

concerns and all the testimony and evidence was taken into consideration as described in the PSU report *Population Forecasts for Lane County, its Cities and Unincorporated Area 2008-2035 (May 2009)* adopted and incorporated here by this reference. The small cities and Eugene and Springfield provided input into the coordinated forecast, as evidenced in the record of proceedings and process for the report.

25. This Ordinance amends the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan, and such amendment shall be by Ordinance as stated in Lane Code Chapter 12.050, Method of Adoption and Amendment. LC12.050(2) is found to be met as follows: The Board may amend or supplement the comprehensive plan upon a finding of: (a) *an error in the plan; or*
(b) *changed circumstances affecting or pertaining to the plan; or*
(c) *a change in public policy; or*
(d) *a change in public need based on a reevaluation of factors affecting the plan; provided, the amendment or supplement does not impair the purpose of the plan as established by LC12.005 below.*

The amendment to adopt a coordinated population forecast is necessary based on changes in public need and circumstances affecting comprehensive plans throughout Lane County. Public policy changes now codified in state law that direct the responsibility for adopting the coordinated forecasts as part of or by reference in a comprehensive plan to the Lane County Board of Commissioners as the decision body for the county and its urban areas has required a re-evaluation of population forecasting and other relevant factors affecting all of the Lane County comprehensive plans. In addition to the public policy changes regarding responsibility of the Lane County Board for countywide coordinated population forecasts, HB 3337 (2007) requires a re-evaluation of population forecasts presented for the Eugene/Springfield Metropolitan Area single urban growth boundary. A single population forecast for that urban area is no longer useful under HB3337 direction enabling Eugene and Springfield to each have their own urban growth boundary and makes it necessary to produce future population projections based on the requirements of each of the two largest cities in Lane County.

LC12.005 Purpose. *The board shall adopt a comprehensive plan. The general purpose of the comprehensive plan is the guiding of the social, economic, and physical development of the County to best promote public health, safety, order, convenience, prosperity and general welfare.*

Lane Code Chapter 16.400(6)(h)(iii)(aa) *further requires the Board to make findings that the proposed amendment meets all applicable requirements of state and local law, Statewide Planning Goals and Oregon Administrative Rules.*

The proposed amendment meets the purpose section of LC Chapter 12 and is also in conformance with the applicable state and local laws, Statewide Planning Goals and Oregon Administrative Rules as discussed below.

26. Goal 1: Citizen Involvement

This goal calls for the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process. It requires each city and county to have a citizen involvement program.

The citizen involvement process timeline presented below is found to be fully compliant with this goal.

On August 5, 2008, the Board of Commissioners directed staff to begin the coordinated population forecast project by solicitation of appropriate consultant firms to conduct the analysis required for the project.

On September 5, 2008, DLCD was notified the cities of Eugene and Springfield had initiated a post acknowledgement plan amendment to the *Metro Plan* to adopt new population forecasts for the cities to comply with the needed housing determination required by ORS 197.304 (HB 3337). The Lane County Planning Commission participated in coordinated population forecasting for the metro cities through a joint hearing with the Metro planning commissions in Springfield City Hall on November 6, 2008 to hear testimony regarding the Metro Safe Harbor separate population forecasts proposed by Eugene and Springfield for the first time under HB 3337. The three planning commissions each voted a separate recommendation up to their elected officials, the vote from Lane County was to recommend adoption.

On December 2, 2008, the Lane County Planning Commission was invited, and many participated in the PSU Countywide Population Forecast Kick-off meeting held in Harris Hall. Two additional public coordination meetings were held upon release of the PSU population forecasts, on February 26, 2009 and March 26, 2009.

The PSU effort was also presented in various ways during the LCPC consideration of the small city PAPA requesting a coordinated countywide population forecast be adopted into the RCP. All of these proceedings gave interested parties and cities an opportunity to coordinate and participate in development of population forecasts for Lane County.

27. Goal 2: Land Use Planning *This goal requires establishment of a land use planning process and policy framework to coordinate decisions and actions related to land use and assuring an adequate factual basis for those decisions.*

The adoption of a countywide coordinated population forecast for the county and urban areas of the county fulfills this goal through the public involvement process under the coordinated policy framework as demonstrated in the public record on file in Land Management. The cities and Lane County have coordinated this decision through the data consideration and analysis phase under contract with PSU. The public was provided ample opportunity for input and involvement in the process, as evidenced by over 300 exhibits in the public record for this project. Therefore adopting this amendment is fully consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 2.

The Lane County Rural Comprehensive General Plan Policies, Introduction, illustrates the connectedness of the city and county plans, and describes the co-adoption of each city's Comprehensive Plan as illustrated in the introduction. In addition to this visual representation of the relationship between the cities plans and the overall general county plan, Part I, Section D of the Rural Comprehensive Plan states:

“While the Policies in this document are directed at Lane County government, it is clearly recognized that the County has a responsibility to, and must coordinate efforts

closely with, the incorporated cities within its boundaries. Statewide planning law requires that each incorporated city develop and adopt its own land use plan which must itself comply with LCDC Goals. The plan must contain essentially the same elements as the County General Plan, with an additional element of an identified Urban Growth Boundary (required by Goal 14). Future urban growth for each city is to take place within that Boundary. In the case of the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area Plan, a mutual Boundary is adopted by both cities and the County. For all other cities, the County must ratify the cities UGBs by independent evaluation of, and adoption of, appropriate city plan provisions.

Through this method, the County becomes responsible for administering the provisions of city plans within the city UGBs but outside of the corporate city limits. 'Joint Agreements for Planning Coordination' drawn up between the County and each city lay the framework for cooperative action in the effort."

The coordinated population forecasts for each urban area provide a key component of the base data to support the policies and framework for long range planning necessary to meet municipal needs for each local jurisdiction particularly as it relates to urban growth. The countywide population forecasts adopted in the RCP provide the basis for cities to use those forecasts and coordinate the population residing in urban areas with the remainder of the population in rural Lane County. The enactment of the statutory and rule requirements applicable in Lane County and the urban areas adopts projections that are reasonable and sufficient for future planning purposes. Those adopted forecasts must then be used by the cities for urban area planning under OAR 660-024-0030.

28. Goal 9: Economic Development *Goal 9 requires the provision of adequate opportunities throughout the state for a variety of economic opportunities to increase prosperity of Oregon's citizens.*

Population Forecasts are a key factor in determining future land needs to serve as location for businesses and companies that provide jobs in Lane County communities. The urban growth boundaries of cities are planned for a twenty year future need as determined by Economic Opportunity Analysis and other documentation that would support amendments and adjustments to UGB's. The lack of a coordinated and adopted forecast, or the adoption of an unreasonable forecast which does not account for current trends poses a significant hurdle to cities seeking to create adequate long range economic development plans. Therefore, adoption of a countywide coordinated population forecast is consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 9.

29. Goal 10: Housing *Goal 10 requires availability of adequate numbers of needed housing to meet the needs of the citizens of the state.*

Population forecasts are used in determining the amount and type of housing needed to accommodate the projected population growth for 20 years. Housing needs are also planned for and determined by urban areas. Housing Needs Studies and other documentation that supports amendments to the population forecast are being reviewed to ensure that urban services are adequate to handle populations which may exceed

those projected in past planning efforts. Adoption of a coordinated reasonable forecast that accounts for current trends complies with this applicable Statewide Planning Goal.

30. Goal 11. Public Facilities and Services *This goal calls for planning and developing a timely, orderly, and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural developments.*

Planning for adequate public facilities and infrastructure requires an accurate population forecast. The design and construction of public facilities such as municipal water and wastewater treatment facilities requires a reasonable population forecast for sufficient supply of infrastructure of a twenty year planning period. The countywide coordinated population forecast will provide the basis for compliance with this applicable Statewide Planning Goal.

31. Goal 12: Transportation *This goal calls for providing and encouraging a safe, convenient and economic transportation system to serve the people.*

Planning for adequate transportation system facilities requires an accurate population forecast. The design and construction of roads, public transportation and associated facilities requires a reasonable population forecast for sufficient budgeting and planning to construct in a timely manner these facilities over a twenty year planning period. The countywide coordinated population forecast will provide the basis for compliance with this applicable Statewide Planning Goal.

32. Goal 14: Urbanization *Goal 7 requires the orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use.*

The adoption of updated population forecasts for the county and urban areas of the county would provide a basis for the twenty year planning for needs in the city's. Establishment and change of urban growth boundaries shall be based on demonstrated need to accommodate urban populations consistent with twenty year population forecasts coordinated with affected governments. The adoption of this amendment is consistent with this applicable Statewide Planning Goal.

Conclusion Findings of Compliance

The adoption of countywide coordinated population forecasts for Lane County and the urban areas of the county as demonstrated in these findings and supporting documents referred to here and incorporated by reference, is found to be in compliance with all applicable statewide planning goals, administrative rules and the Lane County Comprehensive Plan. The PSU report, *Population Forecasts for Lane County, its Cities and Unincorporated Area 2008-2035(May 2009)* is fully incorporated here by reference, contains the supporting documentation, analysis, and responses to relevant comments and questions regarding forecasts for each of the urban areas of the county and provides additional support for this action.

**Population Forecasts for
Lane County, its Cities and
Unincorporated Area
2008-2035**

**Prepared by:
Population Research Center
College of Urban and Public Affairs
Portland State University**

May 2009

*Complete copy provided to Board and
available for review at BCC office*

MINUTES

Lane County Planning Commission
Board of Commissioners Conference Room—125 East 8th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon

January 6, 2009
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Lisa Arkin, Vice Chair; Todd Johnston, Nancy Nichols, Howard Shapiro, Jozef Siekiel-Zdzienicki, Lane County Planning Commissioners; Kent Howe, Keir Miller, Matt Laird, Stephanie Schulz, Lane County Land Management Division; Bob Swank, Lane Council of Governments; Mark Shrives, City of Creswell; Gordon Zimmerman, City of Oakridge; Jessica Taylor, Amanda Ferguson (work session only) City of Cottage Grove; Brian Issa, Ric Ingham, City of Veneta; Kay Bork, City of Junction City; Petra Schuetz (work session only), City of Coburg; Sandra Belson, City of Florence; Carrie Connelly, Attorney for City of Veneta, City of Creswell, City of Oakridge, City of Junction City; Carol Heinkel, Consultant for City of Lowell.

ABSENT: John Sullivan, Chair; Steve Dignam, Tony McCown, Robert Noble, Lane County Planning Commissioners.

Ms. Arkin convened the work session of the Lane County Planning Commission (LCPC) at 5:35 p.m. Staff and Commissioners introduced themselves.

Public Comment—There was no public comment offered.

WORK SESSION

- 1. PA08-5873—Adoption of an Amendment to the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan to Include a Coordinated Twenty Year Population Forecast for the County and for Each Urban Area within the county as Required Under ORS 195.025 and 195.036 (Applicants: Coburg, Cottage Grove, Creswell, Dunes City, Florence, Junction city, Lowell, Oakridge, Veneta, Westfir; Agent: Kay Bock, Planning Manager, City of Junction City).**

Staff: Stephanie Schulz

Ms. Schulz offered the staff report. She explained the meeting was rescheduled from December 16, 2008 due to inclement weather. The purpose of the meeting was to consider the small city Post Acknowledgement Plan Amendment (PAPA) proposing a coordinated twenty year population forecast for Lane County. The Portland State University (PSU) Population Research

Center (PRC) work had been reviewed at previous meetings, and was on its own timeline. There was a joint meeting with the City of Eugene and City of Springfield Planning Commissions at which their Safe Harbor methodology was discussed. The Safe Harbor numbers were included in the data presented to the Planning Commission this evening. The ten small cities were jointly submitting a proposal for consideration by the Commission and adoption by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) for the adoption of an amendment to the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan (RCP) to include a Coordinated Twenty Year Population Forecast for the County and for each urban area within the County.

Responding to a question from Ms. Arkin, Ms. Schulz explained the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) historically had conducted the coordinated population forecast analysis and coordinated the population projections every twenty years for long range planning for use by local governments. New state law required the County RCP to include the population projection numbers. The small cities could not move forward with planning for any municipal facilities such as water or wastewater until the population projection numbers were adopted.

Responding to a question from Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki, Ms. Schulz said PSU was currently gathering information that would be analyzed and released in the future. That analysis does not present a problem for the small cities in moving forward with this proposal. She saw no conflict in the process with the current LCOG numbers and the PSU work.

Responding to Mr. Shapiro and Ms. Nichols' concerns that there would be a significant difference between the LCOG and PSU numbers, Ms. Schulz stated that would be reviewed if it did occur.

Mr. Johnston opined it was not a conflict issue, but potentially an overlap of data. Adoption of the proposal before the Planning Commission by the BCC would allow the small cities to move forward.

Responding to Mr. Johnston, Ms. Schulz iterated she did not believe there was a conflict between the LCOG and PSU processes, it was more of a timing issue.

Ms. Arkin called for presentations from the representatives of jurisdictions participating in the RCP amendment process. Those representatives introduced themselves.

Ms. Bork addressed questions raised by Commissioners. The small cities had submitted the RCP amendment several months before Lane County had decided to do the coordinated population forecast. The numbers were prepared and adopted by the LCOG board in 2004 and several of the cities adopted those figures into their plans. If there had been no change in the State of Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) requiring the County to adopt the numbers in its RCP, the cities would currently be using those numbers in their planning efforts. In addition to buildable lands inventories, several cities were updating public facility plans that relied on the coordinated population numbers. The numbers were needed now to plan out 20 years. Junction City was planning for a state prison and a state mental hospital, and was under a contract with the State to construct utilities, and update wastewater and water master plans for which an adopted number for 2030 was needed. Junction City was also conducting an urban growth boundary (UGB) analysis as part of their periodic review project.

Ms. Belson stated under the new OAR, each city had developed numbers that needed to be coordinated by Lane County. The amendment process would allow use of those numbers.

Ms. Connelly asserted under the OAR changes, the cities could not adopt anything in their facilities or master plans, which were required for infrastructure expansion, without a corresponding number in the County's RCP. The cities started the process in 2006 with LCOG and the County became aware of the rule change in 2007. If LCOG had acted prior to April 2007, there would be no need for the change before the Commission. The cities were in a desperate situation. When the PSU numbers were adopted by the County, the cities could amend their plans as needed. Responding to a question from Mr. Shapiro, it was noted Cottage Grove's numbers were last updated in 2000 and Creswell's numbers were last updated in 1982. Some cities, including Junction City, would be out of compliance with the State Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA).

Ms. Schulz said Veneta recently came off of a moratorium after completion of improvements to the wastewater system. It was considering another moratorium if needed facility planning for infrastructure growth could not be done, and the city again would not be able to issue development permits.

Mr. Zimmerman said although cities with fewer than 5,000 people were not required to conduct periodic review to update their comprehensive plans, they wanted to because it was good planning. He said Oakridge had requested the coordinated population projection in the spring of 2006, and could not proceed with planning for new industry and housing without the information. Infrastructure improvements were funded through state and federal grants, and grants would not be approved without current population projections. Delaying use of the population projection now would possibly push adoption of figures until the 2010 census data became available no sooner than 2011. Timing was a critical issue for all of the small cities. Responding to a question from Ms. Arkin, he said the Safe Harbor number worked for the larger cities. However, small cities, such as Lowell which had a moratorium for 15 years that was recently lifted, would not be able to meet the 20 year population projection numbers because 15 of those years were not relevant due to the moratorium. He said a number of development projects were coming online in Oakridge, including:

- Three hundred residential lots.
- A boat factory opening February 1, 2009 that would employ 100 people.
- Eighteen acres in the industrial park that had been identified for a printing plant.

These developments would increase the population and support a UGB expansion. He said the small cities and two larger cities supported the proposed amendment because they believed the County was wasting money on the PSU numbers because the fractional difference between the PSU numbers and what the cities had done in their own research and histories would be less than one percent. The small cities were frustrated because they believed the County was not paying attention to them.

Ms. Ferguson said Cottage Grove had an economic opportunities analysis grant from the State of Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) that may be lost if a coordinated population projection number was not adopted by June 2010.

Mr. Shrives said Creswell was trying to correct previous plans that did not reflect the exponential growth over the last ten years, which needed the population projection figures. Good planning needed the right numbers when looking at the expansion of the UGB and infrastructure planning. The cities came together to support each other in their planning efforts.

