

MINUTES

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

October 26, 2005
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Dwight Coon, Chair (Junction City); Faye Stewart, Vice Chair (Lane County), Mike Fleck (Cottage Grove), Mike Watson (Coburg), David Kelly (Eugene), Warren Weathers (Lowell), Glenn Fortune (Oakridge), Neil Friedman (Westfir), Christine Lundberg (Springfield), Bill McCoy (Creswell), Susan Ban (Lane Transit District), members; Carol Heinkel, George Kloeppel, Jamon Kent, Tom Schwetz, (Lane Council of Governments staff).

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

GUESTS: Stephanie Schulz (Lane County Planning), Anita Yapp (Lane Transit District), Bill Grile (City of Springfield), Janet Calvert (League of Women Voters), Carlos Barrera (Goshen Area Neighborhood Association), Marguerite Nabeta (Department of Land Conservation and Development), Terri Harding (ODOT), Eleanor Mulder (LWVLC), Rob Hallyburton (DLCD).

1. Welcome and Introductions

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

2. June 22, 2005 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Coon asked for a review of the June 22, 2005 minutes.

Mr. Kelly, seconded by Mr. Fleck, moved to approve the minutes of the June 22, 2005. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Public Comment

Ms. Heinkel said that she had received an email from Rod Zacko of 1000 Friends of Oregon about a Region 2030 process that was starting up in Bend. She said that she would put the information on the website. Mr. Kelly asked that she email the members and let them know when the information was available on the Web.

Faye Stewart said that he had received a telephone call from Eric Anderson of the Economic Team of the Governor's Office. He said that Mr. Anderson expressed his regret at not being able to be at the meeting.

Mr. Anderson also relayed the information that the Governor's Office supported the regional planning process and was willing to help with expertise and funding. Mr. Anderson said that if the Region 2050 board wanted to move forward with the process, the Governor's Office would help with the implementation.

4. Draft Evaluation Results

Transportation

Mr. Schwetz made a PowerPoint presentation on additional engineering analysis of the alternative growth scenarios. He also referred the board to the memorandum titled *Alternative Growth Scenarios Transportation Evaluation: Expanded Analysis* that was included in the agenda packet. He noted that the information was also available on the Web.

Mr. Schwetz said that an analysis had been done on additional needs, strategies to address deficiencies, cost analysis, and a summarization of the evaluation and conclusions. He reminded the board that, in June, one of the basic findings of the analysis was that the sheer growth in population and employment would have a much larger impact on the transportation system than the differences between the three growth scenarios. He noted that Fig. 1 in the handouts had been reconfigured to more accurately depict the range of impacts on the three growth scenarios and that once again the scale of growth tended to outweigh the differences in the growth scenarios.

Mr. Schwetz repeated some of the conclusions that had been shared in June because they still impacted the bottom line:

- Regardless of the scenario, substantial population and employment growth in the Eugene-Springfield would result in large congestion increases on the major roadway system.
- How to pay for future improvements and continued maintenance and operation of the region's transportation system might need significant restructuring to sustain the increase in population and employment by 2050.
- It would be important to make informed choices around the priorities the region makes for investment of scarce resources in order to minimize adverse impacts and maximize future opportunities for addressing those impacts of growth.
- Addressing growth in the future would require an operational focus by using the Intelligent Transportation System (ITS), strategies and System Operation Tools to make the best use of the capacity in the area.
- Discuss the key policy issue of how much congestion would be acceptable to the region and focusing investment where the congestion was the least tolerable.

Mr. Schwetz said that there were some underlying relationships which influenced the recommendations made by the staff:

- Demand for transportation derives from our need for economic and social interaction
- The way in which demand was met was affected by the spatial distribution of regional activity and the development of a region's transportation system.

