

MINUTES

Lane County Planning Commission
Harris Hall—125 East 8th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon

December 2, 2008
6:00 p.m.

PRESENT: John Sullivan, Chair; Lisa Arkin, Vice Chair; Steve Dignam, Todd Johnston, Tony McCown, Nancy Nichols, Robert Noble, Howard Shapiro, Jozef Siekiel-Zdzienicki, Lane County Planning Commissioners; Kent Howe, Deanna Harris, Stephanie Schulz, Matt Laird, Kier Miller, Lane County Land Management Division; George Hough, Jr., Danan Gu, Ken Radin, Risa Proehl, Portland State University.

ABSENT: None

Ms. Schulz convened the meeting and welcomed members of the public.

1. Introductions/Agenda Review

Lane County staff and Portland State University (PSU) Population Research Center (PRC) consultants introduced themselves. Ms. Schulz reviewed the public notice process, the agenda for the meeting, and the ground rules for the meeting.

2. Population Forecasting Techniques PowerPoint Presentation

Mr. Hough offered a PowerPoint presentation entitled *Lane County 20-Year Coordinated Population Forecast Projection—Kickoff Public Meeting—December 2, 2008—Population Forecast Techniques—Presented by Population Research Center Project Team*. The PowerPoint presentation would be available on the Lane County website:
http://www.lanecounty.org/Planning%5Cdocuments%5CPOPULATION%5CPSU_Slides_1202.ppt

3. Questions and Clarification on Portland State University Presentation

PSU/PRC responded to questions from the public.

QUESTION: What method would be used to develop the populations? Would projections be done for individual cities? Would OEA be used as a basis or would a separate projection be done? If they were different, was that acceptable to the state? Were you starting from scratch and not using ODA?

ANSWER: PRC would develop individual forecasts for each of the cities. The county population would be allocated to individual cities only as a check. Regarding the OEA forecast, PRC would develop its own forecast, compare it to the OEA forecast, contact

OEA staff to discuss variations, and work out any modifications. On work for most recent forecasts, PRC was able to reach general agreement with OEA. PRC would do both top-down and bottom-up approaches, and compare them to see if they fit within the range of projected percentage growth in Lane County for five, ten and fifteen years.

QUESTION: Safe harbor at three percent had been used, but it had actually been closer to one percent. Where did that figure come from?

ANSWER: Three percent was the number that PSU used for its budget control in terms of how much budget would be needed for future years, and believed it needed a three percent increase in student enrollment and in revenue to sustain itself. Three percent may be a number built into people's thinking and used as a rule of thumb, whether it had a basis in reality or not. PRC was attempting to find a reasonable number to use, and as pointed out, three percent was not a reasonable number to use for this allocation.

QUESTION: How would you reach out to communities for anecdotal information about changes to the communities regarding employee and other changes?

ANSWER: PRC would talk with each of the cities, the planners and citizens.

QUESTION: Most of the contention in this process had been around the smaller communities outside of Eugene and Springfield. For communities of 6,000 and fewer people, what was the best you can hope for in level of certainty and accuracy?

ANSWER: Based on past experience forecasting in the area and based upon the literature, a range of five percent is the goal. A variety of methods would be used to gather data that will be meaningful and accurate.

QUESTION: As I understand this exercise, it was to get the County Commissioners to adopt an amendment to our comprehensive rural plan. Was this correct?

ANSWER: That was a question for the Commissioners to answer. PRC was here to advise regarding providing a population projection to do a coordinated forecast on what the common total population would look like, and how all the cities and the unincorporated areas add up to that total.

QUESTION: We had a paragraph in a big plan that we had to put a number in, is that correct?

ANSWER: That was correct.

QUESTION: When do we get to that point? How long do we drag the process out? For that purpose, and that purpose only, how relevant was how much energy we put into it? If we are wrong and we pick the wrong number, who cares?

ANSWER: You have to expend the energy that you think would be important and what you feel you want to put into this process. We hope to finish in two months, and we were asking for how much input and how much time you wanted and what do you know? If it takes a month and a half, there will only be a review period of two or three weeks to develop the model from your input. The contract goes to December 2009. In the next two

or three weeks, we were looking for input from you that PRC can take back, digest and build models around your feedback. PRC planned to have preliminary forecast numbers in January 2009 and final forecast numbers in February 2009.