Mr. Issa said in order to build infrastructure in Oregon, it was necessary for a need to be shown. The need was demonstrated through RCPs, facilities plans, and master plans. Veneta was constantly in well exploration mode which needed to be demonstrated in its plans, that were dependent on the population projections. Veneta had grown faster than expected thus reducing the 2020 buffer. The population projections were needed to enable Veneta to build infrastructure to support the growth. He said it was not an issue of whether the numbers were right or wrong, but were they reasonable. The statute stated the numbers should be based on the best available data and methodology but not held to an unreasonable degree of certainty or high level of precision. He opined the small cities had developed reasonable numbers from the LCOG work. He said it made sense for the Cities of Eugene and Springfield to use the Safe Harbor numbers because the difference between the various methodologies was not significant. However, for small cities that were growing fast in comparison to the County, their share had been growing. Methodologies that took this into consideration needed to be used for population projection.

Responding to a question from Mr. Shapiro, Ms. Schulz said the County's contract with PSU did not provide for periodic updates.

Ms. Schuetz concurred with Mr. Issa. She added when applying for funding for major facilities projects, a year period was used to provide for needed capacity at the end of the planning cycle. She cites the Coburg/I-5 interchange project as an example, noting the Transportation System Plan (TSP) process began in 1999, and the first phase of the project would begin in 2010 using the last adopted numbers. A fluctuation from the number, when the project was divided into phases, could impact the need to go back to conduct additional planning and analysis to meet a different coordination. The City of Coburg was moving forward with a \$28 million waste water facility with the assumed numbers. Several grants and loans could be stymied without an adoption of the coordinated population projection within approximately eight months. She added the population projection affected the capital improvement list and projection of future revenue through infrastructure and financing through systems development charges (SDCs).

Responding to a question from Ms. Arkin, Ms. Schuetz said the City of Coburg was currently contracted to do an urbanization study of the UGB, and was out of compliance. The coordinated population projection was the fundamental tool to move forward with the needed analysis.

Ms. Heinkel said the current situation in Lowell was controversial, with at least one person who objected to the proposed population projection that the City had put forth in the application. She reviewed a document entitled, *Presentation to the Lane County Planning Commission by Carol Heinkel, Planning Consultant for the City of Lowell, January 6, 2009*, which would be entered into the record at tonight's public hearing. She reviewed four key points:

- The studies submitted by the City provided valid documentation that supports the proposed 2030 population forecast of 2,823 and a projected annual average growth rate of four percent.

- Lowell's proposed population forecast and growth rate were reasonable and obtainable because the City had removed obstacles to growth, specifically water and sewer system capacity improvements.
- Support for the proposal in the community was unanimous except for one objection from a Lowell developer who controlled a significant amount of undeveloped land in the city.
- It was to be expected that average annual growth rates in small cities would be higher than in big cities.

Mr. Howe thanked Planning Commissioners for attending tonight's meeting. He said the Land Management Division was experiencing a budget shortfall due to a precipitous reduction in construction activity that resulted in a fifty percent reduction in fees received in the first quarter. Since the division was fee based and received no General Fund, revenue projections for the year led to planning program staff reductions from 16 positions to 6. This would have significant impacts on the division's work program and what it could accomplish. The BCC had directed staff to work on population coordination, significant Metro Plan policy issues, as well as activities required by statute. According Lane Manual requirements, the Planning Commission annual report was due by February 1, 2009 and offered a timeline for completion.

Ms. Arkin closed the work session at 6:50 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. **PA08-5873—Adoption of an Amendment to the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan to Include a Coordinated Twenty Year Population Forecast for the County and for Each Urban Area within the County as Required Under ORS 195.025 and 195.036 (Applicants: Coburg, Cottage Grove, Creswell, Dunes City, Florence, Junction city, Lowell, Oakridge, Veneta, Westfir; Agent: Kay Bock, Planning Manager, City of Junction City).**

Staff: Stephanie Schulz

Ms. Arkin convened the public hearing of the Lane County Planning Commission (LCPC) at 7:00 p.m. Staff, Commissioners and visitors introduced themselves.

Ms. Schulz offered the staff report. The small cities in Lane County submitted the proposal to amend the RCP to include a coordinated a twenty year population forecast for the County and the cities within the County. Population forecasts are used in land use planning as a basis for determining the amount and type of housing needed to accommodate residents and to ensure sufficient land was available for economic growth that provided jobs. The requirement for the RCP to explicitly include population projection forecast numbers was a change in state law that affected the process and outcome that had been successfully used in Lane County for long range planning for thirty years. Currently, the RCP did not include previously coordinated population forecasts. Under the previous process, the population projection numbers were stated in each of the cities' comprehensive plans and the left over population was understood to be located outside the cities' UGBs and therefore the rural unincorporated portion of the population is identified as living in rural Lane County. All counties in Oregon are required to coordinate with their cities to

develop population forecasts for use by the County and cities in land use planning activities. Forecasts reflect and incorporate expertise and decisions such as the integrity of the base data used, the appropriateness of the statistical model employed and the reliability of the assumptions considered. Forecasts are an educated best guess of what the future population of an area would be and should not be held to an unreasonably high level of precision. The small cities initiated the proposal in response to statutory and rule requirements that now pertain to the countywide population forecasts and the County's RCP. The small cities that had seen rapid growth over the past few years and those with recent water and sewer service capacity improvements propose that circumstances pertaining to the RCP and the laws regarding population projections have changed sufficiently to require this amendment to their population projections. The lack of an adopted forecast or the adoption of an unreasonable forecast that does not account for current trends posed a significant hurdle to cities seeking to create adequate long range plans and comply with applicable statewide planning goals. She directed Commissioners to supporting documents included as attachments to the Staff Memo for December 8 and 18, 2008. Criteria for the proposed RCP adoption and amendment was cited in Lane Code 12.050(1) and Lane Code 12.050 (2)(a)(b)(c)and (d).

Ms. Schulz said the application submitted by the cities was deemed complete on October 2, 2008. A work session and public hearing was scheduled before the Planning Commission on December 16, 2008. Referral notice of that hearing was mailed to agencies and interested parties and published in the Register Guard on November 26, 2008. Prior to this evening's hearing, the Lane County Planning Commission had participated in coordinated population forecasting for the metro cities through a joint hearing in Springfield on the Safe Harbor separate forecasts proposed for the first time under House Bill (H.B.) 3337 and the countywide forecast kickoff meeting on December 2, 2008.

Ms. Schulz distributed the following documents:

- Letter dated January 2, 2009 to the Lane County Planning Commission from the City of Lowell mayor and city councilors.
- *Presentation to the Lane County Planning Commission by Carol Heinkel, Planning Consultant for the City of Lowell, January 6, 2009.*

Ms. Arkin asked for staff presentations from representatives from the small cities.

Ms. Bork stated the City of Junction City submitted a joint application on behalf of the cities of Coburg, Creswell, Cottage Grove, Dunes City, Florence, Lowell, Oakridge, Veneta and West Fir to request an amendment to the Lane County RCP to include a twenty year coordinated population for Lane County and the urban areas. The proposed amendments were included as Table A in the appendix of the submittal materials. The City of Eugene and City of Springfield had submitted letters of support for the application although they were not part of the application. The City of Dunes City had proposed different numbers since the application was submitted and was asking for a revision to the table included in the original application documents. Ms. Bork submitted a letter into the record dated December 10, 2008 from Lisa Ekelund, Planning Secretary, Dunes City, for updating PA08-5873, exhibit number 3.

Ms. Bork said the cities had submitted the RCP amendment application in response to a change in the OAR that required Lane County to adopt a coordinated population in to its RCP to enable

the cities to be able to use the long range population forecast in their planning efforts or to adopt a figure into their comprehensive plan. Several of the cities required the numbers to be able to move forward with critical planning efforts in their communities. She reviewed the history of the application process and emphasized the need to continue with the amendment process to enable cities to move forward with individual planning efforts. She anticipated that this process would be completed before the PSU process and asked the Planning Commission move forward with recommending adoption. The current population forecast was developed by LCOG with input from city and county staff and adopted by the LCOG Board in 2005, after which some cities adopted the figures into their comprehensive plans. Junction City was asking that the numbers for their city be adopted because of the future location of two state facilities in Junction City and possible expansion of the UGB.

Responding to a question from Ms. Arkin, Ms. Bork reviewed the expiration dates of the cities' comprehensive plans.

Ms. Taylor said Cottage Grove supported the application from the small cities. She noted Cottage Grove was working with a DLCED economic opportunities analysis grant that was projected for completion in June 2009 for which the population numbers were needed.

Mr. Shriver said the City of Creswell had been working with the small cities on the amendment. He iterated without a coordinated population figure for the City of Creswell, a number of projects, including work on the comprehensive plan update, TSP update, interchange area management plan, North Oregon Avenue study, and public facilities plan were at a standstill after significant financial and community investments. He expressed concerned momentum would be lost on many of the projects because they could not move forward. He asked the Planning Commission to keep the process moving and move it forward to the BCC.

Ms. Belson said the Florence City Council adopted a resolution adopting a population forecast for the Florence UGB for 2025 and 2030 in January 2005. She reviewed the City's growth rate and other historical trends. She asked the Planning Commission to be responsive to the requests of the small cities' coordinated request. She expressed reservations that the Lane County planning staff, with its reduced resources, would be able complete the PSU process within the needed timeframe.

Ms. Heinkel said the City of Lowell anticipated that inter-city commuting would continue throughout the county. She noted Lowell was requesting a higher number than adopted by the LCOG Board in 2005. The UGB boundary would likely be a more controversial element of population growth that was not part of this amendment process but would be addressed through other processes, OARs and local urbanization policies. She reviewed possible projects in various design and costing phases including:

- A project to increase water production that was currently scheduled for construction in 2011.
- A lower level water storage reservoir project.
- An upper level water storage reservoir for increased capacity.
- Extension of water and sewer service to unserved areas.

Responding to a question from Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki, Ms. Heinkel opined Lowell was the only jurisdiction where the current LCOG numbers were challenged by one developer who owned a significant amount of property. She thought there was a desire to get a third opinion on two conflicting consultants' reports. Mr. Shapiro added Florence also experienced a controversy regarding the LCOG numbers.

Mr. Zimmerman said house building was currently driving the Oakridge economy, with five subdivisions with 300 home sites currently under development which were selling to people seeking employment, California retirees and "Eugene flight" people. Fourteen percent of the Oakridge workforce commuted to the Willamette Valley. A boat manufacturer was scheduled to open February 1, 2009, with projected employment of 100 people within a year. A printing operation employing 400 people within five years was considering moving to Oakridge. These changes would bring the total workforce to where it was when the mills closed 23 years ago. Additionally, Westfir had 100 home sites under development. Oakridge was completing a \$3.3 million water project, for which the initial planning was done in 1997. He supported the applications by all of the small cities to adopt a coordinated population estimate to allow them to do the necessary planning for twenty years. He asked the Planning Commission to recommend that the BCC support the small cities in their efforts as local governments.

Mr. Issa said Veneta had ample land and UGB expansion was not an issue for the City. However, having adequate facilities to serve the residents was an issue for Veneta. Failure to provide adequate facilities could again result in a development moratorium in Veneta. Veneta was one of the fastest growing cities of Lane County, and there was nothing in the trends indicating that would change. The majority of the population projection work was done and there had been little opposition except as previously mentioned in Lowell and Florence. The issue before the Planning Commission was whether the application met the criteria or not. Under the Lane County RCP criteria, the BCC could amend or supplement the RCP with a finding of an error in the plan, circumstances had changed which affect or pertain to the plan, or there was a change in public policy or public need. He noted a change in state law had put Lane County out of compliance and the County needed to adopt the numbers into the RCP.

Responding to a question from Ms. Arkin, Mr. Swank stated the information shared this evening was very good. Responding to a question from Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki, Mr. Swank was reluctant to make comments that he could not document. He explained there were no LCOG numbers. Rather LCOG provided services to member governments. He said conditions varied among the cities and the most useful methodologies also varied. He asserted it made no sense to use a fifteen year trend analysis on a city that had experienced seven or eight years of moratorium during that fifteen year period.

Ms. Connelly said although some of the cities' population forecasts extended to 2025, it was important to stay ahead of the curve adding over time many of the numbers were inadequate due to circumstances that had arisen since they were adopted. She iterated the numbers were not LCOG's numbers but were developed with the individual cities by the people who knew what needed to happen in their cities. Additionally, tax bases were decreasing and cities were turning more often to SDCs which required capital improvement plans which required facility plans that were tied to the cities' comprehensive plans which had to reflect the county coordinated

population numbers. The small cities could not plan for infrastructure improvements without county action first. She urged the Planning Commission to allow the process to move forward.

Ms. Arkin called for public testimony and noted there was no one from the public who wished to address the Planning Commission. She then called for questions from Commissioners.

Mr. Johnston said very little contradictory evidence had been offered and no contradictory evidence in many cases when it came to the numbers the applicants had provided. He asked if there were any applicants that had provided a forecast that was developed in a manner that was inconsistent with the methodology used by LCOG. He asked if there were any applicants that could not say that their forecast was developed in a manner that was inconsistent with commonly accepted practices and standards for forecasting used by professional practitioners in the field of demography or economics.

Mr. Swank said all the cities' methodologies except Lowell's were based on either the forecasts adopted in February 2005 which were the result of a coordinated process or a five or fifteen year trend analysis that used the certified population estimates from PSU and Microsoft's forecast, known as a straight line regression, which were straightforward and would be difficult for anyone to challenge.

Mr. Johnston stated Lowell's methodology also contained evidence from practitioners in the field certifying that the methodology was based on accepted practices.

Ms. Arkin acknowledged the cities wanted to move forward and expressed concern that economic conditions had changed since the commencement of the project in 2006 that would have a negative impact of the proposed amendment.

Mr. Ingham said the cities were not projecting numbers outside of the state process. The cities then needed to coordinate a number that matched the state number. He added Lane County had stumbled on a process that each of the other 35 counties in the state had not had a problem in completing. The Willamette Valley was one of the most desirable places in Oregon and would continue to see private investment in the communities.

Ms. Heinkel understood Lowell was the only community that used the 2050 methodology, which was very transparent, for their population numbers. Lowell also relied on the economic opportunities analysis from ECONorthwest that found the 2050 methodology to be valid.

Mr. Issa understood PSU intended to incorporate a portion of the 2050 study into their model in the current population projection analysis.

Mr. Zimmerman understood that part of President Elect Obama's stimulus package may be a 10,000 square foot incubator project in Oakridge. If that occurred, Oakridge had the potential for more growth. The small cities represented at tonight's meeting had desirable life styles that attracted people. There were employment and affordable housing components that supported that attraction. In addition to current housing development, the City also owned an additional sixty acres that were available for future residential development. The City had chosen not to develop that property because of the laws of supply and demand which were the foundation of

the Lowell situation. The owner of the majority of developable lots in the city would lose economic interest if the City expanded its UGB, which was the crux of the controversy.

Ms. Belson offered clarifying comments regarding Florence. In March 2004, the City adopted an ordinance for the Realization 2020 RCP that included the 2025 population figures. Subsequently, in 2004, Lane County adopted an ordinance for the UGB, which was when some of the controversy occurred. In 2005, the City readopted the 2025 number and added the 2030 number. She was not aware of any controversy resulting from the 2005 action.

Ms. Connelly stated the cities were not relying on the 2005 numbers, but rather were relying on current growth data.

Ms. Arkin closed the public hearing and opened the floor for deliberation.

Mr. Johnston opined the Planning Commission decision was a relatively easy one, while the BCC decision was more challenging. The Planning Commission's job was to weigh the evidence supporting or not supporting the data provided. Lane Code 12.050 criteria were met, OAR 660-24-0030(2) criteria were met, there was no evidence that the information provided was did not meet a reasonable level of precision, and without exception there were reasonable findings to use as a basis for the forecasts. It was not the Commission's job to speculate on what the BCC felt was the relevance of the PSU information. He would support recommending that the BCC adopt the proposed amendment.

Ms. Nichols said it was clear that the cities needed to move forward although she speculated that some of Lowell's aspirations were not realistic and the core assumption that the economy in Lowell would change perhaps was incorrect. She wrestled with holding up the other cities because Lowell may be wrong. She had observed that Veneta was growing and they needed to be able to move forward with their planning.

Mr. Shapiro recalled the PSU work would consider the economic situation and projections in their forecasts. He concurred with Mr. Johnston that was a decision for the BCC. He supported accepting the numbers provided by the small cities including Lowell because it recently came off a moratorium. He wrestled with a possible UGB expansion.

Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki wanted to deny the application. He questioned dealing with two sets of data, the PSU data and the small cities data. The issue became confusing when the BCC threw out the LCOG system it had used for thirty years. Thus, he had a difficult time accepting the system the BCC had gotten rid of.