Mr. Schwetz said that the guiding principles were that the most efficient transportation system was one that reduced the overall time and also provided a range of viable choices. He emphasized that all parts of the

major system would be experiencing congestion on the roadway. He said that the cost analysis summary showed that there was a base amount that was needed in the roadway system regardless of the scenario and that there was very little difference in terms of what would be required because of a specific scenario. He provided the following table of the cost analysis:

	<u>Compact Urban Growth</u>	<u>Satellite Communities</u>	<u>Rural</u>
Transit	\$45 million	\$47 million	\$50 million
Additional	\$50.3 million	\$42.2 million	\$11.3 million
Roadway	\$638.5 million	\$638.5 million	\$638.5 million

Mr Kelly noted that on page 15 of the report, the costs were added in a way that was a little misleading in that some of the costs were annual operating costs and some of them were one-time capital costs. He also commented that the one big cost missing in the cost analysis was the capital cost of a build-out of BRT. Mr. Schwetz explained that the figures on page 15 reflected the additional costs beyond what was in the illustrative version of the Regional Transportation Plan. Mr. Kelly explained that the difference between “constrained” and “illustrative.” He said that “constrained” meant that funding for projects could be expected to be available during a certain plan period. “Illustrative” meant that while the projects were all important, the money was not available unless “it fell from the sky.”

Mr. Kelly said that it would be interesting to add the total costs beyond the constrained plan to see how big the need was. Mr. Schwetz said that in June the cost for planned capital improvements was estimated to be \$1.5 billion in 2005 dollars. Additional projects identified in the MPO area’s illustrative list were about \$500 million or \$1.6 billion total.

Mr. Stewart emphasized that the \$1.5 billion was in today’s dollars. He added that it would be helpful to know when the need for the money would hit different communities. Ms. Lundberg agreed adding that timing would be very important. Mr. Schwetz responded by saying \$683 million had to go into the system under any of the growth scenarios and added that it would probably be needed sooner rather than later given the state of the existing system.

Mr. Schwetz said that based on the analysis so far, some key conclusions had been reached:

- The region’s transportation system needed a significant investment regardless of the scenario.
- Based on the principles described earlier, the compact growth and satellite community growth would perform best.

Mr. Schwetz added the following key caveats to the conclusions:

- The transportation system performance analysis assumed that the densities and mix of uses was would be attained in the compact growth and the satellite community scenarios.
- Technical advances in virtual accessibility might support some level of more dispersed growth than could be estimated at this time.

Mr. Schwetz concluded with a final thought, a quote from Terry Moore: *the inability to prove a best solution does not mean that better ones cannot be described and technologically defended.* He said that

the staff thought that between compact growth and satellite communities, there would be a solution that would really work.

Mr. Kelly complimented Mr. Schwetz on the quality report. He asked Mr. Schwetz if the model had been run with all the proposed improvements. Mr. Schwetz said that he had and that there were still problem areas where it would be difficult to meet some of the existing mobility standards on a State system. He said that Beltline between River Road and Coburg Road was an example.

Mr. Kelly suggested that summarizing the model on one page would help with the decision as to where to “get the big bang for the buck.” Mr. Schwetz said that was some of what the staff wanted to do with the preferred scenario. Mr. Kelly agreed and added that the team would want to see a preferred scenario before adoption.

Mr. Kelly added that another caveat would be the impact of \$5 and \$7 gasoline.

Mr. Schwetz said that with the preferred scenario, the staff intended to provide more concrete lists of specific types of projects.

Ms. Ban pointed out that another factor that could not be counted on was the kind of policies and/or resources that would be available in the future. She noted that the region’s issues were also State issues and federal issues.

5. Regional Growth Management Strategy Decision-Making Framework Options

Ms. Heinkel said that she had put together a slide presentation to assist the board in clarifying its desired outcomes for regional strategy products and a decision-making framework process. She said this agenda item was to help prepare the board for the discussion on Regional Problem Solving (RPS) with the DLCD Director Lane Schetterly on November 16. She emphasized that the RTAC wanted to hear the board’s desired outcomes. She provided board members with a copy of the slide presentation. Ms. Heinkel noted that Ms. Lundberg had already submitted questions which had been sent to the members by email and handed out copies of the letter to the Board.

Ms. Heinkel began the presentation by saying that in order to talk about the decision-making process and what the members would like to see come out of that process, it was necessary to assume that whatever the product would be, the members would like it. She acknowledged that took a leap of faith. She said that a draft was being worked on and would be available sometime after January. She reminded the board that an extensive outreach effort had been made, results of which would be available in November.

