

MINUTES

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

September 29, 2004
5:30 p.m.

- PRESENT:** Mike Fleck (Cottage Grove), Michael Dubick (Creswell), David Kelly (Eugene), Dwight Coon, Vice Chair (Junction City), Don Hampton, Chair (Lane County), Warren Weathers (Lowell), Sue Bond, Glenn Fortune (Oakridge), Marion Esty (Veneta), Neil Friedman (Westfir), Susan Ban (Lane Transit District), Jamon Kent for Mike Watson (Coburg), Mike Wolf for Erik Andersson (Governor's Economic Revitalization Team), members; Carol Heinkel, Byron Vanderpool, Susan Payne, George Kloeppe, Lane Council of Governments staff
- ABSENT:** Judy Volta, Mike Watson (Coburg), Matt Bjorn (Cottage Grove), Ron Hanson (Creswell), Jim Torrey (Eugene), Barry Schweigert (Junction City); Peter Sorenson (Lane County), Ken Larsen (Lowell), Christine Lundberg (Springfield), Fred Miller (Veneta), Erik Andersson, Gabrielle Schiffer (Governor's Economic Revitalization Team)
- GUESTS:** Carlos Barrera (Goshen Area Neighborhood Association), Deb Brewer, Richard Jeffries (EWEB), Stephanie Schulz (Lane County), Lisa Gardner (Lane Transit District), Kees Ruurs (Oregon State Parks)

1. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Hampton convened the meeting at 5:35 p.m., and members introduced themselves.

2. May 26, 2004, Meeting Minutes

Mr. Kelly noted his name in the document is sometimes misspelled as "Kelley."

Mr. Dubick, seconded by Mr. Fleck, moved to approve the minutes of the May 26, 2004, meeting as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Public Comment

There was no one wishing to speak.

4. Alternative Regional Growth Scenarios, Draft Evaluation Results

▪ Education

Carol Heinkel gave the report. She said staff met with school district administrators and board members in June, 2004, to present preliminary results and ask for feedback on the methodology used, and again in

August, 2004, to present a draft evaluation based on feedback received. She said there were no requests for changes to the draft evaluation. She said administrators and board members recommended that once a preferred growth scenario is determined, a study be done to identify the most efficient way to provide quality education in the region under that scenario.

Mr. Hampton called for questions from board members.

Mr. Weathers said Lowell city officials disagreed with the two points of the Summary of Findings on page 1 of the draft evaluation. He said the first point reads, “The more urban the area, the more enrollment is likely to occur.” He said Lowell officials feel enrollment is a function of how many families with school-age children are in the area, and it does not matter whether they live inside the Lowell city limits or in outlying areas.

He said the second point of the Summary of Findings, “The districts without the least dense urban centers are experiencing the greatest decline in enrollment, and this is likely to continue under any of the scenarios. . . .,” is a double negative, and Lowell officials do not agree with it. He noted that under the rural growth scenario, state land use laws are modified to permit people to live outside of the urban growth boundary, and if that it is done it will increase the number of families with school-age children and maintain enrollment.

He reported that school officials he had talked to thought the phrase in the draft scenario “access to education within the region” meant Eugene, and their vision was that access to education should be available as it is now, distributed throughout the region. He said having education access in Eugene does not satisfy the regional objective for distribution of education services, and adopting something that closes the small schools violates the goal set for education.

Mr. Kelly said Mr. Weather’s point was well taken, and he believed the clear intent of the education goal was access to education in each area within the region, as opposed to across the region. He said perhaps that could be clarified in the draft evaluation.

He continued that his general reaction to the draft evaluation was that, because of the current funding situation, improved access to education was defined as, “The more students you have, the better off you are because of per-pupil funding.” But he said it should be recognized that there are many other factors besides operating money that make an education system more or less successful. He said he appreciated the administrators’ point about school building capacity, and he understood from a budgetary standpoint why staff recommended doing a capacity study once a single preferred growth scenario was identified. However, he said, there is a capital cost for new facilities, and recognizing Mr. Weather’s point that education must be local to each population center, it would be useful to know if one scenario might need fifteen new school facilities built over the growth period, whereas another might need only two, because of where people end up. Given that, he said, he hated to defer facilities evaluation until the board was down to one scenario.

