The Strategy is endorsed by motion. No intergovernmental agreement is used.	Yes. Modifies the existing adopted “Joint Agreements for Planning Coordination” between Lane County and the eight small cities. Modifications to the agreement are needed to include provisions pertaining to the Regional Growth Management Strategy and new agreements are needed for Eugene and Springfield (not previously parties to this type of agreement).	No. A brand new Regional Plan is adopted by all participating local governments; and no intergovernmental agreements are involved.
Retain local autonomy.	Yes. Implementation of the Strategy is voluntary and at the discretion of each local government. Local governments retain local authority to designate and zone individual parcels.	Yes. The local government adopts a Preferred Growth Scenario Map specific to its jurisdiction; it can choose either the Regional Problem Solving Process or the administrative rule process for land use actions; and it can take actions that are not consistent with the Strategy. Local governments retain local authority to designate and zone individual parcels.	No. Local governments agree to a regional framework plan. A change in the plan is needed to take actions that are not consistent with the regional plan.
Increase local autonomy.	No. Jurisdictions do not take a land use action. They vote to demonstrate their support for the	Potentially, yes. It depends on how local jurisdictions define their respective roles in the long range	No. The Regional Plan sets the framework for growth at the regional level, including urban

Regional Growth Management Strategy Decision-Making Framework Options and Selection Criteria

Selection Criteria	Option A Motion to Endorse	Option B Urban Growth Management Agreement	Option C Regional Growth Management Plan
	Strategy and agree to use it as a guiding document. There is no change in the land use planning process itself or local control of the process.	planning process in the intergovernmental agreement and at what point in the process they decide to take a land use action. For example, if a jurisdiction decides to adopt the Preferred Growth Scenario Map and associated capacity analysis and findings of goal compliance concurrent with the Strategy and they are also adopted by LCDC, no further state approval could potentially be required. Need confirmation from DLCD.	reserves and the regional urban growth boundary (UGB).
Flexibility to take actions not in Strategy.	Yes. There is no change in the ability of the local governments to act independently of the regional vision.	Yes. The intergovernmental agreement specifically calls out the ability of local governments to use the existing administrative rule process in place of the Strategy.	No. The local governments must take actions consistent with the Regional Framework Plan.
Ease of changing Strategy	Yes. The Strategy document can define a process for changing the Strategy and the process is optional.	Somewhat. Any jurisdiction can initiate a change to the Strategy at any time. The intergovernmental agreement identifies a general timeframe and process for changing the Strategy; local and state resources would be required	No. Change in Regional Plan would require joint action by participating local governments.

Regional Growth Management Strategy Decision-Making Framework Options and Selection Criteria

Selection Criteria	Option A Motion to Endorse	Option B Urban Growth Management Agreement	Option C Regional Growth Management Plan
		to change it, similar to current Periodic Review Process.	
Use Strategy to meet Periodic Review Requirements	No. Periodic Review results in land use actions and no land use action is taken with a motion to endorse.	Possibly. The enabling legislation in the Regional Problem Solving (RPS) Statute specifically speaks to the connection between Periodic Review and the RPS process (see Intergovernmental Agreement). Need confirmation from DLCD.	Possibly. If Regional Problem Solving process is used, Regional Plan could meet Periodic Review requirements. Need confirmation from DLCD.
Streamline land use planning at the state level	No. No land use action is taken at the local level; thus, no change to the State land use planning process occurs.	Yes. If the Strategy is endorsed at the local and state levels, the Strategy can be the basis for decision-making at the state level in place of OAR (see Draft Intergovernmental Agreement for the state approval process for land use actions that are consistent with the Strategy and the locally-adopted Preferred Growth Scenario Map).	Yes. The Regional Framework Plan provides coordinated growth management planning at the regional level.

Regional Growth Management Strategy Decision-Making Framework Options and Selection Criteria

Streamline land use planning at the local level.	No. No land use action is taken at the local level; thus, no change to the local land use planning process occurs.	Potentially. UGB capacity analysis in Strategy potentially could replace the need for buildable lands inventories for some or all jurisdictions; or it could supplement and endorse local buildable lands analyses and growth management planning, depending on how the intergovernmental agreement and the Strategy are framed and on the needs and resources of the jurisdictions. All local governments retain local authority to designate and zone individual parcels.	Yes. Regional UGB capacity analysis replaces the need for buildable lands inventories and growth management planning in each UGB.
Clear Role Definition	Yes. The roles are clearly defined in the letters of endorsement.	Yes. The roles are clearly defined in the final intergovernmental agreement and Regional Growth Management Strategy.	Yes. Local comprehensive plans must be consistent with the Regional Plan.
Process to Revisit Strategy	Yes, can be spelled out in the Regional Strategy.	Yes, see Intergovernmental Agreement for suggested process to revisit Strategy and reconvene Policy Board and RTAC every ten years, or sooner if need arises and any local government requests it.	Yes, the process would be included in the Regional Plan. Would require joint decision-making.