Ms. Arkin thought the economy would undergo a big change and not be as robust as it had been in recent years. She suggested recommending the BCC amend the RCP with the adopted 2030 numbers and review the PSU numbers when the work was completed. She acknowledged it was important to move forward.

Mr. Shapiro, seconded by Ms. Nichols, moved that the Planning Commission recommend the adoption PA08-5873 as presented including the Dunes City amendment provided at the public hearing and with the con-

dition that the Board of County Commissioners re-evaluate the forecast with the applicants when the Portland State University study came in.

Mr. Johnston offered a friendly amendment to the motion, that the Planning Commission recommend that the Board of County Commissioners make good use of the time and money spent on the Portland State University study and incorporate it into future planning efforts.

Mr. Shapiro declined to accept the friendly amendment.

Mr. Howe emphasized the importance of the BCC understanding the Commissioners' vote. It was important to reference the applicable criteria and cite the reasons for why Commissioners voted as they did.

Mr. Johnston encouraged Commissioners to provide specific basis in the criteria by which to deny the application to the BCC, because he did not believe there were any. He believed the application met all of the applicable criteria without exception. He was concerned that the motion was conditioned upon a subsequent event and that if it did not occur, the Planning Commission would have made no recommendation. He would vote against the motion although the application should be adopted by the BCC.

Ms. Nichols believed the motion met the requirement and supported the motion. She was satisfied with the condition since it was only a recommendation.

Mr. Shapiro supported the motion because the projections met the applicable criteria and the Lane County population forecast at this time. It was important since Lane County had invested the money in a newer study and the newer figures should be re-evaluated by the BCC and by the applicants.

Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki planned to vote to deny. Lane County had started a new process and the proposal would adopt an old process. The Planning Commission voted in the past to recommend to the BCC that it adopt the LCOG numbers which the BCC reversed. Adoption of the proposal before the Planning Commission would only complicate matters. He thought some of the numbers, particularly from Lowell, were inflated.

Ms. Arkin planned to vote to deny, citing Lane Code 16.400(5) and (7) and OAR 660-24-0030(2). She thought new information would come and help in the planning process. She suggested recommending that since there were existing adopted coordinated population projections, Lane County amend the RCP to adopt with the small cities the plan that was in place, i.e., the LCOG plan. The County did need to amend the RCP and work with the cities to move forward.

The motion failed, 2:3, with Commissioners Nichols and Shapiro voting in favor, and Commissioners Arkin, Johnston and Siekiel-Zdzienicki voting against.

Mr. Johnston moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of County Commissioners they adopt PA08-5873 as presented including the Dunes City amendment provided at the public hearing. There was no second to the motion.

Ms. Arkin moved that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners to amend the Rural Comprehensive Plan and adopt the population forecast as listed in *Table 1, column 3, adopted 2030 coordination population*, that was proposed by the Lane Council of Governments in 2004-2005 which would allow them to move forward with infrastructure planning.

Mr. Howe asserted the Planning Commission had an application before it and the motion did not address that application.

There was no second to the motion.

Mr. Johnston, seconded by Ms. Nichols, moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of County Commissioners they adopt PA08-5873 as presented including the Dunes City amendment provided at the public hearing with the further recommendation that the Board of County Commissioners consider and include in its plan the results of the Portland State University study currently underway.

Mr. Shapiro opined the BCC would like to have move direction on what to do with the PSU study.

Ms. Arkin said she would vote against the motion because she felt until the new population forecast and supporting data was available, the adopted 2030 population forecast developed by LCOG was not valid.

The motion failed, 2:3, with Commissioners Johnston and Nichols voting in favor, and Commissioners Arkin, Shapiro and Siekiel-Zdzienicki voting against.

Mr. Johnston moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the Board of County Commissioners adopt PA 08-5873 as presented, including the Dunes City amendment provided at the January 6, 2009 public hearing with the suggestion that the Board of County Commissioners also consider and include the results of the Portland State University population forecast study when those results became available.

Mr. Shapiro offered a friendly amendment that the Planning Commission further suggested that Lane County include the cities in the reevaluation of the plan when the Portland State University results became available. Mr. Johnston accepted the friendly amendment.

MINUTES

Lane County Planning Commission
Board of Commissioners Conference Room—125 East 8th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon

March 3, 2009
5:30 p.m.

WORK SESSION

PRESENT: Robert Noble, Vice Chair; Steve Dignam, Tony McCown (work session only), Nancy Nichols, Howard Shapiro, Jozef Siekiel-Zdzienicki, John Sullivan, Lane County Planning Commissioners; Cathy Engebretson, Chair; Katie Thiel, Vice Chair; Lisa Hellem, Dan Claycomb, City of Coburg Planning Commissioners; Celia Barry, Mark Bernard, Lane County Transportation; Kent Howe, Stephanie Schulz, Lane County Land Management Division; Petra Schuetz, City of Coburg Planner; Terry Cole, Oregon Department of Transportation; Patty McConnell, guest.

ABSENT: Lisa Arkin, Chair; Todd Johnston, Lane County Planning Commissioners; Glenn White, City of Coburg Planning Commissioner.

Mr. Noble convened the work session of the Lane County Planning Commission (LCPC) at 5:35 p.m. Staff and Commissioners introduced themselves.

Public Comment—There was no public comment offered.

1. Approval of Minutes—November 4, 6, 18, December 2, 2008 and January 6, 21, 2009.

November 4, 2008 Minutes

Mr. McCown, seconded by Mr. Sullivan, moved for approval of the November 4, 2008 minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

November 6, 2008 Minutes

Mr. Sullivan, seconded by Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki, moved for approval of the November 6, 2008 minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

November 18, 2008 Minutes

Mr. Noble offered the following correction: Page 11, paragraph 5, should read: Mr. McCown, seconded by Mr. Noble, moved to close the public hearing and to leave the record open until February 6, 2009. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. McCown, seconded by Mr. Shapiro, moved for approval of the November 18, 2008 minutes as amended. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

December 2, 2008 Minutes

Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki, seconded by Mr. McCown, moved for approval of the December 2, 2008 minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

January 6, 2009 Minutes

Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki, seconded by Mr. Shapiro, moved for approval of the January 6, 2009 minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

January 21, 2009 Minutes

Mr. McCown, seconded by Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki, moved for approval of the January 21, 2009 minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

2. Co-Adoption of the Coburg/I-5 Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) and the Mapped Coburg IAMP Overlay Zone as a Refinement to the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan

Ms. Engebretson convened the Coburg Planning Commission meeting. Ms. Schuetz called the roll.

Mr. Sullivan stated he had not attended the January 21, 2009 the Planning Commission meeting in Coburg. However, he had read all of the applicable minutes, and all of the information distributed prior to and subsequent to the meeting. He felt he was qualified to both deliberate and vote on the issue unless there were objections.

Mr. Dignam acknowledged he had not attended the January 21, 2009 the Planning Commission meeting in Coburg but said he intended to participate since the meeting was not a quasi-judicial hearing.

Mr. Noble said he had an *ex parte* contact at the recent Home and Garden Show at the Lane County Fairgrounds with the owner of agricultural property in the vicinity of the subject amendment to the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan. He did not believe this contact would prevent him from deliberating and voting impartially.

Mr. Dignam opined Mr. Noble's interaction with the party did not constitute an *ex parte* contact.

Ms. Schulz offered the staff report. She said the City of Coburg and Lane County Planning Commissions held a joint meeting on January 21, 2009 at Coburg City Hall to provide interested parties the opportunity to give testimony on the Coburg/I-5 Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP). The purpose of the Coburg/I-5 IAMP was to ensure that investments in state transportation infrastructure preserved the long term functionality of the system, through integration of transportation and land use planning at the city, county and state levels. The Coburg/I-5 IAMP recommended: (1) operational and physical improvement, including access management; (2) local policy and development code changes; and, (3) providing the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) with notice of and the opportunity to participate in land use actions within the IAMP area. The IAMP was a collaborative document and reflected coordination among ODOT, the City of Coburg, and Lane County. The IAMP must be adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC), the City of Coburg, and Lane County to be in effect.

Ms. Schuetz said no substantial changes had been made to the code or the document since the January 21, 2009 meeting. She entertained questions from Commissioners.

Mr. Noble called for comments from ODOT staff.

Mr. Cole said the long term objectives of implementing provisions of the state division 51 access management rule to provide for adequate spacing on either side of the interchange ramps had not changed. The state ultimately intended to purchase access control on the west side, where local improvements were already underway. There were not funds currently available to pursue implementation on the east side at the present time. The state was still considering several options to purchase access control and complete construction. The state would continue to work with Lane County staff to assess risk and benefits associated with various options on the east side.

Ms. Barry explained staff had discussed the issue with legal counsel, and understood staff would need to return to the Planning Commission for another public hearing if code changes were required. She understood ODOT was fine with moving forward on the adoption of the IAMP with the additional policy included in the agenda packet. Ms. Barry asked the Planning Commission to adopt the IAMP with changes previously suggested by staff.

Mr. Cole asked the Planning Commission to make a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) based on the information before the Planning Commission with the understanding that there could be a procedural modification. There could be a code change to recognize the ODOT spacing standards being included within the Lane County code as one of the alternatives being discussed.

Responding to a question from Mr. Dignam, Ms. Barry stated the ODOT policy document section 10-A, contained a policy that a 1320 foot spacing standard shall apply. However, that same standard was not part of Lane Code, thus Lane County could not enforce that standard. Lane County could adopt the plan, but unless and until the County had code language that

reflected the ODOT policy language or ODOT purchased access rights on the east side and then enforce its own standards, the County could not enforce the standard.

Mr. Dignam noted four people provided testimony in opposition to the plan and understood from the staff report that all of their concerns had been satisfactorily addressed.

Ms. Thiel said in light of today's news about the closing of Monaco Coach Corporation, there was still a need for land use planning for the area, which the proposed refinement to the Rural Comprehensive Plan would address.

Ms. Engebretson acknowledged there mixed feelings in Coburg about the plan, and other projects such as the sewer projects. People wanted to keep the school in Coburg. The community needed to ensure industry remained in the community. Local roads were becoming inadequate for local property owners and businesses. She favored making infrastructure improvements that would serve the community.

Ms. Thiel, seconded by Mr. Claycomb moved, that the Coburg Planning Commission recommend that the Coburg City Council adopt the IAMP. The motion passed unanimously, 4:0.

Mr. Noble called for discussion by the Lane County Planning Commission.

Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki had asked about the population count at a previous meeting, noting that the report said the work was based on a future population and economic growth. Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki disagreed with the staff statement at the previous meeting that the population forecast was not relevant to the IAMP. He noted Coburg was one of two cities that wanted to adopt the LCOG Coordinated Population Forecast numbers rather than the Portland State University (PSU) Population Forecast numbers.

Ms. Schuetz asserted Coburg was one of the only small cities that had an acknowledged Comprehensive Plan that was co-adopted by Lane County in 2005 and had a co-adopted population projection through 2025. Coburg supported moving forward with the Post Acknowledgement Plan Amendment (PAPA). Coburg was concerned with the preliminary PSU numbers primarily because not all of the Coburg inputs had been included. Coburg wanted to see the draft methodology rather than preliminary numbers. It was difficult at this time to say whether or not Coburg supported the PSU numbers.

Responding to a question from Ms. Nichols, Ms. Schuetz said until today, the ration of employment to population was three to one. Coburg was currently one of the most offset communities in the state. Transportation infrastructure was crucial to future development and to supporting existing businesses. The original drive for the IAMP came from the business community and the community made a commitment to build a wastewater system to support the industry and a reconstruction of the interchange.

Ms. Thiel averred that when the economy eventually turned around, the plan before the Planning Commission tonight would not be adequate in twenty years to address growth and development.

Responding to a question from Mr. Shapiro, Mr. Cole said the IAMP had been in process for four years. He reviewed the history of the process from transportation system planning, funding, project development.

Mr. Shapiro saw the wisdom in moving forward. When the economy improved, it would be too late to plan. He was leaning towards supporting the IAMP and getting the infrastructure in place.

Responding to a question from Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki, Ms. Barry said the Knee Deep Cattle Company was talking with staff and a construction design was underway. ODOT had been working with the property owners. She did not know Knee Deep Cattle Company's current position.

Mr. Dignam, seconded by Mr. McCown, moved that the Lane County Planning Commission recommend the Board of County Commissioners co-adopt PA09-5027, with the change to Chapter 6 and removal of Appendix M cited by staff and as discussed in their presentation at this meeting.

Mr. Dignam would support the motion because the concerns raised by the public at the public hearing had been addressed and it appeared that any potential impact on agricultural lands according to Goal 3 would need to be addressed in any future land use issue.

Mr. Sullivan would support the motion since it was substantiated by Section 12 of the Lane Code and would qualify under Section 16 of the Lane Code.

The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Mr. Noble thanked the Coburg Planning Commission for their work.

The Coburg Planning Commission adjourned at 6:27 p.m.

Mr. Howe noted that Ms. Arkin recently visited with some Land Watch folks and announced there would be no Planning Commission hearing tonight on the PAPA for the ten small cities. When staff were contacted by Land Watch, staff clarified the public hearing was scheduled for this evening. Upon talking with Ms. Arkin, Mr. Howe learned she had misunderstood the meeting schedule information and misspoke to the public. Mr. Howe thought the misunderstanding had been corrected. Responding to Mr. Dignam, Mr. Howe acknowledged the legal notice had precedence over other information.

Mr. Noble adjourned the work session at 6:31 p.m.

Mr. McCown left at 6:31 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING

PRESENT: Robert Noble, Vice Chair; Steve Dignam, Nancy Nichols, Howard Shapiro, Jozef Siekiel-Zdzienicki, John Sullivan, Lane County Planning Commissioners; Carrie Connelly, representing Creswell, Junction City, Oakridge, Veneta; David Clyne, Junction City Administrator; Maurine Weathers representing Lowell City Administrator; Judy Volta, Mayor of City of Coburg; Petra Schuetz, Milo Mecham, City of Coburg; Brian Issa, City of Veneta; Don Driscoll, Ken Hern, Mia Nelson, Robert Emmons, Mona Lindstromburg, guests.

ABSENT: Lisa Arkin, Chair; Todd Johnston, Tony McCown, Lane County Planning Commissioners.

1. PA08-5873—Adoption of an Amendment to the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan to Include a Coordinated Twenty Year Population Forecast for the County and for Each Urban Area within the County.

Applicants: Junction City as lead city with Coburg, Cottage Grove, Creswell, Dunes City, Florence, Lowell, Oakridge, Veneta and Westfir.

Mr. Noble reconvened the Lane County Planning Commission at 7:00 p.m. He explained the purpose of the public hearing was to receive public testimony to enable the Planning Commission to make a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) on the findings of fact showing compliance with the applicable Comprehensive Plan policies in Lane Code criteria as cited in the staff report. Evidence and testimony must be directed toward the approval criteria. Testimony not directed to the approval criteria may be irrelevant to the land use proceeding.

Mr. Noble asked Commissioners if there had been any *ex parte* contacts or if there were any abstentions due to conflicts of interest.

Mr. Dignam asked staff to confirm if the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) was currently doing any work with Lane County on this application. Ms. Schulz confirmed LCOG was not doing any work with Lane County on the application. Mr. Dignam stated he was an employee of LCOG, but since LCOG was not currently involved, he did not believe there was a conflict of interest.

Mr. Noble asked those present if they wished to challenge the impartiality of any of the Planning Commissioners, noting Commissioners would have an opportunity to respond. He heard no challenges to impartiality, adding there would be opportunities for submissions of information and appeal, as well as opportunities to present verbal and written information for the record. Written materials related to the application submitted prior to or during the public hearing would be considered part of the record. Failure to raise an issue or enable a response may preclude an appeal to the State Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA). Only persons who qualified as a party may appeal the actual decision of the BCC to LUBA.

Mr. Noble asked if there was anyone present who wished to make public comment on an issue other than the issue before the Commission tonight. There was no one who wished to make public comment.

Mr. Noble called for the staff report.

Ms. Schulz provided the staff report. The BCC had directed staff to conduct a second public hearing on the Small Cities Rural Comprehensive Plan Post Acknowledgement Plan Amendment (PAPA) for a countywide coordinated population forecast due to concerns raised about the notice given for the January 6, 2009 Planning Commission hearing. Criteria for approval remained the same and must be founded under Lane Code 12.050 & 16.400. Amendments to the Rural Comprehensive Plan were either necessary based on a plan error, changes in policies, circumstances or need. The cities had provided findings that included the entire application in the original packet. Ms. Schulz said the packet for tonight's meeting included a submittal from Mia Nelson.

