

Approved January 11, 1995

BOOK 156 PAGE 1916

DRAFT

MINUTES

Joint Elected Officials
Main Hall, Campbell Senior Center--155 High Street

November 22, 1994
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Bill Morrisette, Springfield Mayor; Larry Schanz, Elizabeth Beyer, Stu Burge, Ralf Walters, Greg Shaver, Maureen Maine, Springfield City Council; Jerry Rust, Jack Roberts, Marie Frazier, Ellie Dumdi, Lane Board of County Commissioners; Jim Carlson, Steve Gordon, Carol Heinkel, Kathi Weiderhold, Lane Council of Governments; Mike Kelly, Susie Smith, Springfield; Bill Van Vactor, Roy Burns, Lane County; Jim Croteau, Jan Childs, City of Eugene.

I. WORK SESSION

Mayor Ruth Bascom of Eugene apologized on behalf of the Eugene City Council for its absence, as Eugene was unable to send a quorum of members to the meeting. Mr. Croteau explained that the Eugene City Council would hold a special public hearing on the periodic review work program on December 5, 1994. The council would be provided with audio tapes of this meeting and the meeting minutes.

Mayor Morrisette convened the meeting of the Springfield City Council. Mr. Rust convened the meeting of the Lane County Board of Commissioners and called for the staff presentation.

Mayor Bascom left the meeting.

A. Staff Presentation

Ms. Heinkel introduced staff present and reviewed the order of the agenda.

Mr. Gordon provided the elected officials with background information regarding the history of land use planning in Eugene and Springfield.

Mr. Gordon called the elected officials' attention to a map that illustrated the plan boundaries for the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan, the 1990 Plan, and 1959 Development Plan, and said that the plan boundaries had changed little. He suggested that the boundary had not changed because of the physical constraints to urban growth represented by the rivers and ridgelines that surrounded the metropolitan area, because of existing land use development patterns, and because the community had made and continued to make a considerable investment in its public urban infrastructure.

Mr. Gordon stressed that the community had planned comprehensively for infrastructure improvements. No one service could drive the direction of growth. A minimum level of key urban services was required for development to take place. Mr. Gordon acknowledged community tension about the topic of annexation and development on the urban fringe where a minimum level of services did not exist. He said it would take time for those issues to be resolved. However, Mr. Gordon believed that the metropolitan area's service capacity was in general adequate and in some cases very good.

Ms. Heinkel reviewed the meeting packet.

Ms. Heinkel said that the packet included information describing the distinction between periodic review and a plan update. She briefly reviewed the distinctions.

Mr. Rust asked staff for a recommendation regarding the desirability of including an update of Eugene's South Hills Study in periodic review. Mr. Croteau responded that the City considered the study to be a local Eugene interest. He said that an update of the study had been considered for inclusion in Eugene's planning work program, but had yet to be funded.

Mr. Carlson discussed the population projections in the Metropolitan Plan and TransPlan in relationship to recent growth. He reported that the community had experienced growth of about 40,000 people per decade in the 1970s and 1960s. That growth was used for the projections in the Metropolitan Plan. However, Mr. Carlson said, the community experienced a decrease in growth and some actual population loss in the 1980s due to the recession. Growth had resumed to some degree in 1983. Mr. Carlson said that the plan and TransPlan were keyed to a population level of 293,700, rather than a definite year. He said that 7,000 people had been added to the metropolitan area during the 1980s; between 1990 and 1994, 11,000 more people were added. Staff projected a total increase over the decade of 26,000 people. Mr. Carlson suggested that the population target in the plan would not be reached until after the year 2010.

Mr. Carlson noted that the community had more employment growth than population growth in the 1980s. Additionally, the community had an adequate buildable land inventory to sustain it through the life of the plan.

Mr. Croteau reviewed the recommendations of the Lane County, Springfield, and Eugene Planning Commissions. He reported that the Eugene and Springfield planning commissions favored a comprehensive Metropolitan Plan update, but both commissions indicated support for the draft periodic review program. Mr. Croteau said that the Lane County Planning Commission supported the periodic review work program and acknowledged the community's interest in an update. He said that the project team recommended that the elected officials adopt the periodic review work program. He reminded the elected officials of their direction to staff to approach periodic review, a State-mandated process, in a minimalist fashion. Mr. Croteau said that staff recommended that the

nonperiodic review work tasks not be included in the State-mandated process, but instead be referred to the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) for discussion and prioritization. Staff also recommended that further discussion of a plan update be referred to MPC.

