

# MINUTES & APPROVED \_\_\_\_\_ NOTICE OF BOARD ACTION



## LANE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

*This document, upon approval in a public meeting by the Board of County Commissioners, serves as official minutes of such meetings as required under the Open Meetings Law, ORS 192.650.*

Pursuant to notice made by mailing agendas to news media, a selected list of jurisdictions and individuals in Lane County, a meeting of the Board of County Commissioners was held.

Questions should be directed to The Board Office Specialist 3, ext. 4203.

October 21, 1997  
6 p.m.

JOINT MEETING  
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
and

Harris Hall  
Main Floor

LANE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Commissioner Ellie Dumdi presided with Commissioners Steve Cornacchia, Bobby Green, Sr., and Peter Sorenson present. Commissioner Cindy Weeldreyer excused. Lane County Planning Commissioners Steve Moe, Clay Myers, Dianne Burch, Marion Esty, Carrieanne Davis, David Crowell also present. County Administrator Bill Van Vactor, County Counsel Steve Vorhes, Lane County Planning Director Kent Howe, Senior Planner Jim Mann, and Recording Secretary Kimberly A. Young were also present.

1. SECOND READING AND PUBLIC HEARING/Ordinance No. PA 1101/In the Matter of Amending the Lane County General Plan Policies (an Element of the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan) Goal One Citizen Involvement, Policies 4 & 5, and Goal Two Land Use Planning, Policy 5, to Combine the Lane County Planning Commission with the West Lane Planning Commission and adopting a Savings and Severability Clause. (NBA & PM 10/8/97) (Kent Howe and Jim Mann)

Jim Mann, Lane County Land Management, distributed copies of a letter from Commissioner Cindy Weeldreyer in support of the proposal to combine the Lane County Planning Commission and West Lane Planning Commission, and a letter from West Lane Planning Commissioner Fred Beisse in opposition to the proposal. He added that otherwise, staff had received very little public response to the proposal. Staff held a well-advertised work session

in the Florence area, the area likely to be most affected by the proposal, and no one appeared to comment.

Mr. Mann recommended approval of the proposal for the reasons stated in the staff report.

Responding to a question from Mr. Sorenson, Mr. Mann said that the proposed ordinance merely combined the two commissions and was not specific to commission membership.

Responding to a question from Mr. Crowell, Mr. Mann clarified that the ordinance did not provide for a reduction in commission members from nine to seven; the proposed Lane Manual revisions would establish a nine-member commission, and if that did not work, the number could be reduced to seven.

Mr. Green asked what the public could expect as a result of the proposal. Mr. Mann said that the public could expect that the planning commission would occasionally meet at the coast or other county areas when a significant land use application was considered or when an issue of regional significance arose. Mr. Howe, Lane County Land Management, added that citizens attempting to monitor land use issues in Lane County would no longer have to follow the activities of two commissions and would have to give input on proposals, such as a comprehensive plan amendment affecting forest zones, to only one commission. Mr. Green said that the public needed to recognize that there will be some impact on the level of service they receive given that the proposal represented an operational budget reduction.

Ms. Burch said that the West Lane Planning Commission did not meet on a regular basis so it was less likely to be familiar with current planning issues and county concerns; more regular meetings would allow representatives to address those issues in a more fair, thoughtful, representative manner.

Ms. Dumdi asked about the differences between planning issues in the west county area as opposed to the remainder of the county. Mr. Mann said that the primary difference was the unique coastal environment, which was addressed by specific statewide goals. However, he suggested that there were more commonalities than differences.

Ms. Dumdi opened the public hearing. There being no requests to speak, Ms. Dumdi closed the public hearing, and asked the Lane County Planning Commission to take action.

MOTION: To recommend approval of Ordinance PA 1101 to the Board of County Commissioners

Burch MOVED, Esty SECONDED. VOTE: 6-0

MOTION: Approval of the Ordinance.

Mr. Sorenson commended the proposal, noted the importance of the coast, the increasing complexity of issues coming before the planning commission, and thanked the volunteers on the planning commission.

Mr. Green indicated his support for the ordinance was strictly on the basis of efficiency. He said that it made prudent financial sense to combine the commissions. He noted the hard work done by the volunteers on the planning commission.