Mr. Kelly also pointed out there were numerous typographical and spelling errors in the draft document.

Mr. Hampton asked if the board wished to modify the wording of the Summary of Findings on page 1 of the draft.

Ms. Heinkel said the double negative in the second conclusion statement was unintentional; the word “least” should be deleted.

Mr. Fleck, building on Mr. Kelly’s comments, said he also found the scope of the draft a little narrow. He said he thought the school administrators were the most informed people about the educational system, but they were also the ones most personally affected. As a parent, he said, he felt there were a lot of other components that perhaps could not be measured, such as students per teacher, busing, and test scores, that were relevant to quality regional education.

Mr. Dubick said the difficulty he sometimes had with the analysis was that factors were so inter-related it was difficult to look at one in isolation. He said you can not look at enrollment without looking at economy: availability of property does not guarantee that someone can get a job enabling them to live on that property. He said he thought the recent growth decline in the northwestern portions of Eugene would seem to indicate there were economic factors weighing against low- and moderate-income homebuyers in those areas. At some point, he thought the board would need to look at how different factors intersect.

Mr. Weathers, referring to the chart at the bottom of page 2 of the draft evaluation, said the number of dwelling units in 1993 for Lowell should be 950, rather than 404. Ms. Heinkel said she would recheck the number.

Mr. Weathers also referred to the last two statements about the Pleasant Hill School District in the paragraph preceding the chart. He said the reason many people move to the Lowell and Pleasant Hill school districts is that they want that type of environment of larger lots, but because land use regulations have restricted availability of those larger lots, prices have increased and only relatively wealthy people can afford them. He said smaller lots would increase supply and thus lower prices so families could afford to live there.

Mr. Kelly said he would like to hear Ms. Heinkel’s response to comments about the narrowness of the draft evaluation scope.

Ms. Heinkel reminded board members that an education component was not part of the original project scope, and there was no funding to do the draft evaluation. Additional funding source would be needed to do more on the current draft. She said the school districts have shown high interest in the project, with good attendance at both meetings, and perhaps the districts themselves or Lane Education Service District (Lane ESD) would be interested in providing additional funding. She said she would be happy to pursue suggestions for funding a more in-depth study, and there was time to do such a study.

Mr. Kelly said he thought trying to fund an additional study would be worthwhile, and he hoped the school districts themselves might have some of the data needed, at least at a surface level. To the extent that additional components can not be included, he said, it should at least be acknowledged that they are missing and are important.

Mr. Hampton supported contacting Lane ESD for additional statistics.

Mr. Vanderpool summarized he was hearing board members ask for more specific statistical information and for more qualitative information, using more than just the educational administrators and school board members for input and feedback. He asked if board members could suggest additional groups to contact.

Mr. Fleck suggested PTA, scouting, and other organized parent groups. He said, like Mr. Kelly, he thought if it was not possible to expand the analysis to other factors, that should be acknowledged.

Ms. Heinkel asked for help on wording the Summary of Findings on page 1 to address Mr. Weathers' concerns. She noted also that she has forwarded Mr. Weathers' paper on a rural buildable land inventory to the land inventory resource group for their consideration.

Mr. Weathers thought the solution to rewording the second Summary of Findings statement on page 1 was to recognize that under the board's own definition of the rural growth scenario, land use regulations are modified to allow more people to live in rural areas.

Mr. Hampton said his assumption was the board would probably not end up with just one scenario.

Ms. Heinkel thanked Mr. Weathers for his comments and said she would draft a modification to the findings statement that acknowledged the difference in the rural growth scenario.

Mr. Dubick said he wanted to clarify he didn't necessarily disagree with the Summary of Findings; he was just saying there were other factors over which the board had no control that could end up modifying the outcome.