B. Discussion

Mr. Shaver asked if there were any work tasks in the draft periodic review work program that were not mandated by the State. Mr. Croteau said no. Ms. Heinkel pointed out that the Metropolitan Plan amendment process was not mandated by the State but was included because it was being done; the Springfield implementation measures were not specifically required by the State.

Mr. Rust asked how long a comprehensive plan update would take to accomplish. Ms. Heinkel estimated it would require four to five years to complete an update, and it would cost more money. Mr. Burge said that an update would not free the community from its responsibility to complete the periodic review work program. Mr. Croteau concurred.

II. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Open Public Hearing

Mayor Morrisette opened the public hearing on behalf of the Springfield City Council. Mr. Rust opened the public hearing on behalf of the Lane County Planning Commission.

B. Staff Presentation

Staff offered no further comment at this point.

C. Public Testimony

Jonathan Siegle, chair of the Springfield Planning Commission, said that the commission acknowledged the work program as an excellent program. However, Mr. Siegle said, the public testimony before the Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County planning commissions had indicated the need for an update of the Metropolitan Plan. He said that the plan was a fluid document that should be updated when needed. Mr. Siegle said that the draft periodic review work program did not address basic issues. He reiterated that the commission recommended that the periodic review work plan be implemented, but strongly supported a Metropolitan Plan update.

Mr. Siegle acknowledged the higher cost of a plan update, but said that the community was growing and changing, and it would require far more effort and cost to update the plan in the future. He asked the joint elected officials to hear the public testimony with an open mind.

Mr. Rust asked Mr. Siegle if the commission had discussed a source of funding for a plan update. Mr. Siegle said no.

Mr. Walters asked what the commission perceived to be the costs saved by an update. Mr. Siegle responded that the growth patterns established through the Metropolitan Plan should be examined, such as urban development on agricultural lands. He said that the plan should be updated on a regular basis, and it would be easier now, when there are fewer constraints on the urban growth boundary (UGB).

Mr. Cornacchia arrived at the meeting at 6:33 p.m.

Ms. Maine asked what issues the commission would like to see examined in an update. Mr. Siegle said that the issues included the way in which the community was growing and its growth patterns; for example, growth tended to be in the north into the valley. He suggested that perhaps the community should instead look to the south hills, rather than using valuable farmland for urban development. Mr. Siegle said that another issue was the possibility of directing growth to satellite communities. He believed that there were many issues that needed to be discussed in the context of a plan update.

Mr. Burge said he did not think population projections indicated that the community was growing at an exceptional rate. He said that he had heard that a plan update would cost \$3 million. He asked Mr. Siegle, "what date was later?" In response, Mr. Siegle urged the elected officials to consider the testimony of those who had more expert information. He acknowledged that population growth was within projections, but said growth had recently increased on an annualized basis. There was concern in the community that the growth would continue and must be planned for. Mr. Siegle said that the commissions had discussed the cost of a plan update at great length, but budgeting was the purview of the elected officials. Mr. Siegle said that the commission gave the elected officials its best judgment about what should be done.

Responding to a question from Ms. Frazier regarding hazards to development caused by the lack of an update, Mr. Siegle said that the community was building on class I and II agricultural soils, not on the more unproductive secondary lands within the UGB that should be used for housing. He believed that the community needed to reconsider the location of the UGB to avoid the use of prime farmland. Responding to a follow up question from Ms. Frazier, Mr. Siegle suggested that the issue would be addressed in a review of the comprehensive plan elements.

Adell McMillan, chair of the Eugene Planning Commission, reviewed the commission's recommendation. The commission recommended a comprehensive Metropolitan Plan update. The commission believed it was time for dialogue about overall land use goals for the region. Ms. McMillan said that the commission acknowledged that there was currently no funding for a plan update and had recommended approval of the draft periodic review work program as pro-

posed. She said that the periodic review work program items must be addressed in any case. Ms. McMillan suggested that work program items could be completed concurrently with a plan update.

Ms. McMillan recommended that the nonperiodic review work tasks be forwarded to the Joint Planning Commissions Committee (JPCC) for prioritization.