Ms. Schulz distributed the following:

- A letter dated March 3, 2009 from the Lowell City Council to the Lane County Planning Commission.
- A memorandum dated March 3, 2009 from Jesse Winterowd to John Sullivan and Kent Howe, subject Lane County Population Projections—LCOG, Safe harbor, and PSU Implications.
- A memorandum dated March 3, 2009 from Greg Winterowd to John Sullivan and Kent Howe, subject Lane County Population Allocation Hearing.

Mr. Noble opened the public hearing and asked for the applicant's testimony.

Carrie Connelly identified herself as the representative for four of the city applicants; Creswell, Junction City, Oakridge and Veneta. These four cities were willing to provide rebuttal on any public testimony offered this evening. The cities had submitted written and verbal testimony sufficient information to show the criteria had been met for the PAPA. She asked for confirmation that anything previously submitted to the record continued to be in the record and did not need to be reentered. Ms. Schulz confirmed she was correct. Ms. Connelly asked for copies of submittals to the record that she had not received.

Responding to a question from Ms. Connelly, Mr. Howe said Greg Winterowd's memorandum was provided as background information and was in the record.

David Clyne, City Administrator for Junction City, said Junction City had the greatest urgency of all of the communities represented in the PAPA application to see an outcome as soon as possible. Several years ago, Junction City was advised by the State Department of Human Services that it would be the site for a new 364 bed mental health facility, with 1,000 to 1,200 employees. Within weeks of that notification, Junction City received notification from the State Department of Corrections that a state prison would also be sited there. The siting of the prison had been discussed since 1996, and infrastructure improvements to support the prison, including a wastewater treatment facility had also been discussed during that time. The community had been very busy doing planning work for the two institutions. The prison had super siting

authority which allowed Junction City to proceed with necessary water and sewer work, but did not have the ability to affect other planning that needed to occur for housing and the impact on the urban growth boundary (UGB). The community had undertaken the necessary planning work and expected to approach the BCC with a request to amend the UGB to accommodate the expected growth from those facilities. Junction City's current experience was that 20 percent of the people employed in the city chose to live in the city while others would live elsewhere in the county. Junction City needed an accurate population projection to complete the planning work. What was important to Junction City and the communities was to have a good coordinated population figure in a reasonable and timely fashion. The jobs that could come with the prison and hospital were very important to the Junction City economy.

Maurine Weathers, 29 South Alder, Lowell, was present at the request of the City of Lowell City Administrator. She read a letter into the record dated February 22, 2009 to the Lane County Planning Commission from the City of Lowell, signed by Mayor Warren R. Weathers, Councilors Marisa Alvarez, George Wild, Jim Burford, and Bill George. The letter urged the Planning Commission to consider all the information related to Lowell provided by the City which asserted there was no evidence to support a lower Lowell forecast and urging adoption of a finding for approval. She submitted a copy of the letter to staff for inclusion in the record.

Judy Volta, Mayor of the City of Coburg, expressed concern about entering the PSU preliminary numbers into the record of tonight's hearing since they were preliminary. She supported the plan amendment. The resolution of population projection was important since Coburg, Coburg School and the wastewater system depended on an accurate representation of Coburg's growth potential. The projected population numbers contained in the plan amendment were the result of careful analysis of all of the factors that played a role in Coburg's growth. The statutory requirements included consideration of growth trends and current events. Some of the critical current events considered in the report were the construction of a wastewater system and the I-5 interchange. Both of the events would open up the opportunity for significant growth in Coburg's population.

Petra Schuetz, City of Coburg Planning Director, said unlike some of the other communities in Lane County, the City of Coburg had a co-adopted population forecast through 2025 in their Comprehensive Plan which was reflected in the PAPA. The City had moved forward with several infrastructure projects since 2005.

Milo Mecham, City Attorney for the City of Coburg, LCOG, 859 Willamette Street, Suite 500, Eugene, noted there had been conflicting information about population projections from LCOG and PSU. LCOG was delegated the opportunity and obligation by Lane County to do population coordination for the county and the cities over decades. In 2005-2007, a coordinated population projection developed by LCOG was adopted and used by the county and the cities. Requests by Junction City, the City of Coburg and City of Veneta resulted in LCOG starting another coordination process in 2007-2008 and reached a number that was not satisfactory by many people. The BCC then decided to take the coordinated population projection back from LCOG and handle the process itself. The result was the small cities decided they needed an updated population projection and initiated the process currently before the Planning Commission. Part of the process was to review the statistical analysis required by statute by the small cities themselves. The numbers before the Planning Commission were similar to but not developed by

LCOG. There was history with the LCOG numbers that may or may not be correct but was distinct from the numbers developed by the small cities now before the Planning Commission. At about the same time the small cities initiated their process, the BCC decided it needed an independent investigation and commissioned PSU to begin a process that was currently underway. The PSU numbers before the Commission were a preliminary analysis by PSU, not the final analysis. Thus the PSU preliminary numbers should not be compared to the small cities' final analysis. This was important because the Commission would be urged to make comparisons. State law required that any analysis of population projections begin with county population projection made by the State Office of Economic Analysis (OEA). PSU determined the OEA numbers were not correct and would use its own numbers arguing the numbers would eventually align. However, PSU engaged in a process that the small cities and the country could not legally do, in that they must begin with the OEA numbers and use them until OEA changed the numbers. He asserted that the PSU process was statistically invalid based on statutory requirements and urged the Planning Commission not to consider the PSU numbers as the final word in population projection. Mr. Mecham said the small city process followed the statutory process, began with the OEA numbers, looked at growth trends, current and projected events and made a population projection based on the statutory requirements.

Mr. Noble asked if the small cities used the same methodology as that used by LCOG.

Mr. Mecham understood the small cities used roughly the same methodology as LCOG but reached a different conclusion, possibly because the small cities had more information available than LCOG.

Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki stated that last week PSU said new OEA numbers would be out by the week of March 16, 2009.

Mr. Mecham responded that was true, but until the OEA numbers were adopted everyone was constrained to use the current OEA numbers.

Don Driscoll, an architect and community planner, was currently working for the City of Lowell. He encouraged the Planning Commission to recommend to the BCC approval of the application before the Planning Commission. He asserted the application justified the population projection requested and was supported by the submitted facts and methodology. He opined a different demographer could be selected who would use a methodology and come up with a different set of numbers. This application would allow better futures for the communities without constraints and guesswork. The numbers were used to justify grants and loans for sewer, water and other infrastructure improvements. Low numbers put communities at a disadvantage when seeking these funding sources. Growth was needed in Lowell to keep the school system viable and others should not deny them that opportunity. Lowell needed young families to support the school district and infrastructure improvements were being initiated. To impose limiting conditions to the goal was unconscionable.

Mr. Sullivan stated three documents had been entered into the record including a letter from Mia Nelson, PSU documents as background, and a document from Winterbrook. He was not able to determine Winterbrook's position and wanted to know who employed the firm. He did not want to proceed until Winterbrook's position was clarified.

Mr. Dignam asserted the PSU document was part of the record.

Mr. Howe stated the Winterbrook document arrived today at 3:25 p.m. Mr. Winterowd was not present, and Mr. Howe did not wish to speak on his behalf regarding Mr. Winterowd's intentions. The document was directed to both the cities of Eugene and Springfield regarding their Safe harbor process and the ten small cities regarding their PAPA process. It made comparisons with the PSU population projection effort on behalf of Lane County. He opined some of the information made the issue confusing but the Planning Commission needed to address tonight's small city PAPA application on the basis of applicable criteria. He added the Planning Commission had requested that information from the February 26, 2009 Lane County Coordinated Population Projection meeting to be available, which was now in the record, but it should not be confused with the application before the Commission.

Mr. Noble called for public testimony from those in favor of the application.

Ken Hern, 40 Trailblazer Court, Lowell, speaking as an individual, urged the Planning Commission to accept the City of Lowell population projection of 2,823. Although he had owned the land his home sits on since the late 1990's, he could not build his house until 2003 because of the three year moratorium due to inadequate sewer and water systems. As a member of the Lowell Planning Commission, he had helped write the current land development code and the City's Comprehensive Plan. He had attended numerous 2050 Plan and coordinated population projection meetings, and listened to all of the facts and testimony. The Lowell Planning Commission unanimously accepted the population projection of 2,823, and as a small, pro-growth community, Lowell must be able to plan for the future.

Mr. Noble called for public testimony from those in opposition to the application.

Robert Emmons, 40093 Little Fall Creek Road, Fall Creek, was head of Land Watch Lane County. He differed with Mr. Driscoll's assessment that population projection numbers were best guesses and suggested there was a contract with PSU which had put forth population numbers he had more confidence in than those developed by the small city representatives who had a vested interest in growing. He suggested the Planning Commission deny or take no action on the proposal. On behalf of **Laurie Segal**, 1210 East 29th Place, Eugene, Mr. Emmons submitted her comments into the record in which Ms. Segal agreed with the comments submitted by Mia Nelson. Additionally, she said the proposal to adopt a countywide proposal was flawed because it was not a countywide projection as required by Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) because it included a Safe harbor projection for Eugene and Springfield. The laws provided for either a Safe harbor or countywide projection. She asked the Commission to deny or take no action on the proposal. Mr. Emmons submitted Ms. Segal's testimony to staff for inclusion in the record.

Mona Lindstromburg, 1442 Golden Avenue, Eugene, said she had followed the tortured route of population projection by the small cities. She had attended both PSU presentations in Eugene and although its draft results differed with LCOG's, PSU's results were deemed acceptable by most of the attending small cities. The request of the small cities was a flagrant attempt to circumvent a BCC process. She asserted the small cities' process was a waste of taxpayer

money. She concurred with Mia Nelson's February 23, 2009 letter. She questioned both LCOG and the small cities' methodologies. She joined Ms. Nelson and Ms. Segal in requesting that the Planning Commission recommend that no action be taken by the BCC on this proposal or that it be denied.

Mr. Dignam provided a remonstrance. He averred use of the term "flagrant attempt to circumvent" was excessive. It appeared to him that the applicants were trying to exercise their legal rights.

Mia Nelson, 40160 East First Street, Lowell, wanted to make sure the Planning Commission had received her 20 page letter with 31 attachments. She said PSU had reviewed all of the information submitted by City of Lowell. She disagreed with Mr. Mecham's assertion that LCOG had the legal authority to do population projections, adding that LCOG either never had that authority or lost it in 1980. She also disagreed with Mr. Mecham's comments that the forecast needed to start with the OEA forecast. She asked that the record be held open for one day to enable her to submit a letter. Ms. Nelson said there were differences between the PSU forecast and the small cities proposal. She distributed and reviewed a handout with a table illustrating population forecasts for the cities in Lane County from 2004 through 2030. She said this process was flawed and would not pass LUBA. Ms. Nelson iterated the contents of the written information she previously submitted into the record.

Mr. Dignam suggested Ms. Nelson be allowed additional time since multiple applicants had spoken. She asked that the Planning Commission carefully read her written testimony.

Responding to a question from Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki, Ms. Nelson confirmed that her request to hold the record open was an official request.

Mr. Sullivan noted the math used by Ms. Nelson, using the same numbers, on her handout differed substantially from another factual document in the record. Ms. Nelson explained the rationale she used for developing the table. Mr. Sullivan said the Planning Commission could not make a recommendation to the BCC based on the chances that the County may be sued and Ms. Nelson's assertion that a suit could be filed should have no impact on the Commission's decision.

Mr. Noble called for applicant rebuttal.

David Clyne opined Ms. Nelson perhaps did not understand that the Junction City figures included group quarters for the prison and hospital for 2,200 people. He asserted Junction City was not "praying at the altar of growth" but did need to manage the growth that was presented to it and provide adequate housing, infrastructure and quality of life to meet the demand. Junction City wanted an accurate number, and while it felt the PSU number was not accurate, it could accept either number since the magnitude of error was not significant. The City Council wanted accurate numbers so it did not put an undue burden on the taxpayers.

Milo Mecham reminded the Planning Commission matters introduced at the public hearing must be sufficiently specific to address the criteria before the Commission or be able to clearly respond to questions regarding how the criteria were addressed. Written or oral testimony that

was not understood did not need to be made part of the record if the matters raised were not done so with sufficient specificity. It was important to understand that the idea of Safe harbor was that if a city wished to have a population projection and the county was not responsive, there was a methodology set forth by the legislature that said the state would endorse and support the Safe harbor as an individual process for a city to determine its population. Additionally, there was nothing wrong with a process in which some cities used the Safe harbor process while other cities used a more sophisticated population regression process. The end result needed to be a population projection for the county as a whole and allocation of that projection amongst the cities within an acceptable range of error. The small cities' PAPA before the Commission was such a process. In terms of which was a preferable methodology, the process before the Commission was initiated as a land use application and a legislative application, and the Commission had the ability to move the application forward based on the evidence in the record. The PSU process had been initiated by the County and there were no guarantees on how fast the process would move or what its end result would be.

Carrie Connelly asserted Ms. Segal's comments read into the record that the forecast was inaccurate because it was not countywide and because it was not coordinated with Eugene and Springfield was not correct. Eugene and Springfield had been very involved in the process and had submitted a letter stating the safe harbor numbers they were using in a separate process did constitute coordinated numbers for purposes of the small cities' PAPA and they supported the PAPA moving forward. Ms. Connelly said the State Division of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) had been involved in providing advice regarding coordinated forecasts and they believed the Eugene and Springfield involvement to date accomplished that coordination element. She thought there was very little difference between the PSU and small cities numbers, and that PSU supported the small cities' numbers almost across the board. Where there were differences, particularly with the Coburg and Lowell numbers, there was contention only with the Lowell numbers. PSU was taking additional information into the record and would provide another round of preliminary numbers, particularly for Coburg. Only evidence in support of the Coburg numbers had been presented tonight. Although she did not represent Lowell, she believed the difference was a minor one. The evidence in the record against the cities' PAPA was against one city, and the number was insignificant. None of the evidence submitted against the PAPA application addressed how any of the criteria had not been satisfied. The action before the Commission was necessary to correct an identified error in the Comprehensive Plan and to fulfill an identified public or community need. The cities could not move forward with necessary planning functions without a coordinated population forecast number. It was also necessary to comply with the mandate of state law requiring the County Comprehensive Plan to include a 20 year coordinated population forecast number. The substantial evidence in the record overwhelmingly supported recommendation of approval to the BCC. She could not address the points raised by Ms. Nelson since she had not yet received the February 23, 2009 letter and only tonight had reviewed the December 2008 submittal. She disagreed with Ms. Nelson's assertion that the proposal should be adopted as a special purpose plan. A number of legal opinions indicated a special purpose plan, although one way, was not the appropriate way to adopt the proposal. Special purpose plans were delineated within the Lane Code and coordinated population was not one of those plans.

Mr. Dignam said testimony from Mr. Emmons and letters from Ms. Nelson and Ms. Segal asserted the application was illegal. He asked Ms. Connelly to address those assertions in writing for the record.

Brian Issa, Community Services Director, City of Veneta, reviewed the methodology used by the City to reach its numbers, emphasizing one of the goals was to have reasonable numbers. He provided an overview of how PSU, Winterowd and other participants reached their numbers. He said Junction City originally tried to get the process started through LCOG in 2006. The only contention in the process was around the City of Lowell which was the smallest city and therefore the most difficult to predict. Although the numbers were not insignificant, Lowell's number was insignificant in terms of its percentage of the larger county number and the other cities that had been drawn into the process. Small cities had taken into account not only the statistics but also the will of their citizens. When erring on the high side, cities could potentially over build facilities and overburden both developers and citizens with high rates for water and other services. These concerns could be mitigated by phasing facility development. Erring on the low side ended in a moratorium, and could possibly result in building two facilities when one should have been built, and it was always cheaper to build one rather than two. Thus, it was better to err on the side of being a little high rather than a little low. He urged the Planning Commission to recommend approval of the application to the BCC, which could exercise its right to change any of the numbers or to bring new evidence into the record.

Responding to a question from Mr. Shapiro, Mr. Issa understood most if not all of the cities had held public hearings on their population projections.

Mr. Noble noted there had been a request to keep the record open.

Responding to a question from Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Howe said statute required keeping the record open for one week when so requested.

Following a brief discussion on scheduling, Mr. Dignam, seconded by Mr. Sullivan, moved to close the public hearing, to leave the record open until March 10, 2009 for additional public comment and accept applicant rebuttal until March 13, 2009. The motion passed unanimously, 6:0.

There was consensus to deliberate on March 17, 2009.

Mr. Noble closed the public hearing at 8:37 p.m.

Mr. Noble directed Commissioners' attention to two documents distributed by staff, *Lane County Planning Commission roster* dated January 21, 2009 and *Upcoming Lane County Planning Commission Meeting Schedule: (tentative, subject to change, last updated 3-1-09)*.