Mr. Coon agreed that was a key point, and that much of the board's planning revolves around criteria the Eugene-Springfield area will set for housing and industry, and that some smaller cities might want different criteria. He cited desired lot size differences in Eugene and Junction City as an example.

Ms. Heinkel said the Resource Lands Committee would be addressing the issue of farm and forest lands. Mr. Coons asked when that work would be scheduled. Stephanie Schulz of Lane County Planning said the committee was being formed, and work on farm land would probably start in a month. Mr. Coons said he would like to know the meeting schedule so he could be involved. He observed that what is considered prime farm land today is quite different from what was regarded as prime farm land twenty years ago; yet the state is operating under the rules set twenty years ago, and they are becoming rapidly outdated.

▪ **Air Quality**

Susan Payne gave the report. She said the Air Quality Assessment was completed in May 2004 and showed that the Eugene-Springfield area has "pretty good" air quality. She reviewed the air pollutants monitored in Lane County under the federal Clean Air Act, and said for the two pollutants of most concern for local air quality, carbon monoxide (CO) and particulate matter (PM), the area far exceeds standards, and there are in fact no local air quality problems. She said the Federal requirement for technology improvements in cars was the major reason for the Eugene-Springfield area exceeding CO standards, and transportation sources were not a major source of PM pollution. She said it was hard to predict air quality trends long term because of technology changes.

Ms. Payne said the goal of the Air Quality Assessment was to look at which scenario sustains or improves air quality. She said in a way, none of the scenarios would sustain or improve air quality, because of population increases in all three scenarios. She said it was more a question of if the increases would lead to hazards to human health. She said transportation history in the area suggests cars would have to increase "an awful lot" to make transportation sources a pollution problem.

Mr. Kent asked if Ms. Payne had a number for “an awful lot.” She said it was hard to translate into vehicle miles traveled, but emission predictions for the Eugene-Springfield area show an overall decrease in CO levels in 2025 from those in 1990.

She said the bottom line in comparing the three scenarios was that because the Satellite Communities Scenario has more concentrated commercial and industrial development in small cities, and more traffic, there is a risk of higher pollution and emissions in those areas over what is there today. On the other hand, as the satellites become more compact, there is less inter-city traffic. Overall, she judged the three scenarios as relatively equal in their effect on air quality. She said only in the rural growth scenario was there likely to be more driving. In the future, she said, greenhouse gases may be more of an issue.

Ms. Payne identified hazardous air pollutants (HAP) as another source of pollutants being considered for control within Oregon, although not so much at the Federal regulation level. She said levels for these pollutants that would cause human health problems have not been established yet, so no limits have been set, but Oregon is one of the states with higher levels of some of these pollutants. This would be relevant to siting industrial and commercial uses in populated areas, she said, and thus the Compact and Satellite Communities scenarios have some risk of increasing HAP pollutants, but it was difficult to forecast numbers.

Mr. Kelly commented that he realized the challenge of having to speculate in the Air Quality Assessment. He said he found the document valuable, but he found the rating of the Rural Growth Scenario as “Low” (in being least likely to sustain or improve air quality) overly harsh, given the written analysis of the Rural Growth Scenario in the document. He said he realized the conclusion could be reached just on looking at vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in that scenario, but he noted the board does not yet have its Transportation Model, and he thought the conclusion was premature.

Mr. Hampton speculated that the Satellite Communities Scenarios might also lead to VMT increases if enough people living in those communities ended up working in another satellite city or in Eugene or Springfield.

Ms. Payne agreed the Transportation Model would give better perspective on all three scenarios.

Mr. Kelly referred to the HAPS emissions graph on page 66 of the report and asked what happened in 1993 or 1994 to cause the charted jump in HAPS emissions. Ms. Payne said she had not been able to identify a cause and wondered if it might have been because of increased monitoring.

Mr. Hampton, following up on his previous comment on the Satellite Communities Scenario, said if mass transportation improves significantly people could still live in one place and work in another, and actually have VMT decline.