Ms. Heinkel gave a brief review of the background of the Region 2050 Policy Direction for Region 2050 products and process from 1999 to 2005, including:

- Adopted City and County Resolutions, 1999
- Request to use Regional Problem Solving (RPS) process, March 2000
- Approved Regional Goals and Objectives, 2001 (reaffirmed 2003, 2004)
- Approved Work Programs and Grant Agreement, 2000-2005

She said that the desired product outcome in the form of City and County resolutions was a coordinated Regional Growth Management Strategy for the Southern Willamette Valley with goals, objectives, and actions in the following areas: land use and development patterns; natural resources, open space, and the environment; jobs and the economy; housing; transportation; community facilities and services; and education.

Ms. Heinkel reviewed the product outcomes from the policy directions given in City and County resolutions. She said that these products, a preferred growth scenario map, land use measures, land use and transportation measures, a farm and forest committee report, and the public involvement report were all tools that would be used to accomplish creating a coordinated growth management strategy for the Southern Willamette Valley. She noted that the initial grant application that applied for Regional Problem Solving was unanimously approved by the LCOG Board with all jurisdictions represented in a unanimous vote. she said that original application contained a three-phase process:

- Phase I: Frame Strategy (year 2000-2002)
- Phase II: Develop Alternatives (year 2003-2004)
- Phase III: Create Strategy (year 2005-2006)

She said that phases I and II had been completed and that the group was entering into Phase III, creating a strategy.

Ms. Heinkel reviewed the desired product outcomes as reflected in the approved work programs with “RPS” indicating the products that would benefit from Regional Problem Solving:

- Preferred Growth Scenario Map
- Jurisdiction-specific comprehensive plan map amendments for Urban Reserves
- Other concurrent jurisdiction-specific comprehensive plan map and text amendments
- Coordinated Population Targets
- Regional Housing Needs Analysis and Regional Residential Land Capacity Analysis (RPS)
- Regional Economic Opportunities Analysis and Regional Employment Land Capacity Analysis (RPS)
- Density targets and thresholds (tied to map and monitoring, RPS)
- Regional Transportation Improvements
- Regional Water and Wastewater Improvements (a critical part of the discussion)

During the review, Mr. Weathers asked about the expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) being tied to the target populations. He asked if a developer wanted to do a phased development of 100 acres over 20 years, would that developer have to wait 50 years if the community could not show an immediate demand for it. Ms. Heinkel said that the staff would apply the models to the project based on the goals that Lowell had for preferred growth. She said that then the decision makers in Lowell could make adjustments to meet the goals and objectives that had been agreed to.

Ms. Heinkel moved to a review of the desired process outcomes. She reminded the board of the Regional Strategy Goal:

Region 2050's goal is to improve and sustain the region's quality of life by building regional consensus among public and private interests on goals, objectives, and action in seven inter-dependent quality of life categories:

*Land Use and Development Patterns
Natural Resources, Open Space and the Environment
Community Facilities and Services
Jobs and the Economy
Housing
Transportation
Education*

Ms. Heinkel read the Regional Strategy Objectives:

- Maintain the autonomy of the local jurisdictions in any regional strategies.
- Pursue an integrated approach that addresses the interrelationships among the seven categories
- Value the interests of all local governments in the region by using consensus decision-making processes requiring unanimous consent of all Policy Board members present.
- Achieve grass-roots support for proposals through a public education and outreach program and stakeholder process designed to facilitate understanding of the issues, conditions, possible futures, choices, and trade-offs.
- Evaluate proposals based on consideration of current and possible future conditions such as economic, technological, financial, ecological, and social equity.
- Identify regional needs, compare community visions with regional needs, identify gaps and conflicts, develop an action plan, and review periodically.

Ms. Heinkel said that based on everything that the staff had heard up to this point and based on all that the board members had told the staff through approved Regional Goals and Objectives, work programs and grant agreements, resolutions, and discussions the staff drew up a draft Desired Process Outcomes for the board to consider and to begin its discussion on what decision making framework it would like to use. The following selection criteria reflected what the staff heard from the board:

- Modify an existing agreement
- Retain and, if possible, increase local autonomy in land use decision-making
- Clearly define the roles and responsibilities of city, county, and state
- Maximize local government flexibility to take actions not in Strategy
- Maximize flexibility to change the Strategy
- Use the Strategy to fulfill state mandate(s)
- Streamline land use planning at state level and, if possible, at the local level
- Revisit the Strategy over time, maintain the data base, monitor progress in achieving goals.