Mr. Noble stated he and Commissioner Arkin would attend the BCC meeting on March 4, 2009 to present the Planning Commission work plan.

Mr. Sullivan stated he would have a strong issue with any language being added to the work plan approved by the Planning Commission at the BCC meeting, and would object to such action. He

asserted the Planning Commission voted on the work plan and for words to be added would change the tone of the work plan. He asked Mr. Noble to convey to Ms. Arkin that any changes needed to come back to the Planning Commission. Mr. Noble noted consensus with Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. Howe said the past practice had been that prior to someone representing the Planning Commission before the BCC, they checked in with the Planning Commission to do so. Past practice had also been that the work plan had been a consent calendar item for the Board and other committees continue to process their work plans through the consent calendar. Mr. Howe said it was his understanding that the decision to present the work plan was made by Planning Commissioner Arkin and County Commissioner Peter Sorenson, with no input from staff.

Mr. Noble opined it was alright if Ms. Arkin was representing the work plan as it was drafted and approved, and putting something on the table the Planning Commission wanted the BCC to support.

Mr. Sullivan expressed concern about the terms “farm” and “rural reserve”, noting it was not appropriate for “farm” to be added to “rural reserves”. The Planning Commission was asking the BCC to focus its educational process on understanding “rural reserves” as defined by the Senate.

Mr. Dignam’s expectation was that the officers of the Planning Commission would represent the plan that the Commission put together and nothing else.

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

(Recorded by Linda Henry)

m:\2009 minutes\lane county\land management division\planning commission\lpc090303ws and ph.doc

MINUTES

Lane County Planning Commission
Board of Commissioners Conference Room—125 East 8th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon

March 17, 2009
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Lisa Arkin, Chair; Robert Noble, Vice Chair; Steve Dignam, Todd Johnston, Nancy Nichols, Jozef Siekiel-Zdzienicki, John Sullivan (via teleconference), Lane County Planning Commissioners; Kent Howe, Lane County Land Management Division; Bob Swank, Lane Council of Governments; Dwight Coon, David Clyne, City of Junction City; Mark Shrives, City of Creswell; Gordon Zimmerman, City of Oakridge; Ric Ingham, City of Veneta; Carolyn Connelly representing Junction City, Veneta, Creswell, Oakridge; Mia Nelson, Jerry Valena, guests.

ABSENT: Tony McCown, Howard Shapiro, Lane County Planning Commissioners.

Ms. Arkin convened the work session of the Lane County Planning Commission (LCPC) at 5:30 p.m. She said she and Mr. Howe had discussed the Commission's schedule and designating the second meeting of the month as a work plan work session beginning May 19, 2009. There was consensus to accept her recommendation.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment offered.

WORK SESSION

- 1. PA08-5873—Adoption of an Amendment to the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan to Include a Coordinated Twenty Year Population Forecast for the County and for Each Urban Area within the County.**

Applicants: Junction City as lead city with Coburg, Cottage Grove, Creswell, Dunes City, Florence, Lowell, Oakridge, Veneta and Westfir.

Staff: Stephanie Schulz

Agent: Kay Bork, Junction City Planning Director

Mr. Howe offered the staff report. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on the small city PAPA for population forecasts on March 3, 2009, after which the public hearing was closed. At the request of a citizen, the Commission held the record open until March 10, 2009 for public

input, and at the request of the applicant, held the record open until March 13, 2009 for rebuttal to new information. He reviewed the numerous documents that had been distributed to Commissioners via e-mail, U.S. mail and at Planning Commission meetings that completed the public record for consideration by the Commission. He said tonight's deliberations would conclude with a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) on the small cities request for a coordinated twenty year population forecast that would be adopted into the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan. He had provided a form to assist Commissioners with the applicable criteria in determining whether the small cities' request for a post acknowledgment plan amendment (PAPA) to adopt a coordinated population forecast into the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan met the Lane Code criteria. As the record attested a coordinated population forecast was one that the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) required: to be developed with commonly accepted practices and standards for population forecasts; must be based on current reliable and objective sources and verifiable factual information; and, the population forecast was an estimate which although based on the best available information and methodology should not be held to an unreasonably high level of precision.

Mr. Howe further explained all Oregon counties must adopt and maintain a twenty year coordinated population forecast for the county and for each urban area within the county consistent with statutory requirements. The cities had provided population forecasts that they had vetted through their public hearing process and were now asking Lane County to adopt them under the Rural Comprehensive Plan. Lane Code Chapters 12 and 16 established the criteria for the Commission to use when determining whether the proposed Rural Comprehensive Plan amendment was justified. According to Chapter 12, the BCC may amend or supplement the Comprehensive Plan upon a finding of one of the following: an error in the plan; or, changed circumstances pertaining to the plan; or, a change in public policy; or, a change in public need based on a reevaluation of the factors affecting the plan. Pursuant to Chapter 16.400(8)(a), the proposal was classified as a major amendment to the Rural Comprehensive Plan. Under Chapter 16 for major amendments, the BCC must find the criteria in Lane Code Chapter 16.400(6)(h)(iii) were met. For major amendments, the proposal must meet all applicable requirements of local and state law, including statewide planning goals and OAR that the plan amendment was: necessary to correct an identified error in the application of the plan; or, necessary to fulfill an identified public or community need for the intended result of the component or amendment; or, necessary to comply with the mandate of local, state or federal policy or law; or, necessary to provide for implementation of adopted plan policy elements; or, otherwise deemed by the Board for reasons briefly set forth in its decision to be desirable, appropriate or proper.

Mr. Johnston asked staff to provide information on how the BCC could capture the value of the cost of the Portland State University (PSU) study and balance that cost to the taxpayers, and either amend the numbers or use the study when the process was completed.

Mr. Howe responded the BCC had a separate project underway on coordinated population forecast and it was unknown when those numbers would be adopted although it was estimated it would sometime this summer. The cities had made the application presenting before the Planning Commission pursuant to the current regulations in affect and were requesting that these numbers be adopted. If the Planning Commission recommends that the BCC adopt the PAPA request from the cities and it was subsequently adopted by the BCC, these figures are the population figures for the cities to use. This summer the BCC would consider the forecast effort

underway by PSU on behalf of the BCC. If the BCC then adopted the PSU study results, those would become the new numbers. Any Comprehensive Plan that was amended would be required to use the most recently BCC adopted numbers. The cities could use the numbers for their planning efforts before the Planning Commission tonight until they were ready to amend their Comprehensive Plans.

Responding to a question from Mr. Noble, Mr. Howe said if a new number was available at the time a city made application to Lane County to amend an urban growth boundary (UGB), the city would be required to use the new numbers. Mr. Howe noted that once the BCC received the PSU numbers, there would be a lengthy adoption process including public hearings before both the Planning Commission and the BCC.

Mr. Dignam opined while the implications of the PSU study were of interest from a curiosity view, they were not relevant to the decision before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Sullivan agreed with Mr. Dignam, adding the Commission should not get hung up in speculation. There was no guarantee that the BCC would eventually adopt the PSU numbers.

Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki agreed with Mr. Sullivan, and cautioned against mixing the PSU and small cities PAPA issues.

Responding to a question from Mr. Johnston, Mr. Howe said the staff position on whether this should be a special purpose plan had not changed, noting the OAR 660.24.0030 stated specifically that the adopted forecast must be included in the Comprehensive Plan or in a document referenced by the plan. Staff did not believe that this required the population forecast to be included in a special purpose plan.

Responding to a question from Ms. Arkin, Mr. Howe iterated the coordination function was the public hearing function the County conducted when it received the population information. As long as the forecast met the OAR requirements for methodology, and opportunity was given for interested parties to express their public interest, which was considered, it was coordinated..

Mr. Johnston directed attention to an April 8, 2008 letter from DLCD to County Commissioner Faye Stewart that provided a definition for "coordinated".

Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Dignam further referenced a May 30, 2008 letter from DLCD that indicated some counties used a top down approach while others used a bottom up approach, both of which were supported by DLCD.

Ms. Arkin noted that according to the April 8, 2008 letter, OAR provided the Safe harbor option that allowed cities to move forward with their planning efforts.

Mr. Howe said the OAR direction is for the coordination of the population effort, and this is what the cities are requesting from the Board. The Safe harbor option allowed all or any cities to use a Safe harbor number if the County was unable to provide numbers on a timely basis, but it was not necessarily considered coordinated.

Mr. Dignam averred the small cities had the option of pursuing the Safe harbor forecast but they had chosen another approach. It was not up to the Planning Commission to direct the cities to use the Safe harbor approach. The rationale for not using the Safe harbor methodology is in the public record.

Mr. Sullivan did not understand why the Planning Commission should or could deny the application because requiring use of Safe harbor would set the process back one or two years.

Mr. Dignam, seconded by Mr. Johnston, moved the Planning Commission recommend approval of PA08-5873 to the Board of County Commissioners.

Ms. Arkin called for discussion of the motion.

Mr. Dignam said the proposal met all legal tests in Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS), the Rural Comprehensive Plan, DLCDC and Lane Code requirements. The evidence in the record overwhelmingly supported this conclusion. The proposed population forecast appeared to be reasonable and in compliance with OAR 660-024-0030(2). There was precedent for following a bottom up forecast as cited by the applicant in a letter from DLCDC dated May 30, 2008. The letter made it clear that both top down and bottom up approaches were supported by DLCDC. Quoting Yogi Berra, "Forecasting is difficult, particularly if it involves the future." He thought the cities had done a thorough job in forecasting issues.

Mr. Dignam addressed several objections to the application:

- We should wait for completion of the PSU study.
 - The PSU study would probably be available later this year and would provide additional information, but it was not critical to his evaluation of the current proposal.
- The applicant did not have the legal standing to make this application.
 - The applicant adequately addressed this question in the October 13, 2008 letter from Local Government Law Group.
- The applicant did not have the authority to make this proposal because a population forecast was a special purpose plan.
 - There was no logical connection that a population forecast was a special purpose plan. The applicant had adequately addressed the issue in the March 13, 2009 letter from Local Government Law Group. He agreed with the argument that a population forecast was a planning document adopting a basic determination.
- There was oral testimony that the application represented a "flagrant attempt to circumvent the county process."
 - This process represented a coordinated effort by all of the small cities in Lane County, which was what they were supposed to do. The Rural Comprehensive Plan stated "the County had a responsibility to, and must coordinate efforts closely with the incorporated cities within its boundaries...." The word "coordinated" appeared numerous times in the December 8, 2008 staff memorandum.
- There was written testimony that select small cities were pursuing this application.

- In fact, all small cities had joined the effort, which gave weight to the urgency of their request and showed their level of coordination. It was now up to Lane County.

Mr. Dignam supported the application and believed the Planning Commission should do so.

Mr. Johnston echoed Mr. Dignam's comments.

Mr. Sullivan agreed with much of what Mr. Dignam said. He added the Local Government Law Group provided expert testimony to mitigate the legal arguments raised by some opponents. The Winterowd memorandum further reinforced the fact that population forecasts were an educated guess. According to Lane Code Chapter 12, the cities had a responsibility to respond to statute, rural changes and circumstances, which they were doing through this effort. Failure on their part would cause delay. The Planning Commission had an obligation to determine findings and move them forward with a recommendation to the BCC to enable them to make a timely decision.

Mr. Noble said the application was legal in its approach and the applicant had standing. He concurred with Mr. Dignam regarding the appropriateness of moving the application forward to the BCC. While he struggled with forwarding the application forward to the BCC with no recommendation rather than favoring it, as he looked at the numbers to determine whether they were reasonable, he noted the statute said an unreasonable standard should not be used. He was troubled by a couple of the numbers and encouraged the BCC to closely look at them. While the sum of the numbers for Lane County met the test of reasonableness, there were some numbers in the subsets that needed review. He did want the cities to have a number they could rely on to advance their capital infrastructure needs. It was important to understand that even if the BCC adopted the small cities' request, the BCC may eventually adopt the PSU or other numbers.

Ms. Nichols stated the process needed to move forward, adding the work of the Local Government Law Group provided credible documentation of the process. She emphasized the need to "get it going".

Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki stated the applicant asserted the County was not in compliance with applicable ORS requiring the County to establish and maintain a population forecast for the entire area within its boundaries for use in maintaining and updating Comprehensive Plans and to coordinate the forecasts with local governments. He stated Lane County was in compliance as of August 8, 2008 by starting a population forecast. He therefore objected to the application believing the County was in compliance and all of the cities with the exception of Creswell already had an adopted number. He would vote against the motion.

Ms. Arkin would not support the motion and could support a motion of no action because the forecast presented to the Planning Commission was not coordinated. The cities used different techniques to reach their numbers. She felt it was important for cities to plan and provide services for their residents and thought they should take advantage of the temporary Safe harbor numbers or the numbers already in place in their Comprehensive Plans, with the exception of Creswell. It might be possible to adopt something that would help out Creswell on an individual basis. Under applicable OAR, the application was out of place. The purpose of a coordinated forecast was to minimize the chance of duplicating growth planning. In her opinion, The cities

decision does impact the rural lands because there could be arbitrary expansions of city limits and UGB's that could not be coordinated by the County, which under statute, was the County's responsibility.

Responding to Mr. Noble's and Ms. Arkin's thoughts of recommending no action to the BCC, Mr. Johnston said a recommendation of no action was not an option for the Planning Commission. He questioned whether the Commission had the option of a no action recommendation on the application, since it needed to either recommend approval or recommend not approving. He recalled a statutory reference in the materials in the record that the County was obligated to take some action and this process had taken almost three years, which put the County in some jeopardy of not complying with the statute because the process had not progressed in a timely fashion. He opined a no action recommendation would be a mistake and send the message that the Planning Commission was taking the process away from the BCC, a message he would not be comfortable sending. The number forwarded to the BCC was subject to replacement when better information became available.

Ms. Arkin agreed a no action recommendation was not acceptable. She called for the vote on the motion before the Planning Commission.

The motion passed 5:2, with Commissioners Dignam, Johnston, Nichols, Noble, and Sullivan voting in favor, and Commissioners Arkin and Sielkiel-Zdzienicki voting in opposition.

Mr. Sullivan, seconded by Mr. Noble, moved that the transcript of the minutes from tonight's meeting, starting with Mr. Dignam's motion recommending approval of PA08-5873 be placed at the top of the packet of information the BCC would be receiving.

Ms. Arkin opined the Planning Commission had already agreed to follow Mr. Sullivan's motion.

Mr. Sullivan said this was a perfect situation for the Planning Commission to show the BCC how it was saving the BCC time as well as directing their focus. It was important for the BCC to understand there was not unanimity on the motion and that the LCPC had been working on the issue for over two months.

Mr. Dignam opposed the motion, and suggested asking staff to follow the Planning Commission's direction.

Ms. Arkin opposed the motion but supported the request since the Commission had already agreed on its intent.

Mr. Noble would vote against the motion as it was not necessary.

Responding to a question from Mr. Johnston, Mr. Howe said staff intended to package the information as the motion stated, adding that the minutes would become part of the report that was forwarded to the BCC.

Mr. Sullivan withdrew the motion.

2. Approval of Minutes—February 3, 2009

Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki, seconded by Mr. Johnston, moved that the February 3, 2009 minutes be approved as submitted. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

3. Report from Planning Commission Chair

Ms. Arkin offered a summary of the presentation she and Mr. Noble recently made to the BCC. The purpose was to open dialogue with the BCC and describe the dedication and hard work of the Planning Commission. The Chair and other Commissioners who wished would make quarterly visits to the BCC.

Mr. Noble confirmed that the Planning Commission work plan was presented to the BCC as approved by the Planning Commission. He emphasized the importance for Planning Commissioners to represent the Commission's work accurately to the BCC.

Mr. Howe reminded Commissioners to complete the Oregon Government Ethics Commission statements.

The meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

(Recorded by Linda Henry)

c:\documents and settings\cemnlh\desktop\linda\2009\03mar\lpc090317ws.doc

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're 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. Schultz 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 with adoption of number 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 that would change growth unless you wanted to go negative and put up a sign that said "Lane County is a nice place to visit but count on 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 to 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, 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?