Mr. Coons commented on the geographic dimensions of the Willamette Valley, in which the Willamette River goes north, but downhill. He said pollution does not just sit in the immediate area, but moves around through the valley.

Ms. Payne said those air circulation patterns in the valley were one reason ozone could be a major concern for the valley. Mr. Coons cited field burning models previously developed and in use based on wind direction, and said those models were applicable here for airborne particulates.

Mr. Fortune asked if the pollution model used in the assessment was ongoing and could be modified for stricter standards. Ms. Payne said the model does incorporate existing standards and predicts future changes as they can be projected.

Mr. Hampton noted that one thing he had learned while on the Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority Board was that the highest level of ozone ever measured was in Saginaw. It was not created in Saginaw, he continued, but probably carried there from this area by the north wind.

Mr. Weather noted statements on pages 62, 67, 69, and 70 of the draft evaluation, relating to CO reductions despite increased population, success of hybrid cars in reducing pollutants, people working closer to home in satellite communities, and dispersed emissions and VMT in rural areas, as additional findings that did not support the conclusion that the Rural Growth Scenario would increase pollution.

Ms. Payne responded that although CO was likely to increase under the Rural Growth Scenario, no one she has talked to thinks CO will be a problem under any of the scenarios.

5. City and County Local Official Update Meetings

Ms. Heinkel directed board members to a summary in their packets of key issues coming from the update meetings held so far. She reviewed the schedule of remaining meetings scheduled for October and November. She invited board members to share their impressions of the update meetings they had attended.

Ms. Esty said the meeting for Veneta officials and staff was held on July 19, 2004, and was very well attended. She said growth is a big issue for Veneta currently, and there were many questions and opinions shared. She said for a subject that was hard to make concrete, there was a lot of interaction, and she felt the meeting was very worthwhile.

Mr. Fleck reported that Cottage Grove tends to be a little skeptical of the county stepping in and having a say in municipal affairs. Nevertheless, he thought the meeting, which was the first joint City Council-Planning Commission meeting in some time, was a good thing in itself, and he hoped those joint meetings would be held more often. He said once the 2050 Plan began to get more specific it would get more response in his city. He said land use regulation was a big issue for Cottage Grove.

Mr. Hampton said he has tried to encourage small city officials to continue to attend the Region 2050 Advisory Board meetings, so that the report does not appear to be just a metro area plan being forced on everyone else. He said he thought that was one of the concerns rural residents had: Will our voice be heard, and will we have an impact on what is going on? He said those residents have an impact on the plan by representation in these board meetings.

Ms. Heinkel noted that the local officials in the meetings she had attended expressed appreciation to staff and other Region 2050 participants for taking the time to come to their communities and they expressed appreciation for the tools the project brings their communities. She said staff had asked specifically for feedback on the Regional Goals and Objectives and on the public outreach plan, and there was a lot of discussion and suggestions on public outreach, but no objections in any of the meetings to the goals and objectives. She thought that was positive.

6. Draft Public Outreach Materials

Ms. Heinkel made the report. She said the Regional Technical Advisory Committee (RTAC) was recommending that the board begin public outreach after all the evaluations were completed, which should be by January or February of 2005 with the completion of the Transportation Evaluation. She said RTAC staff would present some information about the Transportation Model at the October board meeting for review and feedback.

In the meetings between now and February 2005, Ms. Heinkel said staff wanted to bring public outreach materials and plans to the board for detailed review and feedback, so that the board could be completely comfortable with the products going out into the communities.

Draft Newspaper Insert

Ms. Heinkel directed board members to the draft newspaper insert included in their agenda packets. She said the final product would be professionally done; the first draft was done by staff just to give the board a sense of content and format. She said the content of the newspaper insert will be used for other outreach formats, such as the web page and display panels. Ms. Heinkel asked for input on the content and format of the newspaper insert. Board members made the following suggestions:

Ms. Esty: Keep it simple, and this is.

Mr. Coon: Keep it simple, but also provide enough information so people can build a clear picture of the process and the scenarios. Remember this is the first time most people will be exposed to the Region 2050 concept.