Ms. Schulz reviewed a handout available at the meeting entitled *Coordinated Population Forecast Project*, which explained the second phase of the project would also involve substantial public input and it would follow the formal post acknowledgement plan amendment (PAPA) process for the Board of Commissioners to adopt the coordinated population forecast as a Rural Comprehensive Plan amendment as compelled by law. The work before the group tonight was the first phase of the project.

Mr. Howe said the project work calendar showed the goal was to begin the PAPA process in the spring and have adoption of number(s) by mid-summer.

QUESTION: When looking at the planned growth for small cities, how do you determine how many years it would take to sell out planned subdivisions that were on the books?

ANSWER: Expert judgment, prior experience, and hope and faith that accurate information was provided. Not all information was full or accurate and it was important to filter the information to make it useful and accurate. It was important to look at the difference between a permit that had been issued and actual completion of a unit.

QUESTION: Eugene is trying to build a sustainable community. How did the notion of a sustainable community fit within the process and forecasting objectives?

ANSWER: It depended on the policies you put in place and the extent to which you take that idea. If you talked about controlled populations and being sustainable, then you were looking at what was the capacity of the city to hold a certain number of people. PRC's task was to determine what kind of growth the community wanted, and what did the community not want to see. This area already had a somewhat sustainable community. There had been a number of large plants come into the area and leave over the past 15 years, and the area had seen the same one and one-half percentage of growth. I did not know how you would constrain it so that growth would not change unless you wanted to go negative and put up a sign that said "Lane County is a nice place to visit but count on not staying." That could be respected as one desirable alternative.

QUESTION: Had the Lane County population forecast been coordinated with the process used by the Oregon Big Look Task Force that showed that 1.7 million additional people would live in the Willamette Valley by 2040? Whether it had or not, what credibility do you place in that number? That seemed well above the one or two percent growth show in the PRC projections.

ANSWER: One projection was one million people would be added in the Portland metropolitan area, but I do not know how they were counted. Oregonians had great ideas but it was not known if there was enough money, resources, or infrastructure, to have a carrying capacity for that many people. The demographics of the 1.7 million people, regarding age, educational needs, ability to participate in the workforce had not been identified. It was important to determine this information to decide what services and needs they would have and what the state would have to provide. The PRC office had not been asked for an opinion regarding the future population of Oregon.

QUESTION: Were we going to take into account any additional moratoriums that have stagnated growth in this process? We already had a PAPA for the small cities and a parallel safe harbor in place. Were you going to touch base with ten cities and Eugene and Springfield to determine if we could reach a clear picture of what we were trying to achieve in population growth? The Big Look recently stated that maybe the communities themselves needed to take more responsibility and not leave it to PSU, the State of Oregon, or Lane County. How much was this costing?

ANSWER: The cost of the contract was a matter of public record, and was in the range of \$45,000. PRC had no authority to change the law regarding cities that had moratoriums on future growth. PRC would gladly review and evaluate any city's consolidated or comprehensive plan regarding future growth and expansion in terms of whether or not they made sense.

4. Break

There was a break from 7:20 p.m. to 7:35 p.m.

5. Brainstorming Local Issues and Trends—Citizen Input

Lane County Planning Commission
Population Forecasts
Public Kick-Off Meeting

December 2, 2008

Questions for Consideration:

1. What recent **local** events have a reasonable likelihood of changing historical population trends in Lane County?
2. What recent **national** or **global** events have a reasonable likelihood of changing historical population trends in Lane County?
3. Based upon responses to the above questions, what techniques or analysis methods do you believe PSU should employ to generate the forecasts?
4. Do you have any other comments to make about the assumptions or methods being considered for Lane County's population forecasts?

Following are the small group break-out flip chart notes responding to these questions.
GROUP 1—Keir

- Will PSU consider the intangibles of Lane County? 2nd paycheck.
- Will PSU consider plant closures and layoffs—Monaco, Hynix, etc.

- Are the moratoriums in Veneta and Lowell being considered? Also many places in the County have water issues, transportation issues, congestion, restraints.
- Infrastructure cost—M49/37? Potential effects may be unsustainable.
- Gas costs—would they favor growth in urban areas?
- Commercial improvements and major employment centers.
- City of Coburg—current constraint due to sanitation/sewers.
- Lowell: issues with census tract data not reflected in 2000 census
 - activity encourages growth
 - trying to attract families with low income housing.
 - water not an issue in Lowell
- Overestimating population will have high costs.
- Sustainability
 - Global climate change
 - Lack of water
 - Lack of food
- Questions concept that growth is good.
- Consider in-migration due to climate change.
- Consider that society is aware of Big issues and taking steps to mitigate future issues/disaster.
- Future populations may choose to live in urban areas.
- Density is important for local food security—farmland.
- Land use laws may force urban density.
- Employment types are changing due to internet; major employer model is changing.
- Values about protecting air, water, soil.
- Limited air quality may limit growth.
- Unemployed folks may try to become more self sufficient.