Ms. Dumdi noted Mr. Beisse's letter of opposition and indicated her understanding of his position. She noted his offer to resign to reduce the membership on the commission to ease the transition period, and said she wished to go on record as rejecting that proposal. She thought there was no need for resignations, and Mr. Beisse was a valuable member of the commission and vital to the transition. Mr. Green indicated his support for Ms. Dumdi's comments. He said that Mr. Beisse would be of greater help if he continued his membership.

Responding to a question from Ms. Dumdi, Mr. Vorhes said that in the absence of a quorum--Ms. Burch being the only member present--the West Lane Planning Commission could not take action on the proposal.

Green MOVED, Sorenson SECONDED. VOTE: 4-0

2. SECOND READING THE PUBLIC HEARING/Ordinance No. 12-97/In the Matter of Amending Lane Code Chapters 1, 10, 14, and 16 to Revise the Definitions of "Lane County Planning Commission" "Planning Commission," and "West Lane Planning Commission" to Combine the Lane County Planning Commission with the West Lane Planning Commission (LC 1.010, 10.020, 14.015, & 16.090). (NBA & PM 10/8/97) (Kent Howe and Jim Mann)

Mr. Mann reported that the ordinance revised the Lane Code. He said that the commission had the ability to define the quorum requirement as less than stipulated in the ordinance in the future if it deemed necessary. Mr. Sorenson asked if the membership qualifications for the commission were addressed in the ordinance. Mr. Mann said no.

Ms. Dumdi opened the public hearing. There being no requests to speak, Ms. Dumdi closed the public hearing.

MOTION: To recommend approval of Ordinance 12-97 to the Board of County Commissioners.

Crowell MOVED, Burch SECONDED. VOTE: 6-0

MOTION: Approval of the Ordinance.

Cornacchia MOVED, Green SECONDED. VOTE: 4-0

3. ORDER 97-10-21-1/In the Matter of Amending Chapter 3 of Lane Manual to Combine the Lane County Planning with the West Lane Planning Commission (LM 3.510). (Kent Howe and Jim Mann)

Mr. Mann explained that the amendment of Chapter 3 stipulated that two members of the planning commission would be appointed from the West Lane planning area. The parameters of the planning area were defined in the amendment. All other provisions of the manual related to the commission membership remained the same.

Mr. Green believed that the amendment addressed in part the concern raised by Mr. Beisse in his letter of opposition to the proposal to combine the commissions.

Ms. Burch said that Mr. Beisse was concerned that issues specific to the coast would be considered by a knowledgeable, representative body.

Ms. Dumdi noted her previous opposition to proposals to combine the two commissions because of the same concerns expressed by Mr. Beisse. She agreed with Mr. Green's remarks, adding that the representation and commission's intent to meet in the areas where land use proposals originated addressed those concerns.

Mr. Cornacchia said that it was important to be on record about the expectations the board had for the combination of the commissions. He said it was the intent of the board that public hearings and work sessions of regional significance be held in the affected region. It was the expectation of the board that the West Lane area would be able to supply knowledgeable candidates for the positions representing that area, and his expectation that the board would select the most appropriate representatives.

Mr. Crowell noted the West Lane representative could live as far east as Walton given that the boundary was the Mapleton School District boundary. Mr. Green said that the board must keep in mind the need for representation when appointing planning commissioners. Ms. Esty believed that Lane County residents traveled throughout the county and were not as isolated from each other as in the past, and that residents had more concern and understanding of the coastal area. Ms. Dumdi agreed, and said that staff must also ensure that the commission understands that Lane County was bound by all 19 state planning goals, including those specific to the coast.

MOTION: To approve Order 97-10-21-1.

Green MOVED, Cornacchia SECONDED. VOTE: 4-0

4. ORDER 97-10-21-2/In the Matter of Approving Amendments to the Bylaws for the Lane County Planning Commission. (Kent Howe and Jim Mann)

Mr. Mann reviewed changes to the commission bylaws related to special meetings and the membership quorum.

Mr. Sorenson asked if there were other planning areas in Lane County. Mr. Mann said no.

Mr. Sorenson noted his support for meetings in the area impacted by a land use proposal and expressed the hope such meetings would occur. Ms. Dumdi agreed. She said the board holds its meetings in various locations throughout the county and finds that such meetings were very worthwhile. She suggested that the commission consider car pooling.

MOTION: To approve Order 97-10-21-2.