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 with 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 area 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 result in population increase
- Fuel/oil, demand for timber
- Water availability/rain fall 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 visit 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/AMP 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 periodic review, 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 take 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. Schultz 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

MEETING NOTES

Lane County Coordinated Population Project
Eugene Public Library—Bascom-Tykeson Room
100 West Tenth Avenue
Eugene, Oregon

February 26, 2009
6:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Howard Schesser, City of Cottage Grove; David Klein, Kay Bork, City of Junction City; Chuck Spies, Carol Heinkel, City of Lowell; Greg Mott, City of Springfield; Ric Ingham, Brian Issa, City of Veneta; Bob Willoughby, City of Florence; Jerry Behney, Judy Volta, Don Schuessler, Milo Mecham, Petra Schuetz; City of Coburg; Gordon Zimmerman, City of Oakridge; Mark Shrives, City of Creswell; Jason Dedrick, City of Eugene; Carrie Connelly, City Attorney for City of Oakridge, City of Veneta, City of Creswell, City of Junction City; Matt Laird, Stephanie Schulz, Keir Miller, Kent Howe, Lane County; Nancy Nichols, Lisa Arkin, Jozef Siekiel-Zdzienicki, Lane County Planning Commission; George Hough, Risa Proehl, Danan Gu, Portland State University Population Research Center; Ed Moore, State Department of Land Conservation and Development; Mona Linstromberg, Mia Nelson, Don Driscoll, Robert Emmons, John Ballguess, Jerry Behney, Jerry Valencia, guests.

I. INTRODUCTIONS/AGENDA REVIEW—Lane County Staff

Ms. Schulz convened the session. She stated the Coordinated Population Project was a high priority for the Lane County Board of County Commissioners (BCC) as the body responsible for a county-wide population forecast. Information on the project was available on the County's website at http://www.co.lane.or.us/Planning/Population_forecasts.htm and an extensive written record was available in the Land Management office.

Those present introduced themselves.

Ms. Schulz said tonight's conversation was expected to focus on each city's assumptions about expected future demographic and economic trends from city leaders and staff. The intent of the meeting was to facilitate communication and discussion between the cities, Lane County citizens, the County and Portland State University (PSU) Population Research Center (PRC). The County's hired PRC/PSU to conduct the analysis as the first phase of the project. Board direction included equal consideration of citizen perspectives and interested parties which is part of tonight's agenda, following the local municipal perspectives section. PRC staff presented the first draft of a countywide forecast, which had been posted on the county website for a week. Interested parties have also been notified about tonight's meeting and the availability of the draft document.

II. LOCAL MUNICIPAL PERSPECTIVES—All Cities

Local municipal representatives offered comments on the preliminary information.

Mark Shrives, City of Creswell, said Creswell had no issues with the numbers.

Gordon Zimmerman, City of Oakridge, said Oakridge was a little disappointed but would live with the numbers.

Ms. Proehl stated Oakridge was one of the three cities from which the PRC received no information since the December meeting.

Mr. Zimmerman said Oakridge had submitted all of its information at the initial submittal and had submitted no additional information since the December meeting.

Judy Volta, City of Coburg, said the study was critical for Coburg. It was unfortunate that the preliminary numbers provided by PSU did not include documentation and explanation of the methodology used, which made it difficult to determine how PSU came to their statistics. Coburg had been involved with construction of a new municipal wastewater system that was scheduled for completion in 2011. Upon completion of that system, Coburg expected to see growth that had been at its door for some time. Additionally, Coburg was making improvements to the municipal water system and was completing improvements to the Coburg/I-5 interchange. Coburg had a Comprehensive Plan that had been accepted by Lane County, and a Coburg Community Crossroads and Vision plan that illustrated how adequate growth would support the elementary school as well as primary services such as a grocery, bank and pharmacy. Ms. Volta requested that prior to finalizing the numbers, PSU examine the preliminary numbers and adjust the population forecast upward for the City of Coburg. Available plans, studies and data argue for a population forecast between 4,000 and 4,200.

Ms. Proehl had spoken with Petra Schuetz, City of Coburg Planning Director, and received the information reviewed by Ms. Volta. When the population forecast was initially developed, PSU staff were not aware of the I-5 interchange, the improvements to the water system, or possible influence of Sacred Heart Medical Center at River Bend, but they had incorporated the wastewater facility and intended to further revise Coburg's population forecast.

Responding to a question from Bob Willoughby, City of Florence, Ms. Proehl said the end date of the study period was 2035. Mr. Willoughby said the further out the study extended, the more difficult it was to forecast population with certainty. Florence's Post Acknowledgement Plan Amendment (PAPA) was prepared through 2030, and although the figures differed by approximately 800 people, it was difficult to say which was more accurate. Florence could live with the number that was in the PSU estimate.

Brian Issa, City of Veneta, said overall Veneta was very happy with the PSU numbers. He had read a report about the Marion County study, which contained a section entitled, *A Note of Caution*, which contained the disclaimer that forecasting by nature was a best guess, and unanticipated events would impact the numbers. The Marion County study had used high, medium and low growth scenarios, with the medium growth scenario the preferred scenario.

Veneta was attempting to get to a *reasonable* number rather than a right or wrong number. Information about the high or low end of the PSU numbers, what was reasonable for each of cities and advice on how to use them would be very helpful.

Ms. Proehl said the low and high forecast scenarios for Marion County were developed for the county and the largest cities. PSU was developing high and low growth scenarios for Lane County, City of Springfield and City of Eugene. The remaining cities were based on the most likely growth scenario, which was the medium scenario. A high and low scenario was not used for smaller cities because the smaller the population, the greater the potential variable. The methodology for this project had been part of the proposal and was typical

Mr. Issa said the cities of 2,000 people or less were the ones that initiated the population project process and have spent considerable time and energy on it. It was important for PSU to drive the point home that the communities that were growing the fastest were the most difficult to predict, and a good prediction was needed. The reasonableness range for the small cities population forecast number was wider than that for the large cities.

Greg Mott, City of Springfield, said the City of Springfield and City of Eugene had taken the safe harbor population forecast approach because statute provided for it. Additionally, Springfield and Eugene were compelled to do the safe harbor approach because the 2007 Legislative Assembly enacted a law that required Eugene and Springfield to create their own urban growth boundaries (UGBs), and demonstrate those boundaries could accommodate needed housing for twenty years. The existing Eugene/Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (Metro Plan) only went to 2015. Additionally, the cities currently shared a single UGB. Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) coordinated a population forecast in 2004/05 for many of the cities in the County, which formed the basis for Eugene and Springfield's understanding of what the population for Lane County would be in 2030 and which were submitted to DLCD with a notice of intent to amend their Comprehensive Plans with those figures. Subsequently, Lane County had undertaken the current effort and several cities had submitted requests for PAPAs using the LCOG figures Eugene and Springfield for safe harbor. The PSU figures were lower than the LCOG figures, with 90 percent of the lower figure coming from the Eugene and Springfield projection. He asked why such a large decrease came from Eugene and Springfield. Springfield could not support the outcome of the PSU work. He asked why the figures that had been generated fairly recently and been relied upon by some of the cities were now being subjected to a reassessment. He iterated Mr. Issa's comment that the figures should not be held to an unreasonably high degree of precision. Springfield believed it was still entitled to pursue the safe harbor figures that it submitted as a PAPA, adding that he doubted it would have a significant influence on the other cities' request for population figures because the safe harbor methodology was a very conservative approach.

Ms. Proehl said PSU developed the Eugene/Springfield forecast, as well as separate forecasts for both Eugene and Springfield, using the cohort-component method, which incorporated fertility, mortality and migration. She opined the Springfield forecast was low because it was based on the 2008 OEA population forecast which was currently being revised. PSU conferred with the State demographer who developed the OEA forecasts whose preliminary figures were approximately 15,000 people lower in 2030 than the 2004 forecast. PSU developed its figures

independently from the State demographer, and those figures were only off by a few hundred people. PSU was confident in its numbers and felt they were reasonable.

Milo Mecham, City of Coburg, said the law required all jurisdictions to use the numbers published when the process started. Those jurisdictions using numbers that were not published meant those jurisdictions were not in compliance with the law.

George Hough said State demographer numbers would be likely be published in March 2009 and PSU would then be compliant. He said if municipalities asked for numbers from 2004 or 2005 to be used, they would be asking PSU to ignore any current conditions that existed in Oregon and assume that the forces that led to the growth in 2004 would be driving forces that may or may not exist today.

Mr. Mecham asserted PSU did not take into account current events that were in the record.

Mr. Hough said the information was not available from Coburg for incorporation into tonight's report.

Chuck Spies, City of Lowell, thanked Ms. Proehl who had communicated with him throughout the process. He noted city policies on growth were missing throughout the process. The Lowell City Council was 100 percent behind growth and was establishing policies to promote managed growth, with infrastructure planning and other measures. If errors occurred, it was important to err on the high side to prevent falling behind with the planning process. He supported the City of Coburg's position. Migration out of the larger urban areas would move to the small cities.

Carol Heinkel, City of Lowell, expressed her appreciation for Ms. Proehl's efforts. The City of Lowell felt PSU's preliminary forecasts were low. The City's initial forecast of 2,823 people was more in line with their planning needs and city policy related to growth, and the City asked PSU to adjust the methodology and figure to reflect the City's forecast. She noted the methodology for Marion County was very involved and did satisfy the OAR methodology requirements for population forecast in that the forecast was developed using commonly accepted practices and standards for population forecasting by professional practitioners, and was based on current, reliable, and objective sources, and verifiable and factual information. There was one part of the OAR that the forecast had not addressed, that the forecast must take into account recent events that had a reasonable likelihood of changing historical trends. The current forecast for Lowell did not take into account the likelihood that the infrastructure changes the City recently made and planned to make would change historic trends. PSU needed technical basis to adjust the numbers. In a recent case study with the Cities of Veneta and Creswell, during the last two decades, a very good indication of what would be reasonable for Lowell and Coburg was demonstrated. Both were poised to experience the same level of growth. Ms. Heinkel said Lowell was asking for use of high end of the population forecast range.

Ms. Proehl said PSU was in compliance with the OAR requirement to consider recent events and their potential impact on historical trends. The higher growth rates following the lifting of the building moratorium were considered.

Mr. Spies said Lowell was designing a water treatment facility and had other projects in the planning process. Small cities depended on their funding through the Oregon Economic and Community Development Department (OECD), which looked at 20 year population forecasts when planning for capacities. If forecasts were not accurate, infrastructure was always behind.

Responding to Mr. Spies and Mr. Issa, Ms. Proehl said PSU staff would review the numbers and include assumptions for adjustment.

David Klein, Junction City, said Junction City was satisfied with the outcome of the study presented by PSU and was pleased that comments from cities that had concerns were being taken seriously. He expressed his appreciation to the Land Management Department staff for keeping the project on track.

Howard Schesser, City of Cottage Grove, said Cottage Grove was okay with the numbers.

Jason Dedrick, City of Eugene, said Eugene did have comments to enter into the record, which he summarized. He echoed Mr. Mott's comments in terms of the safe harbor forecast based on the published OEA data. The process was relatively conservative, and for the PSU estimates to come in below the OEA data indicated that something was changing. He iterated the City's process needed to be based on the published numbers. Changing economic conditions and their potential impact needed to be taken into consideration. It was important to determine whether this was a decrease in growth rates over the next 30 years or a decrease in the base with the same growth rates over the next 30 years. The safe harbor process was based on the Cities of Eugene and Springfield having individual numbers, and the PSU process was based on the current UGB boundary. One challenge was the urban transition area, which represented approximately ten percent of the current combined UGB. Based on the City of Eugene's data based on the safe harbor process, which was the 2000 census and 2004 household data, the combined urban transition area population was about 31,000. Based on the PSU numbers, the urban transition area projection for 2010 was less 29,000. It was important to understand the methodology and the data used in the urban transition area.

Mr. Gu thanked everyone for their comments. Based on OEA and PSU's data, the growth rate for Eugene was in a slight decline. Even if the countywide projections were changed, Eugene's would not change much. The PSU forecasting model for the Eugene-Springfield UGB used the current UGB boundary, which is a single Metro boundary for both cities. There are no separate UGB's for these two cities. Additionally population growth assumptions assumed that although migration may slow down during the current economic condition, it will eventually increase.

Mr. Laird said the Lane County numbers were a component of the numbers developed by the cities. The County had participated through providing input for the record regarding local conditions in the county related to Ballot Measure 49 and other pertinent issues.

Ms. Volta was concerned the conservative side was being taken which hampers small cities. Although the County may want to take a neutral stance, part of the County's mission was to protect the economic well being of the small cities. While larger cities had the luxury of diversity and staff to respond to economic changes, the small cities were impacted disproportionately when the numbers were too conservative.

Ms. Proehl said the forecasts for the cities were developed independently from the County, after which the sum of the cities was reconciled to the County. As the small cities grew, the unincorporated area became smaller.

Mr. Mecham expressed concern about the adoption process because it did not appear to follow the process and could be prejudicial to the end result. Through the public process, it could appear that the numbers were established and it would become more difficult through time to engage in the iterative process and reach a refined number. It was important for the record to indicate that the current published numbers were preliminary and in no way indicative of the final numbers that PSU would recommend to Lane County.

Mr. Miller said the next set of numbers released, after all of the new information, including that from tonight's meeting, were incorporated, would be the draft numbers. This would start the PAPA process. The numbers would not be final until adopted by the BCC.

Mr. Mecham emphasized the importance of calling attention to things already in the record. There were adopted policies of Lane County and the City of Coburg that had a population projection. There needed to be documentation in the findings as to why there was a deviation from the adopted standards. There were specific improvements the City had initiated that were based on population projections, such as Coburg was paying \$24 million for a wastewater system that would accommodate 4,200 people. The City was in a position to have infrastructure to support the population, and not just that it was hoping for those people to come. The City was spending over \$5 million to improve the water system to accommodate the projected population. The I-5 interchange had been planned by ODOT to accommodate an increased population, and \$15 (or \$50) million to reconstruct the intersection. Coburg was prepared to accommodate the increased population through its Comprehensive Planning process, including the Coburg Connections (2005) and Coburg Parks Master Plan (2005). He opined no consideration of these factors was used in the PSU process. Mr. Mecham added businesses in Coburg currently employed over 2,000 people, and over 3,000 people had been employed in the past. Most of the people did not live in Coburg because there were no homes available. However those people could live closer if Coburg could expand its UGB. A large regional employer, Sacred Heart Medical Center at RiverBend, would eventually have an additional 3,000 employees. Ancillary services could be located in Coburg.

III. PUBLIC PERSPECTIVES—Interested Parties

Mona Linstromberg, asked the following questions:

- Has the geology, hydrology and availability of water of the Veneta area, been factored into the methodology?
- Who decides which is used at the high, medium and low scenarios for Eugene and Springfield—does PSU make a recommendation or does the BCC make the decision?
- Will PSU's forecast provide a separate forecast for the newly separated Eugene and Springfield UGBs? If no, why not?

Ms. Proehl said separate UGBs for Eugene and Springfield would not be provided because PSU had been contracted to forecast for the current UGB, with Eugene and Springfield as separate cities, and a shared UGB, but had not been contracted to provide information for separate UGBs. PSU proposed what it considered reasonable for the high and low growth scenarios and conferred with Lane County staff. Ms. Proehl agreed to check with the PSU GIS specialist regarding the hydrology and geology question.

Ms. Schulz said H.B. 3337 required the Eugene and Springfield to develop individual Comprehensive Plans, and the inventory studies to provide the basis for each cities future action was in process.

Responding to a question from **Mia Nelson**, of Lowell, regarding whether the dividing line between the Eugene and Springfield UGBs had been established, Ms. Schulz said she understood that would not be addressed during the current coordinated population project.

Mr. Laird explained that the population would be developed for the total UGB, and a percentage applied to both Eugene and Springfield.

Ms. Nelson said there were good reasons not to err on the high side of the population projections for Lowell. She read from a letter from the director of DLCD, copies of which she provided to Lane County and PSU staff for inclusion in the record. She opined there would be negative consequences, including increased water rates, if Lowell developed oversized water and sewer systems. The removal of the building moratorium in 2003 coincided with the housing boom, with twelve dwelling units being added annually. After the housing boom collapsed in 2008, only six units were built last year. Lowell was asking for 36 homes per year over the planning period. The PSU forecast estimated 15 units per year, which Ms. Nelson thought was erring on the high side. She referred PSU to documents she previously submitted for the record. Lowell was not like Coburg, having only \$200,000 to its name and did not have the ability to fund its infrastructure plans.

Robert Emmons, Fall Creek resident and president of LandWatch Lane County, said growth continued to create problems and measures should be taken to reduce population and consumption. He commended the scientists engaged in this project for sensible, reasonable and objective population projections for the cities in the region, which was a refreshing change from the numbers that came from LCOG.