RESOLUTION NO.

A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE CONCEPT OF A COORDINATED GROWTH MANAGEMENT STRATEGY FOR THE SOUTHERN WILLAMETTE VALLEY REGION (CENTRAL LANE COUNTY)

WHEREAS, Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) has determined that there is a need for local governments and service providers to take a regional approach to growth management in the Southern Willamette Valley, including the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area and the surrounding commute shed, based on inter-city commute patterns;

WHEREAS, in 1990, one-quarter to three-quarters of the resident workers in Coburg, Cottage Grove, Creswell, Junction City, Lowell, Oakridge/Westfir, and Veneta commuted to Eugene-Springfield to work; and three percent to 40 percent of the jobs in those cities were held by residents of Eugene-Springfield;

WHEREAS, the role these cities play in the future growth of the region needs to be considered in addressing growth-related issues in these cities, including maintaining community identity; providing a balance of jobs and housing, efficient transportation facilities, and adequate public facilities and services to support the level and type of desired growth; and ensuring orderly, efficient urban growth to minimize costs;

WHEREAS, these inter-city commute patterns have impacts on air quality and state and metropolitan transportation systems and their ability to efficiently move people and goods;

WHEREAS, Interstate-5 faces congestion with few alternative north/south routes; the adequacy of road connections to Interstate-5 and east/west connections across Interstate-5 is in question; and these conditions may impact the movement of people and goods and the economies of these cities and create the need for coordinated and consistent corridor management to maintain the planned functions of these transportation systems;

WHEREAS, public transportation can address some of the travel needs of inter-city commuters, if planned in a coordinated manner that considers urban and rural bus service, transit links between adjacent cities, and regional inter-modal connections, including bus, rail and air;

WHEREAS, it is important to preserve the environmental quality, economy, life style, livability, and identity of the region and its member communities by protecting open space and valuable agricultural, forest and mineral resources; and managing and protecting watersheds, stream corridors, and wetland systems; and

WHEREAS, the availability and location of public facilities and the economic development policies of the involved jurisdictions affect the type, amount and direction of growth in the region; and these facilities and policies need to be evaluated as part of a growth management strategy for the Southern Willamette Valley.

NOW THEREFORE THE CITY OF SPRINGFIELD DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1: The City of _____ supports the concept of a coordinated growth management strategy for the Southern Willamette Valley region and LCOG’s pursuit of funding to support strategy development;

Section 2: Strategy development will include formation of a technical advisory committee (TAC) comprised of staff from the organizations with authority to implement the strategy and, if possible, expanding an existing staff committee, such as the Transportation Planning Committee for the Metropolitan Planning Organization, to include all relevant organizations on the TAC;

Section 3: The Strategy is intended to result in an intergovernmental agreement among TAC organizations, possibly including Lane County, local and regional utilities and transit district, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Eugene, Springfield, and cities within the commute shed of the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area, as defined by inter-city commute trends;

Section 4: The agreement could include some or all of the following types of agreements: to cooperatively address growth management and public facility issues, including transportation; to use certain principles to guide growth management efforts, jobs/housing interactions, and transportation improvements in the region; to establish target population and density levels for each urban growth boundary (UGB); to implement provisions to protect transportation facilities, open space, watershed health, and agricultural land; and to implement provisions to minimize/guide development in areas outside and between UGBs.

ADOPTED by the _____, by a vote of 6 for and 0 against.

APPROVED by the Mayor of the City of Springfield this 7th day of July, 1999.

Mayor

ATTEST:

City Recorder

Reviewed and Approved as
to form by City Attorney

OPTION A: SAMPLE ENDORSEMENT LETTER

February 11, 2003

To all concerned:

With pleasure, the Lane County Board of Commissioners is providing this letter of endorsement and support for the vision and strategies as presented in the *Rivers to Ridges - Metropolitan Regional Parks and Open Space Study* (January 2003). This, with the understanding that the vision and strategies provide a general framework for future park and open space planning and protection in our region and will be refined based on future study and close coordination with private property owners.

As the vision is implemented in the years to come, the Board of Commissioners supports the approach of relying on voluntary participation of property owners and partnering with state and federal agencies and land trusts to help implement the vision as a way to lesson the financial burden of local governments. It is also the Board of Commissions understanding that much of the resource land (e.g. farm and forest) identified for protection will likely remain in private ownership, with open space goals being achieved through the purchase of conservation or visual easements and voluntary management by property owners. Public ownership of parks and open spaces will rely on willing seller approaches whenever possible.

Sincerely,

Peter Sorenson, Chair
Lane County Board of Commissioners