Ms. Heinkel said that the staff had framed three decision-making options for the board to consider:

- Option A - Option to Endorse (like "Rivers to Ridges") – this was a vision designed for the Metro area and was endorsed by many of the local governments and the park districts, etc. This option was completely voluntary and was not a land use action by definition
- Option B – Urban Growth Management Agreements (Amend existing IGAs)

- Option C – Regional Growth Management Plan (like Portland Metro Model) – this is not being proposed by the staff

Ms. Heinkel said that in evaluating the framework options, there was the selection criteria and also an inverse relationship between maximum flexibility and maximum streamlining benefits. She pointed out that Option A: Motion to Endorse had maximum flexibility because it was completely voluntary and there were no streamlining benefits. In Option C: Regional Growth Management Plan there was maximum streamlining benefits and very little flexibility or very low local autonomy. She reviewed options A and C first and then Option B, what was considered the middle of the road option.

Option A: Motion to Endorse

- Not a land use action, by definition
- Retains local autonomy in land use decision-making
- Clearly defines roles and responsibilities of city, county, and state
- Maximizes local government flexibility to take actions not in Strategy (completely voluntary)
- Maximizes flexibility to change the Strategy
- Flexibility to revisit the Strategy over time, maintain the data base, monitor progress in achieving goals
- Does not streamline land use planning at state or local level; same land use planning process as used today.

Option C: Regional Growth Management Plan

- Not a likely option. Will not be supported by local governments
- All jurisdictions adopt same regional framework plan
- Local autonomy is low
- Local governments retain authority for planning and zoning but required to be consistent with framework plan
- A land use action, by definition
- Maximum streamlining of process at state and local level: one plan, one approval process
- Low flexibility to change or deviate from plan. Requires approval of all local governments and state

Option B: Urban Growth Management Agreements

- Amends existing, adopted Joint Agreements for Planning Coordination between Lane County and 8 small cities in region; adds State agencies; and develops new agreements for Eugene and Springfield
- Requires a land use action by each city, independent of the other cities, and requires co-adoption by county (level of detail to be defined)
- Satisfies state requirements for city-county planning coordination between city limits and UGB
- Uses Regional Problem Solving Statute to create a Strategy that can be the basis for LCDC decisions on land use measures and as guide for other state agencies.

Option B: 10 Urban Growth Management Agreements

- Retains and may increase local autonomy in land use decision-making, depending on the level of detail in concurrent plan amendments*
- Clearly defines roles and responsibilities of city, county, and state*
- Potential to maximize local government flexibility to take actions not in Strategy**
- Flexibility to change the Strategy*
- Flexibility to revisit the Strategy over time, maintain the data base, monitor progress in achieving goals*
- Potential to streamline land use planning at state and local level**

*Process is defined in the IGA

**Need confirmation from LCDC

Option B: 10 Urban Growth Management Agreements

DRAFT IGA, CITY AND COUNTY ROLES*

- Endorse Strategy, Preferred Growth Scenario Map, and supporting documentation and findings as tools to help guide growth and development in the region.
- Adopt jurisdiction-specific comp plan map amendments concurrently to add Urban Reserves; adopt other comp plan amendments identified in Strategy either concurrently or over time
- Use Strategy implementation and monitoring to identify any needed Periodic Review work tasks (Eugene, Springfield only)
- Participate in review, update, and amendment of Strategy over time.

*Roles are defined in the IGA

Mr. Weathers asked if there were disagreements with the reports, how that would be reconciled. Ms. Heinkel said that if there was counter-information or if there were disagreements, then it would be worked through at that time. She repeated that it did take a leap of faith that at the end the product will be one that everyone wants.

Option B: 10 Urban Growth Management Agreements

DRAFT IGA LDCD ROLE**

- Acknowledge Strategy, Preferred Growth Scenario Map, concurrent comp plan amendments, and supporting documentation and finding to be in compliance with the intent of the Statewide Planning Goals
- Use Regional Strategy implementation and monitoring to identify needed Periodic Review work tasks (Eugene and Springfield only)
- Actions to implement Strategy will not require further statewide planning goal exceptions because findings of compliance are contained in the Strategy
- Use coordinated population targets to meet state-mandated coordinated population projections in place of projections based on past trends

**Need confirmation from LCDC

Option B: 10 Urban Growth Management Agreements

DRAFT IGA, OTHER STATE AGENCIES ROLE:**

- Endorse Strategy, Preferred Growth Scenario Map, and supporting documentation and findings as tools to help guide growth and development in the region

- Endorse population targets (important for state funding)
 - Use the Strategy as the basis for decision-making (e.g., municipal water rights)
- **Need confirmation from state agencies

Process for Terminating and Modifying IGA

- Any party can terminate with 60 days written notice to other parties.*
 - Parties agree to:
 - Keep each other informed;
 - Meet every ten years or upon the release of census data to evaluate Strategy;
 - Monitor and maintain the data base for land need and capacity and to support maintenance of regional data files.
- *Existing IGA language

Ms. Heinkel asked the board members for their feedback.