Don Driscoll, community planner and architect, said we should be talking about how to enrich the communities rather than quibbling over a bunch of numbers that inevitably would be wrong. However, there was a state law that mandated population projections. Neither the methodology nor the numbers were spelled out by the State, so it was up to the communities to make the right choices. All of the cities' and the County's land use planning was dictated by the numbers, and they were difficult to change once they were adopted. He said the cities and County should shoot for the highest number they can justify. It was paramount for Lowell to have a growth number within reason to be able to attract young families with children in order to keep the schools.

Jerry Valencia, Lowell resident, said people in the community understood the need to be proactive instead of reactive. It was important to be proactive in planning for the future, because

every year it cost more to build. It was important for everyone to understand what PSU's task was to better understand where the numbers came from. He said Lowell had the same UGB it had in 1955, and there was a need to be proactive rather than waiting for other jurisdictions to take action.

Mr. Miller stated the PSU website contained a detailed description of PSU's research proposal, and the tasks they were contracted for.

Jerry Behney, Coburg resident, opined the wastewater facility would have a greater impact than was reflected in the PSU data.

Ms. Proehl said PSU would review additional data provided by Petra Schuetz, Coburg planner.

Mr. Hough added Ms. Proehl had been outstanding in responding to people who had provided input to her.

Ms. Heinkel asked what came first, the population projection or the infrastructure. She understood population projections were needed for grant funding. There was a lag time between the time the Veneta moratorium was raised and Veneta began to experience growth. There were two major considerations for community members when Lowell went through its visioning process: to achieve a population level that would allow Lowell to support young families and enable the school to remain viable; and to attract local goods and services to reduce the number of vehicle miles traveled to purchase basic goods.

Mr. Spies, in response to Ms. Nelson, said today he had been on the phone with the U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Development regarding a \$2.5 million funding package for water system improvements to increase Lowell's treatment capacity from 175 to 350 gallons per minute, to build a 730,000 gallon high elevation reservoir to serve currently undeveloped areas, most of which were owned by Ms. Nelson, provide increased capacity in the lower levels and a project to extend water and sewer lines west into unserved areas on the west side of the city. He was optimistic up to 40% of the required funding would come from grants to make it affordable.

Ms. Heinkel said the City of Lowell vision in the growth concept map that was included in the record showed the City's vision for increasing density in the community.

IV. SUMMARIZE, WRAP-UP, NEXT STEPS—Lane County Staff

After a brief discussion, Mr. Laird offered the following proposal for the project timeline:

- New information submitted to Lane County until March 5, 2009.
- PSU would provide a preliminary estimate on March 16, 2009.
- One more meeting would be scheduled after March 16, 2009.

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

(Recorded by Linda Henry)

m:\2009 minutes\lane county\land management division\coordinated population project\lccpp090226.doc

MINUTES

Lane County Coordinated Population Projection Project
Eugene Public Library—100 West 10th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon

March 26, 2009
6:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Stephanie Schulz, Keir Miller, Lane County Land Management Division; George Hough, Jr., Risa Proehl, Portland State University; Amanda Ferguson, City of Cottage Grove; Chuck Spies, City of Lowell; Greg Mott, City of Springfield; Kurt Yeiter, City of Eugene; Don Schuessler, Judy Volta, Petra Schuetz, City of Coburg; Bob Swank, Lane Council of Governments; Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki, Mia Nelson, Mona Lindstromberg, members of the public.

Ms. Schulz convened the meeting at 6:40 p.m. and welcomed members of the public.

1. Introductions/Agenda Review

Those present introduced themselves.

Ms. Schulz said the purpose of the meeting was to examine the second proposal submitted by Portland State University (PSU), noting the materials had been provided on Lane County's website for public review.

2. Local Municipal Perspectives

Ms. Schulz read a letter into the record from Carolyn Connelly who represented the cities of Dunes City, Creswell, Oakridge, Veneta and Junction City. Although not all of the cities were represented at tonight's meeting, they wished to acknowledge their independent review of the second round of PSU preliminary numbers and express satisfaction with the numbers as part of the Coordinated Population Forecast.

Mr. Schuessler thanked PSU for its work and the revised increase in population for Coburg. He added Lane County had already accepted a population projection of 3,330 in 2005 that was included in the Coburg Comprehensive Plan. Since that time Coburg had embarked on several projects based upon that population projection including construction of the first phase of the wastewater project, and obligation of funds for the I-5 interchange and water system improvements. Funding and repayment for the projects was based upon growth and a reduced population projection put those plans in jeopardy. The outcome of the study would affect the economic and environmental conditions on the county and possibly jeopardize the wastewater system vital for economic growth and ground water stability for the region. Coburg needed a population consistent with the post acknowledgement plan amendment (PAPA) or a minimum of 3,300 for 2030.

Mr. Yeiter referenced a February 26, 2009 letter from Lisa Gardner, City of Eugene Planning Director. The City's primary concern was having background information to better understand where the numbers came from, most importantly the methodology used to project the population in the urbanizable areas of Eugene and Springfield, that was critical for the development of separate urban growth boundaries (UGB) for the two cities.

Mr. Mott noted the clock was ticking on Eugene and Springfield to each complete the vacant land analysis, and was concerned about the methodology used to change the current official forecast figures. According to the latest information, the urban transition area (UTA) population figures decreased while the city populations for Eugene and Springfield increased. Since both cities had strict limitations on development in the UTA without annexation, he asked if the growth occurring in those cities was due to annexations from the UTA rather than actual growth.

Ms. Proehl concurred that the city boundaries would expand. The Eugene and Springfield forecasts were developed differently than the other cities, which included UGB areas, while Eugene and Springfield were city only. The small city UGBs were held constant whereas with Eugene and Springfield, it was assumed the cities would expand as needed. According to the available data during the 1990's, and between 2000 and 2008, the population decreased from rural to increased urban. That was not considered in the first set of forecasts, but was considered in the current version.

Mr. Spies thanked PSU for its work and for reviewing the additional information submitted by the rural cities. While he was still not satisfied with the numbers, he did not know what other information he could provide that would lead to additional population based on the PSU methodology. He urged PSU to make it clear in its written report that the smaller the city, the less accurate the forecast. It was important to identify the potential shortfalls in projecting small cities' population forecasts and the potential impact of events on the forecast. The Board of County Commissioners (BCC) was not locked into adopting this forecast, the PAPA or any other forecast, and was allowed to use its judgment.

Ms. Ferguson said Cottage Grove's only complaint was that the annual average growth rate dropped below one percent during the last ten years of the study, an assessment with which the City of Cottage Grove disagreed. According to Ms. Proehl, combined sewer and stormwater connections would place a moratorium on growth. Ms. Ferguson asserted Cottage Grove had no such restrictions because the wastewater and sewer systems were designed for 1.6 percent annual population growth for a 20 to 30 year period. The master plans showed clear plans for the few pipes that were combined, while the majority of the system was completely separate. The City was expecting no issues.

Ms. Proehl confirmed that Ms. Ferguson had clarified the infrastructure information in an e-mail. Noting there were several ways to calculate the average annual growth rate, Ms. Proehl used the continuous average annual growth rate which resulted in the current number. Ms. Proehl agreed to forward her calculation methodology to Ms. Ferguson.

Responding to a question from Mr. Yeiter regarding Eugene's growth rate dropping off during the last decade, Ms. Proehl explained that represented the fluctuations for the county which were also reflected in the cities' growth rates.

3. Public Perspectives

Ms. Nelson emphasized the importance of Lowell's numbers being accurately documented and requested an explanation of weighted numbers be included in the record for the benefit of the BCC.

Ms. Volta noted several of the other cities were satisfied and inquired about shifting some of the numbers to Coburg. Responding to a question from Ms. Volta, Ms. Proehl confirmed that PSU was aware of Coburg's wastewater project. Ms. Schulz added the wastewater project was considered a major factor in looking at Coburg.

Mr. Spies observed that the PSU forecast was 10,000 people below the Oregon Office of Economic Analysis (OEA) forecast which presented some flexibility in discussions with the BCC.

Mr. Miller averred that while the applicable Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) called for coordination for population forecasting, it was not clear how frequently the forecasting needed to be done. The ORS said cities could have their own alternate population forecast if the coordinating body had not adopted a forecast within ten years. He opined if OEA developed a different forecast for the out years, the County in its coordinating role may need to work with the cities again to adopt the new figure. Any figures adopted through the current population forecast would need to be revisited.

Ms. Schulz added there were no expectations that there would be a new round of calculations when the new OEA numbers were released in the next few weeks.

Mr. Hough said this process would evolve over many years, and encouraged the county and cities to get involved in Census 2010 because the census figures were part of PSU's calculations.

4. Summarize, Wrap-Up, Next Steps

Ms. Schulz said this meeting was the close of phase one of the coordinated population forecast project. A written report would be forwarded to the BCC after review by the Lane County Planning Commission.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

(Recorded by Linda Henry)

c:\documents and settings\cemnllh\desktop\linda\2007\07 july\lcp070710ws.doc

**FILE RECORD CONTENT SHEET
2030 POPULATION FORECAST FOR LANE COUNTY AND
EACH URBAN AREA IN LANE COUNTY
PA 08-5042**

<u>No.</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Date</u>
File No. 1		
1.	Exhibit 1 – letter from DuPriest representing Shade Tree, Inc. to LCOG re: Region 2050 & Coord. Pop. Forecast	01/16/07
2.	Exhibit 2 – letter from LCOG in response to DuPriest letter	01/23/07
3.	Exhibit 3 – email from Mia Nelson to Kent Howe re: UGB reserves	01/31/07
4.	Exhibit 4 – memo from LCOG to Regional Managers re: process	02/15/07
5.	Exhibit 5 – letter from Lowell to County: city meeting invite	02/09/07
6.	Exhibit 6 – letter from DuPriest to LCOG re: pop forecast is land use	03/26/07
7.	Exhibit 7 -- charts of countywide totals, 2004 & 2007	07/2007
8.	Exhibit 8 – memo from LCOG to Regional Managers re:draft forecast	04/02/07
9.	Exhibit 9 – email from B. Swank to Metro staff re: forecast history	07/12/07
10.	Exhibit 10 -- letter from DuPriest to BCC re: forecast resolution to reassume authority for projections	09/10/07
11.	Exhibit 11 – notes and agenda from 9/13 BCC Mtg. re:LCOG report	09/12/07
12.	Exhibit 12 – notes and testimony from 9/13 BCC mtg	09/26/07
13.	Exhibit 13 – letter from G. Kloepfel to BCC re: forecast adoption	10/02/07
14.	Exhibit 14 -- letter from DLCDC to LCOG re: (Lane Co. 011-07)	11/20/07
15.	Exhibit 15 – report from Journal of Planning Education and Research Population Forecast Errors: A Primer for Planners	02/04/08
16.	Exhibit 16 -- Working Paper: Population	08/1981
17.	Exhibit 17 – letter from G. Kloepfel to BCC re: forecast cost estimate	11/29/07
18.	Exhibit 18 – paper on Oregon Statutes and Case Law re: pop. proj.	
19.	Exhibit 19 – OAR 660-024-0030 – Urban Growth Boundaries ORS 195.Local government Planning Coordination, 2007 edition House Bill 3436	
20.	Exhibit 20 – Marion County Ordinance No. 1201 re: Coordinated Population Forecast to update comprehensive plans	11/24/04
21.	Exhibit 21 – letter from small city Mayors to BCC	01/24/08
22.	Exhibit 22 – Board Order No. 08-2-13-2 Rescinding Delegation to LCOG of the Population Forecasting coordination role	02/13/08
23.	Exhibit 23 – letter from DLCDC to LCOG re: process in Lane Co.	02/14/08
24.	Exhibit 24 – memo from WinterBrook Planning to LCOG re: process	02/15/08
25.	Exhibit 25 – email from Junction City to staff re: trend method used	02/29/08
26.	Exhibit 26 – email from Oakridge to staff re: trend method used	03/04/08
27.	Exhibit 27 – email from staff to LCOG re:cost	03/12/08
28.	Exhibit 28 – email from B. Parker to staff re: Marion Co. RFQ	03/18/08
29.	Exhibit 29 – packet for BCC Work Session report back from staff	03/19/08
* * * file no. 2 * * *		
30.	Exhibit 30 – email from PSU to staff re: Request for Quotes (RFQ)	03/20/08
31.	Exhibit 31 – email from B. Parker to staff re: costs & funding	03/25/08
32.	Exhibit 32 – email from legal staff to LMD re: forecast adoption	04/01/08
33.	Exhibit 33 – letter from Springfield to BCC re: forecast for Springfield under HB 3337	04/02/08

FILE RECORD CONTENT SHEET
Countywide Population Forecast to 2030
PA 08-5042

<u>No.</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Date</u>
34.	Exhibit 34 – letter from small city Mayors to BCC re: process	04/08/08
35.	Exhibit 35 – letter from DLCDC to BCC re: (Lane Co. 011-07)	04/08/08
36.	Exhibit 36 – letter from Lowell to BCC re: process	04/09/08
37.	Exhibit 37 – submittal & attachments from Mia Nelson to BCC	04/09/08
38.	Exhibit 38 – email from Springfield to DLCDC	04/10/08
39.	Exhibit 39 – email from C. Fleenor to LMD re: process	04/15/08
40.	letter from ShadeTree Properties to Lowell re: SDC's	04/20/08
41.	Exhibit 40 – Resolution No. 08-4-30-12 Adopting Pop. Forecast	04/30/08
42.	Exhibit 41 – packet memo to BCC re: report back on process	04/30/08
43.	Exhibit 42 – notes from BCC meeting	04/30/08
44.	Exhibit 43 – Safe Harbor population forecasts for Lane Co. UGB's	May 2008
45.	Exhibit 44 – email from C. Fleenor to Junction City Administrator	05/06/08
46.	Exhibit 45 – email from Junction City to C. Fleenor re: extraterritorial extension	
47.	Exhibit 46 – letter from Junction City to BCC re: process & need	05/16/08
48.	Exhibit 47 – email from PSU to staff re: process	05/20/08
49.	Exhibit 48 – email string on Safe Harbor Population Estimates DLCDC, Springfield, LMD, Eugene	05/20/08
50.	Exhibit 49 – Safe Harbor letter to cities, BCC Action, DLCDC	05/20/08
51.	Exhibit 50 – email to PSU re: contract/IGA	05/21/08
52.	Exhibit 51 – Small Cities Intent to Appeal BCC decision to LUBA	05/21/08
53.	Exhibit 52 – DLCDC letter to small city managers re: BCC Action and Safe Harbor analysis, submitted by LCOG	05/23/08
54.	Exhibit 53 – email from C.Fleenor to staff re: New BCC Resolution	05/23/08
55.	Exhibit 54 – email from Keir to PSU re: other county pop info location	06/03/08
56.	Exhibit 55 – email from Keir to Vorhes re: other counties comparison	06/03/08
57.	Exhibit 56 –email from Vorhes to Keir re: other counties comparison	06/04/08
58.	Exhibit 57 – Draft InterAgency IGA template for PSU's review	06/04/08
59.	Exhibit 58 – email with letter to BCC re: cities input into process	06/05/08
60.	Exhibit 59 – email from Keir to PSU re: background for cost bid	06/05/08
61.	Exhibit 60 – notes from meetings, Matt Laird, LMD Division Mgr.	06/06/08
62.	PSU Conference Call Notes and Charts discussed	06/07/08
63.	Exhibit 61 – email from C. Fleenor to BCC & staff re: process	06/11/08
64.	Exhibit 62 – email from C. Stewart to BCC & staff re: process	06/12/08
65.	Exhibit 63 – email from C. Stewart to BCC & staff re: process	06/12/08
66.	Exhibit 64 – email from C. Green to BCC & staff re: process	06/13/08
67.	Exhibit 65 – email from C. Fleenor to BCC & staff re: process	06/13/08
68.	Exhibit 66 – memo from Shade Tree Inc. to LMD Director re: process	06/16/08
69.	Exhibit 67 – LCDC Agenda Item 10, June 2008 Commission Meeting info briefing on coordinated population forecasts	06/17/08
70.	Exhibit 68 – email from M. Laird to BCC re: process	06/17/08
71.	Exhibit 69 – memo to M. Laird re: LCPC recommendation to BCC	06/18/08
* * * file no. 3 * * *		
72.	Exhibit 70 – BCC Packet Work Session on Population Forecast	06/19/08
73.	Exhibit 71 – email from B. Swank to Regional Managers re: Safe	