GROUP 2—Deanna

1. What recent **local** events have a reasonable likelihood of changing historical population trends in Lane County?

- Veneta—moratorium (lifted 2002-03)
- Hynix closure
- RV industry downturn.
- County/Cottage Grove funding transition from combined storm/sewer—environmental rules
- Affordability/bedroom communities near Eugene/Springfield
- Fuel costs associated with commuting
- Location of employees in County
- Extra effort in population forecast in small cities

2. What recent **national** or **global** events have a reasonable likelihood of changing historical population trends in Lane County?

- Global warming resulting in population increase

- Fuel/oil, demand for timber
- Water availability/rainfall amount
- Displaced civilians from natural disasters relocating to local favorable area
- Variable choices of housing in area for aging population
- Location of hospital

3. Based upon responses to the above questions, what techniques or analysis methods do you believe PSU should employ to generate the forecasts?

- Focus on small city ability to fund projection goals
- Focus on growth policy (infill vs. expansion)
- Annexation policies

4. Do you have any other comments to make about the assumptions or methods being considered for Lane County's population forecasts?

- "Great impressions in meeting"
- Accuracy of land inventory/zoning densities

GROUP 3—Stephanie

1. What recent **local** events have a reasonable likelihood of changing historical population trends in Lane County?

2. What recent **national** or **global** events have a reasonable likelihood of changing historical population trends in Lane County?

3. Based upon responses to the above questions, what techniques or analysis methods do you believe PSU should employ to generate the forecasts?

4. Do you have any other comments to make about the assumptions or methods being considered for Lane County's population forecasts?

- PSU will outreach to small communities?
- What will PSU actually do?
E-mails, what else?
Walking visitors wanted
- Small towns—talk to people and the planners! And City Councils! Elected officials
- How will preliminary information be disseminated?
BCC report and website

TRANSPARENCY!!

- Transparency in process is very important***
- Minority input—no Hispanics in this room. Migration, etc.—what is important to them?

Coburg

- wastewater system expected for completion in 2010
- Urbanization study at city level for UGB expansion—same timeline as other projects, 2010.
- Reconstruction of I-5 interchange—Phase I west side (city) in 2010

Creswell

- water plant upgrade August 2009
- Comp Plan update—UGB expansion 2 years out
- I-5 interchange upgrade completed/IAMP is in process
- New motel is being built
- New middle school is under construction

Small cities are investing in their own communities, see more pro-activeness instead of re-activeness

Junction City

- Prison—2012 first facility (minimum security—500 beds)
2014 (medium security—1200 beds)
- Mental hospital—State—360 beds—2013 target date—2,000 jobs
- Grain Millers relocation—sustainable food manufacturing
- In speicalized periodic review, new Hwy 99 couplet; completed 2010-2011
- New water and wastewater improvements to serve the above
- Trend—recent housing market. Californians staying there, number of immigrants will go down
- Illegal immigration rule changes and observation of existing laws is reducing that.

External Factors

- How do these external assumptions affect the model? What part of “the model” will these factors go into? in-migration
- Looking at E/S and long term plans for dynamic of small cities—and Metro area—how does land availability drive growth in the smaller communities.
- Water availability, global warming
- Sustainable efforts—smaller communities absorb growth—but then what happens?

Lowell

- Natural resources draw people, tourism base, large companies taking a look
- Migration within the county is a factor—transportation trends are a factor
- People will live closer to where they work
- Cost of transportation—more busses, more economical cars?
- Law enforcement is a factor of quality of life
- County decision on long term financial stability will affect the model assumptions

- Aging population may gravitate to cities. Lifestyle
- What will the aging population do to the model?

Coos Bay Port development

- 2 million containers a year!

Oakridge

- New water system upgrade—3 years next phase will be built
- 500 jobs in 5 years—on City-owned industrial site

6. Summarize, Wrap-Up, Next Steps

Ms. Schulz thanked everyone for participating in tonight's meeting. Written input would be accepted until December 16, 2008. Comments from the brainstorming tonight would be made available to the Board of Commissioners and placed on the website.

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

(Recorded by Linda Henry)

m:\2008 minutes\lane county\land management division\planning commission\lpc081202.doc