Ms. Ban thanked Ms. Heinkel for the review.

Mr. Watson said that he saw some value in Option B. He said that he wanted a Strategy that would provide assurances that a buffer could be maintained between Eugene and Coburg although he would want the City to have the flexibility to change it if something unusual happened like the Fairgrounds wanted to locate there. He said that he wanted the Preferred Growth Scenario map and strategy to help plan for and meet the needs for transportation, wastewater, and schools. He said that he wanted flexibility in the strategy so that if growth did not occur as reflected in the document or if growth did occur and the city could not serve it (e.g., it did not have the wastewater facilities needed), the city had not made a commitment it could not meet.

Mr. Weathers said that he supported Option B as long as the finding supported Lowell's vision. He agreed that the board should seek answers to Ms. Lundberg's questions from Mr. Shetterly. Mr. Weathers wanted assurances that LCDC would accept the agreed-upon findings of compliance with the Statewide Goals. He said that Lowell residents wanted to grow as a Satellite Community with rural growth in the Lowell School District and wanted affordable housing in both the urban and rural areas (RR2, RR5, and RR10 and some lower quality forest lands).

Mr. Kelly said that he could not speak for the entire Eugene City Council, but that he thought that Option B, as outlined in the packet, made sense. He said that he thought that there were huge question marks and supported getting the answers to Ms. Lundberg's letter. He was very interested in the answer to the question about the exceptions process and how RPS and Periodic Review inter-related. He believed that it would be important for RPS to substitute for Periodic Review requirements and to get a definitive answer on this.

Mr. Kelly said that he wanted clear information on what parts of the state planning requirements were in statute and which were in administrative rule, for example was periodic review and 20 year buildable lands requirement in statute or OAR and what would that mean for RPS.

Mr. Kelly asked for clarity on the legal status of the Preferred Growth Scenario map and what it would be used for and who was blessing it. He said that he wanted confirmation from LCDC that if local government deviated from the strategy would they use the administrative rule process used today.

Mr. Kelly said that if a Strategy was to be sign off on by all participants, time would be needed to get public input on the draft, especially in Eugene. He wondered how input from the evaluation reports would get into the Strategy. He said that it seemed clear for land use, but not so clear for water, wastewater, and transportation.

Mr. Stewart said that he wanted assurances from DLCD/LCDC that the state would support and endorse the regional vision. He thought that his board would want the answers to Ms. Lundberg's questions. He said that there was skepticism on the board.

Mr. Stewart said that one of the outcomes needed to be that all communities retain their separate identity and local autonomy. He thought that the process needed to be more streamlined than the current process and that it needed to protect natural resources and farm and forest land. He said that the plan needed to be flexible and realistic and needed to be able to accommodate new ideas.

Mr. Fleck said that he believed that his council would support Option A and that there would need to be clear advantages for the City to support Option B because Cottage Grove already had the facilities to serve growth or had planned for them. He said that Periodic Review could be an advantage if it helped the city obtain funding for needed planning work. He said that growth was a big topic for the city right now and that the City needed to update its comprehensive plan.

Mr. Fleck said that the level of detail in the Preferred Growth Scenario map and the legal status of the map were important topics for the City to get clarity on soon. He said that it was important that the map not be another layer of bureaucracy.

Mr. Fleck wanted flexibility in the Strategy so that if a business like Hynix came to town or some other major event that was not anticipated, the City could respond quickly even if the event or condition was not addressed in the Strategy or was addressed differently in the Strategy.

Mr. Fleck did not want the state to impose density levels for the City that the City did not support. He said that he was all right with setting density levels consistent with the agreed-upon goals and objectives in the Strategy, e.g., to meet the City's housing needs and to allow for the development of the type of housing in the community's vision. Mr. Fleck said, with the agreement of all board members, that it would be important for the Preferred Growth Scenario map and the Strategy to reflect the visions of each community in terms of density.