Ms. McMillan noted Eugene would begin development of an Urban Development Functional Plan, and suggested that such a plan was best focused on the entire metropolitan area, rather than on one municipality.

Responding to a question from Mayor Morrisette, Ms. McMillan said that it would be acceptable to the Eugene Planning Commission if prioritization of the nonperiodic review work tasks was done by either MPC or JPCC.

Margaret Holemar Thumel, chair of the Lane County Planning Commission, reported that the commission had forwarded a favorable recommendation and acknowledged public interest in a plan update. She said that local government's fiscal constraints must be taken into account. Ms. Thumel said that the plan can be "tweaked," but she did not believe an update was called for as the plan's population projections have not been achieved. She suggested that the periodic review work program was sufficiently comprehensive.

Ms. Thumel asked the elected officials how effective local government was in service delivery to taxpayers. She believed that there was much duplication of service, and asserted that local government was ineffectively managed due to a lack of funds. Ms. Thumel said that local government was mandated by State and Federal government to do certain tasks for which it was not recompensed. She called for a reevaluation of the structure of local government, including smaller outlying jurisdictions. Ms. Thumel acknowledged success in some joint efforts in government service delivery but believed more could be done. She said that many services being performed by local government could be privatized if performance standards could be established and liability concerns addressed. Ms. Thumel said that further discussion of government efficiency should be part of the community's planning effort.

Jerry Ritter, 1865 Yolanda Street, Springfield, said that he was involved in a growing citizen's group concerned about forced annexation. He claimed that Springfield is on a fast-track toward annexation. Mr. Ritter criticized what he termed the vaguely defined tasks in the work program.

Mr. Ritter said that the vast majority of citizens oppose annexation, and do not want annexation to be part of periodic review.

Mr. Ritter objected to the meeting notice as being insufficiently detailed. He said that the notice should include the implications of periodic review on private property rights. He said that citizen involvement through better communication was a way for the elected officials to achieve the public's trust.

Mr. Ritter submitted written remarks.

Jack Radabaugh, 1361 Louella Street, Eugene, said that no new issues have been included in the periodic review work program. He said that the work program lacked sufficient funding to adequately plan for the community. Mr. Radabaugh said that public input into the work program had been ignored. The public offered 62 proposals for work tasks and none were included in the periodic review work program. Mr. Radabaugh predicted that the result would be appeals to the State.

Mr. Radabaugh asserted that population growth in the community has been substantial and said that Eugene-Springfield will reach the plan's population projections soon. He said that many cities are examining the limits to population growth within city boundaries, and suggested that Eugene and Springfield should do the same.

Mr. Radabaugh called for a comprehensive Metropolitan Plan update. He suggested that the area was out of compliance with State requirements regarding plan updates. He noted the support for an update voiced by the Eugene and Springfield planning commissions.

Mr. Radabaugh reiterated that the funding for the periodic review work program was inadequate. He said that an update could be supported by a "tax on the taxes" from areas that benefit from long-range planning. He closed by calling for an extension of time for the work program planning process and for an independent citizen planning committee.

Mr. Radabaugh submitted written testimony.

Mayor Morrisette asked staff to respond to Mr. Radabaugh's comments about the area's lack of compliance with State requirements. Ms. Heinkel said that the State had indicated that the City was in compliance with its requirements.

Responding to Mayor Morrisette's question, Mr. Radabaugh said that State Goal 1 indicates that in the absence of a citizen planning committee, the area must submit a proposal to the State Advisory Committee regarding citizen involvement. He said that he had not seen a reply from the State Advisory Committee regarding the adequacy of the citizen involvement effort associated with periodic review.

Anna Russo of the State Department of Land Conservation and Development responded to Mr. Radabaugh's testimony, saying that the State requires jurisdictions to use their approved citizen involvement programs for periodic review. She said that the programs were acknowledged by the State. Ms. Russo said that the metropolitan area's citizen involvement program complied with State requirements.

Joyce Lorenz, 2285 Parkside, Eugene, noted her continuing opposition to the Natural Resources Special Study (NRSS) and asked that the record of the public hearing be left open to allow her to prepare and submit testimony.

The elected officials agreed to hold the record open for seven days.

Paul Atkinson, 26884 Powell Road, introduced himself as a farmer and life-long resident of Lane County. He encouraged the elected officials to become more familiar with soil maps and to learn more about the value of Class I and II soils.