Cornacchia MOVED, Green SECONDED. VOTE: 4-0

5. ORDER 97-10-21-3/In the Matter of Adopting Amendments to the Time lines for the Approved Work Program for the Periodic Review of the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan, Project 1 Work Plans: Goals 11 and 14 Compliance. (Kent Howe and Jim Mann)

Mr. Mann said that the County's original work plan, prepared three years ago and previous to passage of Ballot Measure 50, called for the completion of 35 community plans in three years. Because of budget reductions, staff was proposing to extend the time line. The community plans and update of the Coastal Resources Management Plan would be completed over a nine-year period. That meant the County would have an opportunity to do more concentrated citizen involvement on a watershed basis during the community planning process. Mr. Mann said that he proposed to start the process with the communities in the McKenzie River watershed and use that process as the model for the other watersheds.

Mr. Mann said that staff envisioned a role of the watershed councils in the community planning process. Staff met with the McKenzie Watershed Council and its Executive Committee regarding the concept, and the council had indicated support for the approach proposed by staff. The council had not resolved its role in the process. Mr. Mann said that staff had proposed to solicit feedback from the council on issues of a watershed concern and to conduct information meetings with the watershed council. He said that the council would discuss the proposal again in December.

Responding to a question from Ms. Dumdi, Mr. Mann said that staff had not discussed the concept with the Suislaw Watershed Council.

Mr. Cornacchia asked how community was defined, if the communities had been selected, and if there was debate about those communities. Mr. Howe responded that the community boundaries were fixed in the existing rural comprehensive plan. The communities in the McKenzie watershed were Marcola, Walterville, Vida, Leaburg, Rainbow, Nimrod, Blue River, and McKenzie Bridge. He said that there may be debate about the precise boundaries of the communities by residents living near those communities. However, the community rule implementation process required that the County consider those community boundaries adopted in the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Sorenson asked if the proposal would reduce or roll back planning being done because of fiscal constraints. Mr. Mann said no; he believed that the County could do much more planning using the approach. He believed that the longer process would allow the County to get more grassroots involvement and provide more opportunity for citizen involvement and ownership of the community plans. Mr. Howe clarified that it would take about two years for each watershed planning effort.

Responding to a question from Mr. Sorenson regarding the need for County compliance with goals 11 and 14, Mr. Howe reminded the board and commission of the Curry County court case, which addressed the questions of what was an urban use and what was a rural use. The County would be demonstrating to the Land Conservation and Development Commission that the uses and densities allowed in the rural areas were not urban.

Ms. Davis asked if the community plans would be adopted as completed, or if they must await the completion of other plans. Mr. Mann said that the work program called for the plans to be adopted within the two-year time period allotted for development.

Responding to a question from Mr. Green regarding the need for a public hearing, Mr. Mann reminded the board of the public hearing it held to adopt the work program for periodic review and said that led to the need for a public hearing to consider revisions to the work program.

Ms. Dumdi opened the public hearing.

**Pete Kildra**, 87824 Oak Island Drive, Veneta, said it was his understanding that the periodic review cycle was normally six years. Although he agreed that such an approach might be an effective approach, he questioned how the nine-year time line effected the six-year review cycle.

In response, Mr. Mann said that the six-year time line was established by the Department of Land Conservation and Development. Lane County staff presented the work program with a nine-year time line to the department, and the department indicated acceptance of the time line because the substance of the work program would not change.

Ms. Dumdi read a letter from Commissioner Cindy Weeldreyer into the record. Ms. Weeldreyer indicated support for the staff proposal.

Ms. Dumdi closed the public hearing.

Ms. Esty said that nine years was a long time to complete the community planning process given the speed with which changes were taking place in the county.

MOTION: To recommend approval of Order 97-10-21-3 to the Board of County Commissioners.

Burch MOVED, Esty SECONDED. VOTE: 6-0


MOTION: To approve Order 97-10-21-3.

Cornacchia MOVED, Green SECONDED.

Responding to a question from Mr. Sorenson, Mr. Howe said that staff proposed to complete the community plans in the McKenzie watershed, followed by the Suislaw watershed, Long Tom watershed, and the North Fork or South Fork of the Willamette watersheds, depending on when those watershed councils were established. He said that even if no watershed councils were established for the three latter areas, staff would proceed with the community planning process on a watershed basis.

VOTE: 3-1; Sorenson voting no.

Commissioner Dumdi adjourned the meeting at 7:08 p.m.

  
Kimberly A. Young, Recording Secretary