Ms. Ban said that anything that helped plan land uses would be a benefit to LTD. She said that she preferred Option B because she thought that it would enable local folks to make the decisions instead of deferring to state rules. Ms. Ban supported having the map with the 50-year vision to plan for larger infrastructure that would be needed.

Mr. Fortune said that the City of Oakridge wanted to adopt the concurrent comp plan map amendments with UGB expansion. He said that he wanted the RPS process to be more streamlined than current administrative rules so that cities would have the flexibility to respond to opportunity for development potential outside the UGB.

Mr. McCoy said that the City of Creswell supported the spirit of Option B. He added that strategy could not impose something on the City or create another layer of bureaucracy.

Mr. Coon said that he could see advantages in Option B with assurances that it would provide the flexibility the City wanted. He said that it was important that LCDC support the finding agreed to in the Strategy. He wanted Junction City to retain a large industrial base and low density residential. Mr. Coon wanted to be able to expand the UGB before developing all buildable lands in the UGB, especially when some of those lands were not really available for development.

Mr. Friedman said that his community of Westfir was isolated and complacent about growth. He thought that it was important for Pleasant Hill's interests to be represented. He thought that it was important for the strategy to address future needs in the region for transportation and solid waste.

Ms. Heinkel reported that Veneta City Councilor Marion Esty called to say she could not attend and that her alternate on the Council was ill. She said that based on comments made by the Veneta RTAC staff, she believed that the City's main interest was that it not commit itself in the Strategy to growth it could not serve, for example, if improvements to Highway 126 West could not be made or if the City was unable to secure water rights.

Board members had a brief discussion about densities and agreed that communities wanted to have the flexibility to choose their own density levels. Ms. Heinkel said that communities would have that opportunity in creating their vision for their community.

Mr. Kelly asked what the growth scenario map was used for and if it had any legal standing. He wondered why have it if it did not have legal standing.

Mr. Stewart acknowledged that he was new to the process and added that he was hopeful that this process would allow communities to grow in the way in which they wanted to grow. He said that the phone call he received earlier in the day was encouraging to him because Mr. Anderson had said that the State saw the benefit to regional development.

Ms. Lundberg said that the Springfield Planning Commission and City council had discussed the process and came up with the questions included in Ms. Lundberg's letter. She said that she thought that Option A would be approved of in Springfield. She said that the information had been useful and she appreciated it, but was concerned about what would happen if Springfield did not get the growth it wanted in the Preferred Growth Scenario. She thought that the council would support not moving forward if that happened. She was clear that she wanted the Strategy to result in Springfield getting the growth it wanted.

Ms. Lundberg wanted to look at the Preferred Growth Scenario next and see if all the communities could agree. She added that she thought that it would be critical for LCDC to do rule making to define the RPS Statute. She said that if there were no rules to back up what came from LCDC, then the rules were just opinions.

Mr. Friedman said that Westfir was isolated and that people moved there for that reason. He said that he would love to see Pleasant Hill have a seat at the table because he thought that Pleasant Hill was facing more impact from this process than even Westfir. Mr. Stewart said that there had been three meetings in Pleasant Hill in an effort to get out to different more isolated places.

Mr. Watson said that he saw advantages of Option B over Option A. He expressed concern that flexibility be included in the option.

Mr. Kelly requested that meeting dates for 2006 be picked soon.

Ms. Heinkel said that she heard the board members to be saying that they were willing to continue discussing Option B. She said that she also heard that members wanted specific answers from State to Ms. Lundberg's questions.

Ms. Heinkel said that the staff would summarize the community reports and make them available to board members before the next meeting. Mr. Weathers said that he thought that the board needed written answers to Ms. Lundberg's questions.

6. Work Program, Timelines, and Process

Ms. Heinkel reported that the project was still on schedule and that staff would continue to put together a summary of the reports, the map, and anything else needed for a strategy.

Mr. Coon gave his email address: DwightDCoon@juno.com

7. Future Meeting Dates/Adjourn

Future meeting dates were:

Wednesday, November 16

Mr. Coon adjourned the meeting at 7:59 p.m.

(Recorded by Elise Self)

L:\City County Planning\Region 2050\Policy Board\Nov 05\Oct26PBMinutes.doc