Mr. Atkinson called for a comprehensive plan update. He said that the Metropolitan Plan was not upholding Statewide Goal 3, Preserving and Maintaining High-Value and Important Farmland. He asked why the community was allowing valuable agricultural soils to be covered by development.

Mr. Atkinson recalled agricultural uses on land now covered by development and asked if that development had improved the quality of life in the community. He said that the community should not accept the development community's version of economic development at the expense of the state's most stable industries, agriculture and agriforestry. Mr. Atkinson said that agricultural and agriforestry, when sustainably practiced, can help the community maintain its clean air and water, constant food supplies, wildlife, open space, and natural beauty.

Mr. Atkinson indicated he would submit a discussion of a mechanism to address the issue of the cost of conversion of farmland to urban uses: "Does Farm Land Protection Pay?" from the American Farmland Trust.

Mr. Atkinson said that the periodic review work program did not have balance. He referred to Statewide Goal 9, which called for the provision of adequate opportunities for a variety of economic activities. He said that the goal was not sufficiently addressed in the metropolitan area; instead, narrow development interests have superseded planning goals and endangered the long-term health, prosperity, and quality of life for citizens. Mr. Atkinson said that the community's planning efforts did not adequately address goals 3, 4 (the conservation of forest lands), 5 (conservation of open space, protection of natural and scenic resources), 6 (protection of air, water, and land resources), or 9.

Mr. Atkinson submitted written testimony.

Eben Fodor, 394 East 32nd Avenue, Eugene, President of the Friends of Eugene, called for a Metropolitan Plan update. He said that substantial changes in circumstance in the community have occurred since the plan was first adopted, justifying the need for an update. Mr. Fodor said that the metropolitan area has undergone a transformation since the original adoption of the plan. He anticipated further growth in the remainder of the 1990s. Mr. Fodor said that the draft periodic review work program was an inadequate planning response to

changes in the community. He advocated for a visionary, comprehensive planning process.

Mr. Fodor termed the citizen involvement in periodic review disappointing. He said that the process was deficient and asserted it violated State law in many respects.

Mr. Fodor said that planning was an important process that should be adequately funded. He supported a construction tax similar to that recently adopted by Portland to support community planning, saying it would yield \$150,000 annually.

Mr. Fodor criticized the long time period it would take to complete periodic review. He said that the process should be completed within two years, and it should include both vision and identified goals.

Mr. Fodor submitted written comments.

Tom Bowerman, 3370 McKenzie View Drive, said he was disappointed with present community planning processes. He said that the metropolitan area had undergone many changes, and the community was missing an opportunity by not undertaking more comprehensive planning. Mr. Bowerman suggested the result of the missed opportunity would be a community that looked much like other communities.

Mr. Bowerman suggested that planning examines the past, considers the present, and looks to the future. Mr. Bowerman agreed with those who called for a long-term vision. He believed that the community lacked a concept of what the future will look like. Mr. Bowerman said that the objectives and policies in the community's current plans had not been realized.

Mr. Bowerman said that the special features of the Eugene-Springfield area should be integrated into its plans, including wetlands, sloughs, waterways, and farmlands. He advocated an integrated approach toward open space, natural resource lands, and agricultural lands. Mr. Bowerman acknowledged the development pressure on such lands, but said he believed that the community could have truck farms and smaller farms inside the UGB.

Mr. Bowerman called for community-wide design standards.

Mr. Morrisette asked if Mr. Bowerman had reviewed Willamalane's Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan. Mr. Bowerman said yes. He commended the plan and said it was a good example of integrated planning, but it needed to be integrated into other plans more thoroughly, and become part of the Metropolitan Plan.

Hugh Myron, 1294 Horn Lane, said that the Metropolitan Plan should be discarded. It was based on location and money. He asserted that he spoke on behalf of the residents of River Road, and said that the River Road area was not part

of Eugene, but was part of Lane County. He resented the fact that Eugene was responsible for the area's planning and permit processes. Mr. Myron asserted that Eugene held unfair hearings. Mr. Myron said that River Road residents could be provided incentives for inclusion in Eugene, but Eugene must bring money to the River Road residents. He said that if Eugene continued to "rape" the "nice, law-abiding citizens" of River Road, it should not be surprised if "we stop being nice."