Ms. Esty: Provide supplemental materials on the process and content for libraries, web site, city halls.

Mr. Weathers:

- Reword first statement in the Rural Growth scenario to reflect most growth occurring in the small cities in the metro area, rather than rural lands.
- Change “no regional commuter services” to “no light rail or rapid transit services” in last statement. (LTD services small cities in metro area now and will probably continue.)

Mr. Kelly:

- Use eye-catching headlines to capture interest.
- Change “Because growth happens in regions;” the statement does not communicate. Say “We need to work together;” “We are inter-dependent;” or something similar that reflects the coordination goal of the advisory board.
- Include more material in the alternative growth scenarios section to explain how the scenarios were developed.
- Explain that all three assume the same population in the year 2050.
- Clarify what the percentages mean in the second statement of the Compact Urban Growth scenario.
- Saying Cottage Grove and Veneta would grow to the size of McMinnville and Oakridge about the size of Lebanon in the second statement of the Satellite Communities scenario may not communicate if people don’t know the size of those cities.
- Highlights section, page 3: Yes, keep it simple, but give this part as much space as possible; point people to the web page for full evaluations.

- Delete picture of the Policy Advisory Board to gain space for more content. (All board members agreed with this.)

On-Line Survey

Ms. Heinkel reviewed the questions posed on the draft on-line survey. On demographic question #4, she asked board members if they preferred “other city” or “small city” for the third choice; board members preferred “small city.”

Mr. Kelly said he understood the need to make the survey simple, but he felt it was so simple he wondered if the results would be useful. He said at least there needed to be space for people to make comments on all the survey instruments. Ms. Esty also supported providing space for comments.

Ms. Heinkel said she would take the suggestion back to RTAC. Board members emphasized they did not expect staff to collate comments.

Mr. Weathers was concerned that questions #2 and #3 offered choices that were too nebulous. For instance, he said, if people checked “land use development” as a concern in question #2, did that mean they wanted small lots, bigger lots, did not want to cut trees, or something else.

Ms. Heinkel said RTAC wanted to add a little more detail to the survey to ask about the impacts to get more specific information on the issues. She said RTAC was also trying to construct the survey so that respondents could see results to date of each question immediately online after completing their survey.

Random Sample Survey

Mr. Weathers said Lowell officials were worried that a random sample telephone survey would be dominated by Eugene-Springfield, which represents 65% of the county population. He said this would distort the survey results for rural and small city respondents and not truly reflect their interests.

Mr. Hampton suggested surveying the Eugene-Springfield metro area and the rest of Lane County separately.

Ms. Heinkel said sampling the areas separately would double the cost of the survey. She said LCOG had an \$8,000 grant to do a random sample survey of the region. She said she believed the original thinking was to compare the regional survey to the self-selected survey and public meeting responses in the different areas. She said the board could choose not to do a random sample survey at all, and the \$8,000 could probably be transferred to some other outreach activity.

Board members discussed the random sample survey option and decided to eliminate it and use the money for rural outreach and town hall meetings.

Mr. Kelly thanked RTAC for its recommendation to delay all surveys until evaluations are completed. He encouraged holding a locally televised town hall for more outreach.

7. Work Program Reports

Mr. Heinkel said LCOG had received a grant from TGM for funding through June of 2007. She said that takes the project to the point of having a preferred growth scenario with transportation projects that would serve that scenario. She said Water and Wastewater evaluations were in progress, and staff were working on the Transportation Model. She said that four small cities – Veneta, Creswell, Cottage Grove, and

Junction City - have made a cash contribution to Region 2050 as a match for the grant and specifically to help support the development of urban transportation models in those cities.

8. Adjourn, Future Meeting Dates:

Ms. Heinkel noted that future meeting dates for October and November were on the agenda.

Mr. Hampton adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m.

(Recorded by Marjorie Beck)

M:\2004\Lane Council of Governments\Region 20 0\region2050040526.doc