Dena Neeman, 3019 South M Street, Springfield, said that there were dangers to long-range planning when the basis for planning was wrong. She said that the best approach to economic development was to improve the existing resource base rather than giving away what the community had. Ms. Neeman said that it was time to consider what the community gained in growth as opposed to what it lost. She said that the community should consider if growth meant dense urban development, given the increase in violent crime she believed would result.

Ms. Neeman believed that the community should avoid development on farmland. She said that farming was incompatible with the urban environment.

Ms. Neeman called for examination of the goals and implementation policies in the Metropolitan Plan to determine whether the policies have accomplished the goals of the plan. Ms. Neeman believed that the community's transportation policies have caused people to drive more. She attributed the loss of retail uses from downtown to transportation planning.

Ms. Neeman noted her opposition to the PROS plan. She asked if the elected officials were planning for people who live in the community now or those who may want to live in the community someday.

Peter Keyes, 1941 East 19th Avenue, Eugene, called for an update to the Metropolitan Plan. He said that the community should determine what it would gain if it grew more intelligently. Mr. Keyes said that there was a need for an overall vision for the community. He believed that the community lacked that vision now. Mr. Keyes suggested that citizens opposed the Ferry Street Bridge expansion because people did not like the vision of the future it represented.

Mr. Keyes believed that the level of citizen participation was less significant than whether such input was listened to. He urged the elected officials to listen to a broad range of community input, not just the voices of the community's most powerful and rich citizens.

Mr. Keyes said that periodic review should be broadened as much as possible. He commended the work of the Land Use Measures Task Force formed in association with the TransPlan update and noted his students' work on that process with the issues raised by the task force. Mr. Keyes said that the issues of transportation and land use should be integrated when possible.

Responding to a question from Mayor Morrisette, Mr. Keyes described the work of his landscape architecture studio and invited the elected officials to a public presentation on November 30 at the University of Oregon.

Mr. Rust asked Mr. Keyes if the studio had the capacity to consider how best to address the cost of metropolitan planning. Mr. Keyes said yes. Mr. Rust asked if the studio could be used as a resource for a plan update. Mr. Keyes said yes.

Art Farley, 907 Woodhill Drive, Eugene, representing the Lane County Audubon Society, noted his earlier testimony regarding the evaluation phase of the periodic review work program. He advocated for expanded consideration of natural resource issues through the NRSS that extended to county lands to ensure a full identification of natural resources. Mr. Farley expressed the hope that Springfield would be able to complete a full analysis of water management issues, including examination of wetlands. He suggested that the two jurisdictions' wetlands plans could be integrated with storm water management plans and Springfield's wellhead protection plan.

Mr. Farley called for an integrated, unified approach to parks, open space, and natural resource areas such as that proposed by the Willamalane Parks District in its PROS plan. He said that there was a shortage of park spaces in many parts of the two cities and that lack must be addressed.

Mayor Morrisette asked Mr. Farley if he supported the PROS plan. Mr. Farley responded that he supported the plan and had testified in its favor.

Referring to Mr. Farley's recommendation to extend the NRSS to include county lands, such as lands now in agricultural production, Mr. Cornacchia asked if Mr. Farley envisioned that extending the study would result in conversion of those lands back to their natural state. Mr. Farley said he did not see that happening. He anticipated possible conversion of those lands intended to be included in the metropolitan area in the future, and suggested it was appropriate to know what natural resources exist in those areas so that the community can pursue the possible purchase of those resource lands with willing sellers.

Mr. Cornacchia indicated his agreement with the approach outlined by Mr. Farley. He noted concerns expressed by county residents about their ability to use their property if the land was included in the NRSS. He believed that the elected officials had an opportunity to express that such was not the intention. Mr. Farley agreed, saying that people needed to know that they were not going to be forced off their land. Mr. Cornacchia said that county residents were concerned that their land was being converted by the application of setbacks. He said that the community needed to reach consensus on those issues.

Responding to a question from Mr. Burge, Mr. Farley confirmed that he would prefer not to expand the UGB at this time. He supported infill and higher density development.

D. Questions From the Elected Officials

The elected officials had no further questions.

E. Additional Testimony

Ms. Heinkel incorporated a letter from Alan Wilm and Doug Dill, co-chairs of the Churchill Area Neighbors, into the public record.

Ms. Heinkel noted that the written record would be held open until November 29, 1994, at 5 p.m.

F. Close Public Hearing

Mr. Rust closed the public hearing on behalf of the Board of County Commissioners. Mayor Morrisette closed the public hearing on behalf of the Springfield City Council.

G. Deliberations by Elected Officials

Ms. Maine said that she did not share the concern expressed in testimony about the need for a Metropolitan Plan update, given that the community had not reached projected populations. She was unsure that current growth rates would be sustained. Ms. Maine said that the testimony indicated that there were issues the elected officials needed to examine. However, she believed that the plan was being updated all the time by the actions taken by the cities and County. Ms. Maine indicated her support of the work program as proposed. She said that some of the nonperiodic review work tasks should be discussed by the elected officials.

Mr. Shaver said that the Metropolitan Plan was not broken, and appeared to be working. He believed the plan was a fluid plan that was continually being updated. Mr. Shaver did not think the community could afford to revisit the basic plan premises, a process which he termed a "can of worms." He was very concerned about the money being spent on periodic review. Mr. Shaver said that the time and money required for a full update were not available. He indicated his support for a minimalist approach to periodic review, and suggested that some of the nonperiodic work program tasks could be addressed through other planning processes.

Mr. Walters expressed appreciation for the testimony. He said he had not made up his mind, although he supported the periodic review work program. Mr. Walters said that the issues raised in favor of a plan update were worthy, but the cost of an update was high. He said that issues must be considered from a variety of perspectives. While some may object to development at Gateway and

missed opportunities in terms of lost farmland, Mr. Walters said that the property owner who sold the land to Sony would have considered it a missed opportunity had he been unable to sell.

Responding to earlier testimony, Mr. Walters questioned the practicality and economic viability of truck farms inside the UGB because he believed agribusiness was the trend, and smaller farms were being "squeezed out." He said that local government cannot prevent that from happening.

Mr. Walters questioned how a municipality could cap its population.

Mr. Walters suggested that if the community implemented all its proposals made for periodic review, the community would be a more attractive place and current residents would be forced out by immigration because they could not afford to live here.

Mr. Burge indicated his support for the periodic review work program and said he was not interested in a plan update. He did not believe that the testimony supported calls for a plan update.

Mr. Burge did not support high-density development. He believed it would have a "terrible social impact" on the community. Mr. Burge averred that social problems in other communities were the direct result of high density. He acknowledged what he termed the "negatives" of urban sprawl, but said that the social problems that accompanied density were "too high a price" to pay. Mr. Burge believed that development above ten units per acre represented high-density development. Mr. Burge said some concentrations of high-density development with open space might be appropriate but he opposed tenement housing and three- to five-story "walkups." He said such development was not necessary because he did not object to extending the UGB to accommodate a way of life that he perceived to be desirable. Mr. Burge said that ghettos were not better than urban sprawl.

Mr. Burge said that the community could not put up "no vacancy" signs. People have a right to move to the area.

Mr. Burge suggested that people get too "hung up" on artificial boundary lines. The boundary was not "set in stone." It was established many years ago and should be flexible. He said that boundary lines could be used to limit growth while the community was experiencing infill development that created social and housing conditions that may not be in the community's best interests.

Ms. Beyer indicated support for the periodic review work program. She was concerned about the cost of a plan update, and suggested that the issue could be addressed in the future.

Responding to a question from Ms. Beyer about the State deadline for submittal of the periodic review work program, Ms. Heinkel said that staff informed the State the program would be late.

Mr. Morrisette supported the periodic review work program. He wondered whether the community was in compliance with State rules. Mr. Morrisette also believed the community needed to seek a way to fund a plan update. He asked staff when a plan update was required. Ms. Smith responded that every seven years the plan must be reviewed for compliance with State laws. There was not a requirement for a plan update. Ms. Russo responded that the citizen involvement process used for periodic review complies with State requirements.

Mr. Morrisette said that there was already integration occurring in planning for recreation, open space, and natural resource protection. He also believed the UGB must be expanded at some point, but that expansion must be liveable. Mr. Morrisette commended the work of the Land Use Measures Task Force and noted its relationship to many of the issues raised in testimony. He said that the work of the task force was helping the community to move in the right direction.

Mr. Schanz supported the periodic review work program and said he did not think a plan update was necessary. He said that the community's geographic constraints presented limits to growth. Mr. Schanz said that as vacancy rates went down and housing prices went up, people could not afford to stay in the community. He said that the community must make decisions about how much density it desired, and whether growth should be upward or outward.

Ms. Dumdi supported the periodic review work program. She said that many of the concepts raised in testimony interested her. However, Ms. Dumdi said that she did not think all the nonperiodic review work program tasks should be done by government. She suggested that the private sector might be very excited by some of the proposals and wish to invest in them.

Ms. Dumdi noted her previous residence in New York City and her current residence on a farm and said density does not enhance the quality of life. High densities detracted from a sense of community. However, Ms. Dumdi believed that good planning did enhance the quality of life. She suggested that imaginative, attractive PUDs could be part of the solution to managed growth, and said that private investment in those factors that enhanced quality of life should be encouraged.

Mr. Cornacchia noted community concerns about growth. He said that the growth the community was experiencing was planned for 15 years ago. He recollected extensive discussions about the uses planned for the Gateway property. Mr. Cornacchia did not believe that the UGB would need to be moved for some time. He supported infill development and said that the cities should not be looking outside the UGB at this time.

Mr. Cornacchia did not think that the community needed to start the debate about basic plan premises again. He said that the land outside the UGB was unlikely to be converted to urban uses in the near future because the community had not reached the population projections in the plan and he did not anticipate that they would be realized soon.

Mr. Cornacchia said that the testimony seemed to indicate that some people do not like what was planned for. He said that was a political issue. Mr. Cornacchia said that he liked, in general, what the plan had achieved. He did not like what had not been planned in the past, such as the strip development along Coburg Road and West 11th Avenue, but pointed out that those decisions were made 30 years ago. Mr. Cornacchia said that many of the things called for in testimony can be achieved through other processes, such as the Land Use Measures Task Force.

Mr. Cornacchia said that he did not support the periodic review work program. He said that it was an expensive process that precluded the community's ability to update the plan on an ongoing basis. However, he acknowledged the statutory requirements that led to periodic review.

Mr. Cornacchia agreed that the community needed to update the plan to some degree through an ongoing, community-based process, but it was unaffordable. He supported the direction the elected officials gave to staff and said staff had produced the document asked for. He commended staff. Mr. Cornacchia said that the County was under tremendous fiscal pressures. He pointed out that Lane County's rural comprehensive plan had been acknowledged only two years ago, but was scheduled for periodic review.

Ms. Frazier concurred with the remarks of Ms. Dumdi and Mr. Cornacchia.

Mr. Roberts said that he did not support a plan update or periodic review. Periodic review was not at the top of the County's priority list in light of its anticipated \$2.5 million deficit, which threatened its ability to provide police, jail, and health and human services. Mr. Roberts believed those services were a higher priority than periodic review.

Mr. Roberts said that the November 8 vote indicated that "business as usual" was not good enough for the voters. He said that all services should be prioritized and funded accordingly. Mr. Roberts did not believe the fact the program was supported in some part by grants was relevant. He said that those who called for a plan update were calling for examination of basic plan premises, including compact urban growth. He said that there may be value in that examination, but he was unsure that the debate about the premises should occur now.

Mr. Roberts said that he shared Mr. Burge's concerns about density to some degree. He believed that actual growth was acknowledged in the concept of compact urban growth.

Mr. Roberts said that the loss of agricultural land to urban growth had not resulted in a shortage of agricultural products. He said that it was wrong to pretend that the community must preserve that "older form of life." A debate about the plan premises, he said, would bring the community no nearer to its goals.

Mr. Roberts said that he supported the periodic review work program as a minimalist approach. He reiterated that it was time to determine the community's priorities.

Mr. Rust said that the community had an opportunity to address many of the issues raised in testimony through the TransPlan update, which was a comprehensive planning process. He believed that it was unlikely that the community would undertake a plan update.

Mr. Rust said that the community should consider including an element in the Metropolitan Plan that addressed natural resource issues. He agreed that the community should attempt to secure private investment in its planning efforts and take advantage of such resources as university classes. Mr. Rust said that the community should consider a construction tax, such as that imposed in Portland, to support planning. Mr. Rust agreed that periodic review was a bureaucracy-driven mandate.

Mr. Rust noted the differences between what the State mandated and what citizens called for in testimony.

The meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)
jeo22.114