FILE RECORD CONTENT SHEET
Countywide Population Forecast to 2030
PA 08-5042

<u>No.</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Date</u>
	Harbor calculation for cities & process	06/20/08
74.	Exhibit 72 – packet from Lowell to LCOG re: adjustment of projection	06/20/08
75.	Exhibit 73 – email from Lowell City Mgr. to BCC re: process	06/23/08
76.	Exhibit 74 – email from Keir to M. Laird re: contract process	06/24/08
77.	Exhibit 75 – letter from Eugene & Springfield requesting Safe Harbor Forecast numbers for the metro cities	06/25/08
78.	Exhibit 76 – email from G. Mott to Metro Staff re: workshop 7/9/08	06/26/08
79.	Exhibit 77 -- email from Keir to PSU re: cost estimate & contract	06/27/08
80.	Exhibit 78 -- email from PSU to Keir re: cost estimate & IGA	06/28/08
81.	Exhibit 79 – email from M. Laird to Director re: regional meeting	07/02/08
82.	Exhibit 80 – email string, metro staff re: regional meeting	07/04/08
83.	Exhibit 81 – email and documents for DLCD TA grant funding	07/07/08
84.	Exhibit 82 – email string, LMD staff & BCC re: regional meeting	07/08/08
85.	Exhibit 83 -- population projections handout, regional workshop	07/09/08
86.	Exhibit 84 – population forecast for Springfield handout, reg. wkshp.	07/09/08
87.	Exhibit 85 – email string re: PSU contract, cost, form	07/09/08
88.	Exhibit 86 – email C. Fleenor and Florence staff re: projections	07/17/08
89.	Exhibit 87 – email from PSU re: proposal and timeline	07/19/08
90.	Exhibit 88 -- PSU's research proposal and cost estimate	07/19/08
91.	Exhibit 89 – letter from Florence to C. Fleenor re: city projections	07/22/08
92.	Exhibit 90 – packet for BCC work session to direct LMD to PSU	07/21/08
93.	Exhibit 91 – PSU research proposal, revised attachment	07/24/08
94.	Exhibit 92 – email PSU & staff re: contract timing	07/28/08
95.	Exhibit 93 – email PSU & staff re: contract timing and format	07/29/08
96.	Exhibit 94 – email PSU & staff re: contract format to IGA	07/30/08
97.	Exhibit 95 – email string DLCD & LMD staff re: TA grant	08/04/08
98.	Exhibit 96 – memo to BCC re: 8-5-08 work session directing LMD	08/05/08
99.	Exhibit 97 – attachments to above memo	08/05/08
100.	Exhibit 98 – APA Journal of Planning Education & Research article on Population Forecast Errors; final version of above packet	08/07/08
* * * file no. 4 * * *		
101.	Exhibit 99 – Board Order 08-8-19-1 initiating Countywide Forecast	08/19/08
102.	Exhibit 100 – suggested change to Board Order from Mia Nelson	08/19/08
103.	Exhibit 101 – suggested change to Board Order from Mia Nelson	08/19/08
104.	Exhibit 102 – draft Board Order	08/19/08
105.	Exhibit 103 – revised work program for Board Order	08/21/08
106.	Exhibit 104 – Lane Code 16.400 RCP Amendment Process & RCP format chart	
107.	Exhibit 105 – modified work program for Board Order & IGA w/PSU	08/09/08
108.	Exhibit 106 – email requesting Web Page added to LMD for this	08/25/08
109.	Exhibit 107 – DLCD email re: funding for TA grant	08/27/08
110.	Exhibit 108 – email Veneta & Corvallis re: DLCD acknowledged Comp Plans that have a range for their projection	09/02/08
111.	Exhibit 109 – email from Legal Counsel on IGA language	09/02/08
112.	Exhibit 110 – email string w/cities on PSU revised work program	09/04/08
113.	Exhibit 111 – email string w/cities on process	09/04/08

FILE RECORD CONTENT SHEET
Countywide Population Forecast to 2030
PA 08-5042

<u>No.</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Date</u>
114.	Exhibit 112 – email update from M. Laird to BCC	09/05/08
115.	Exhibit 113 – email string PSU & legal re:IGA	09/08/08
116.	Exhibit 114 – email from M. Laird to J. Valencia re: Web link	09/09/08
117.	Exhibit 115 – email from DLCD to city administrators & BCC	09/09/08
118.	Exhibit 116 – email string LMD & PSU re: IGA	09/09/08
119.	Exhibit 117 – email string LMD & PSU re: IGA	09/08/09
120.	Exhibit 118 – email string city, DLCD, LMD, re: Grant funding	09/09/08
121.	Exhibit 119 – Eugene –Springfield PAPA for Safe Harbor forecast	09/09/08
122.	Exhibit 120 – email string re:PSU IGA revisions	09/09/08
123.	Exhibit 121 – work program to place on the LMD Website	09/10/08
124.	Exhibit 122 – updated PSU research proposal	09/15/08
125.	Exhibit 123 – updated PSU IGA & research proposal	09/17/08
126.	Exhibit 124 – updated DLCD TA grant application	09/23/08
127.	Exhibit 125 – DLCD approval of TA grant funding	09/25/08
128.	Exhibit 126 – PSU IGA for signature	09/26/08
129.	Exhibit 127 – email to schedule PSU & LMD staff meeting	09/26/08
130.	Exhibit 128 – email to BCC from LMD update on IGA	09/29/08
* * * file no. 5 * * *		
131.	Exhibit 129 – DLCD confirmation of TA Grant funding, copy of grant conditions, letter of instructions – 2 copies	09/30/08
132.	Exhibit 130 – Population Forecasts for Marion County, its Cities and Unincorporated Area 2010-2030	09/2008
133.	Exhibit 131 – IGA for signature to County Administrator	10/01/08
134.	Exhibit 132 – email to PSU from Keir re: spatial data	10/01/08
135.	Exhibit 133 – DLCD ltr. to Mott re: Metro Safe Harbor, PAPA 003-08	10/02/08
136.	Exhibit 134 – letter to small cities from metro cities re: Safe Harbor	10/06/08
137.	Exhibit 135 – email transmitting above letter & mailing labels	10/06/08
138.	Exhibit 136 – TA-R-09-207 executed DLCD Grant Agreement	10/07/08
139.	Exhibit 137 – email confirming staff mtg. PSU & LMD	10/08/08
140.	Exhibit 138 – staff email re: process	10/08/08
141.	Exhibit 139 – email transmitting grant documents to DLCD	10/13/08
142.	Exhibit 140 – Mia Nelson email disputing cities PAPA submittal	10/14/08
143.	Exhibit 141 – IGA correction regarding insurance	10/14/08
144.	Exhibit 142 – email scheduling staff mtg PSU & LMD	10/14/08
145.	Exhibit 143 – IGA correction final copu	10/14/08
146.	Exhibit 144 – email string M. Laird & Florence Planning	10/16/08
147.	Exhibit 145 – copy of PSU IGA	
* * * file no. 6 * * *		
148.	Exhibit 146 – Agenda, Project Initiation Meeting 1:30-3:00	10/16/08
149.	Population Forecast Update #4 to BCC	10/21/08
150.	Exhibit 147 – Memo to BCC update on project process for 11/4 mtg.	10/22/08
151.	Exhibit 148 – email from PSU following up 10/16/mtg.	10/23/08
152.	Exhibit 149 – email from Mia Nelson re: concerns	10/23/08
153.	Exhibit 150 – email string PSU & cities re: spatial data	10/23/08

FILE RECORD CONTENT SHEET
Countywide Population Forecast to 2030
PA 08-5042

<u>No.</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Date</u>
154.	Exhibit 151 – email update on forecast methods	10/23/08
155.	Exhibit 152 – email from C. Fleenor to LMD re: Mia’s concerns	10/24/08
156.	Exhibit 153 – email string staff planning for Kick-off meeting	10/28/08
157.	Exhibit 154 – email string re: process concerns	10/29/08
158.	Exhibit 155 – email to small cities re: process and process concerns	10/30/08
159.	Exhibit 156 – email PSU & LMD re: RLID access	10/31/08
160.	Exhibit 157 – BCC Cover Memo	11/04/08
161.	Exhibit 158 – Lane County Planning Commission Agenda & Packet	11/04/08
162.	Exhibit 159 – DLCDC Nov. 6 th letter correcting the October 2 nd letter	11/05/06
163.	Exhibit 160 – PW Director response to Mia Nelson & C.Fleenor	11/05/08
164.	Exhibit 162 – Planning Director response to Mia Nelson	11/06/08
165.	Exhibit 163 – C. Fleenor to LMD staff re: complete record	11/07/08
166.	Exhibit 164 – C. Fleenor to Planning Director re: complete record	11/07/08
167.	Exhibit 165 – P. Director response to C. Fleenor re: complete record	11/07/08
168.	Exhibit 166 – email string Mia Nelson & Planning Director re: process	11/07/08
169.	Exhibit 167 – email string re: complete record	11/07/08
170.	Exhibit 168 – mailing list update	11/17/08
171.	Exhibit 169 – Invitation to Kick-off meeting	11/17/08
172.	Exhibit 170 -- Invitation to Kick-off meeting	11/18/08
173.	Exhibit 171 – email J. Valencia re: Springfield Safe Harbor	11/19/08
174.	Exhibit 172 – email PSU creating slide show for Kick-off meeting	11/19/08
175.	Exhibit 173 – Meeting Notice email to add Kick-off meeting	11/19/08
176.	Exhibit 174 – email on slide show	11/20/08
177.	Exhibit 175 – Lowell submittal of additional model methodology	11/21/08
178.	Exhibit 176 – extra copy of above (in small city PAPA file)	
179.	Exhibit 177 – Register Guard email string re: legal ad for Kick-off mtg.	11/24/08
180.	Exhibit 178 -- RG email string re: final legal ad for Kick-off mtg.	11/24/08
181.	Exhibit 179 – Planning Director response to Mia Nelson re: legal ad	11/25/08
* * * file no. 7 * * *		
182.	Exhibit 180 – email string re: slide show	11/25/08
183.	Exhibit 181 – Lane County Meeting Notice of Kick-off meeting	11/26/08
184.	Exhibit 182 – email to minutes taker for Kick-off meeting	11/26/08
185.	Exhibit 183 – email PSU to staff re: slide show	11/26/08
186.	Exhibit 184 – Kick-Off Meeting Agenda, sign in sheets, narrative, handouts, minutes, slide show, Register Guard display ad & dates of publication,	12/02/08
187.	Exhibit 185 – DVD of Kick-of meeting	12/02/08
188.	Exhibit 186 – OEA preliminary population estimates for Oregon and its Counties	
189.	Exhibit 187 – revised powerpoint for Kick-Off meeting	12/01/08
190.	Register Guard Article on County Forecast	12/05/08
191.	Exhibit 188 – testimony from Bill George, Lowell developer	12/2008
192.	Exhibit 189 – testimony from Mona Lindstrom	12/08/08
193.	Exhibit 190 – testimony from Mia Nelson	12/10/08
194.	Exhibit 191 – letters to the editor, Register Guard	12/12/08
195.	Exhibit 192 – testimony from Jerry Ritter	12/03/08

FILE RECORD CONTENT SHEET
Countywide Population Forecast to 2030
PA 08-5042

<u>No.</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Date</u>
196.	Exhibit 193 -- email from Mia Nelson	12/03/08
197.	Exhibit 194 -- inputs from Lowell	12/04/08
198.	Forecast Update #5 to BCC	12/02/08
199.	Exhibit 195 -- DLCD email request for PSU presentation	12/05/08
200.	Exhibit 196 -- email string PSU & cities re: further info submittal	12/05/08
* * * file no. 8 * * *		
201.	Exhibit 197 -- flip chart notes for review	12/08/08
202.	Exhibit 198 -- email string, PSU & cities re: additional mtg. for input	12/09/08
203.	Exhibit 199 -- input from Lowell	12/12/08
204.	Exhibit 200 -- ECONorthwest report for city of Lowell	12/13/08
205.	Exhibit 201 -- email w Lowell on citizen contact	12/15/08
206.	Exhibit 202 -- Update # 6 to BCC	12/17/08
207.	Exhibit 203 -- email string: PSU data to cities for review	12/22/08
208.	Exhibit 204 -- email string: PSU data review by city staff	12/23/08
209.	Exhibit 205 -- memo transmitting input to PSU	12/26/08
210.	Exhibit 206 -- input from Florence	12/30/08
211.	Exhibit 207 -- email PSU project includes Eugene & Springfield	12/30/08
212.	Exhibit 208 -- email list of small city contacts & city input to PSU	01/06/09
213.	Exhibit 209 -- input from Dunes City & Creswell	01/06/08
214.	Exhibit 210 -- input from Veneta	01/07/08
215.	Exhibit 211 -- email from Mia Nelson re: notice errors	01/08/08
216.	Exhibit 212 -- input from Springfield	01/07/08
217.	Exhibit 213 -- input from Eugene	01/08/08
218.	input from Coburg	01/12/08
219.	Exhibit 214 -- phone call note: PSU & C. Spies, Lowell	01/23/08
220.	Exhibit 215 -- email string Mia & PSU phone calls	01/26/08
221.	Exhibit 216 -- M. Laird response to Mia's process concerns	01/26/08
222.	Exhibit 217 -- Update 6.2 to BCC	01/28/08
223.	email from C. Fleenor clarifying cost and suggesting intern	01/28/09
224.	Exhibit 218 -- email request to view file	01/29/08
225.	Exhibit 219 -- email PSU & Planners re: coordination meeting	01/30/08
226.	Exhibit 220 -- email PSU & Planners re: draft figures	01/30/08
227.	Exhibit 221 -- email PSU & Planners re: draft figures	01/30/08
* * * file no. 9 * * *		
228.	Exhibit 222 -- email from PSU re: process and meetings with cities	01/30/09
229.	Exhibit 223 -- email from J. Valencia requesting draft figures	02/05/09
230.	Exhibit 224 -- PSU email transmitting correct table of draft figures	02/05/09
231.	Exhibit 225 -- PSU email revisions for Ballot Measure 49 est.	02/06/09
232.	Exhibit 226 -- notes from Conference Call re: draft figures	02/06/09
233.	Exhibit 227 -- email, small cities re: reschedule PAPA & PSU #'s out	02/05/09
234.	Exhibit 228 -- PSU Draft Forecast	02/06/09
235.	Exhibit 229 -- email string Keir & PSU formatting for web page	02/08/09
236.	Exhibit 230 -- email from C. Spies to PSU	02/09/09
237.	Exhibit 231 -- email from J. Valencia to PSU	02/09/09

FILE RECORD CONTENT SHEET
Countywide Population Forecast to 2030
PA 08-5042

<u>No.</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Date</u>
238.	Exhibit 232 – email requesting minutes recorder for 3-3 mtg.	02/10/09
239.	Exhibit 233 – Interested Parties Contact List as of 2/9/09	02/09/09
240.	Exhibit 234 – email invitation to 3-3-09 Coordination Meeting	02/09/09
241.	Exhibit 235 – email string PSU & Lowell	02/09/09
242.	Exhibit 236 – email from PSU to Lowell	02/10/09
243.	Exhibit 237 – email PSU to staff re: Lowell again	02/10/09
244.	Exhibit 238 – email from Lowell to PSU	02/10/09
245.	Exhibit 239 – email from staff to PSU re: Lowell	02/10/09
246.	Exhibit 240 – email, Lowell again	02/10/09
247.	Exhibit 241 – Invitation to 3-3-09, Meeting Agenda & Legal Ad	02/11/09
248.	Exhibit 242 – email PSU to Lowell re: process for adjustments	02/11/09
249.	Exhibit 243 – email string from J. Valencia re: view the tables	02/10/09
250.	Exhibit 244 – Certification of mailing NOTICE of 2-26-09 meeting	02/13/09
251.	Exhibit 245 – Excell spreadsheet of interested parties as of 2-13-09	02/13/09
252.	Exhibit 246 – Excell Spreadsheet comparison PSU & Small City PAPA	
253.	Exhibit 247 – email string on meeting format	02/23/09
254.	Exhibit 248 – phone & email Ed Moore and M. Laird re:DLCD issues	02/24/09
255.	Exhibit 249 – email C. Heinkel re: charts & meeting logistics	02/24/09
256.	Exhibit 250 – email PSU & C. Heinkel re: Methodology and meeting	02/24/09
257.	Exhibit 251 – phone notes, staff and C. Heinkel & R. Ingram	02/25/09
258.	Exhibit 252 – email PSU & C. Heinkel re: methodology	02/25/09
259.	Exhibit 253 – email PSU & Springfield re: process & safe harbor	02/25/09
260.	Exhibit 254 –email input from Coburg	02/25/09
261.	Coord. Public Meeting Agenda, minutes, handouts, sign in sheets, CD	02/26/09
* * * file no. 10 * * *		
262.	Exhibit 255 – email to interested parties re: documentation of PSU methodology is found on the County website and in the public record	
263.	Exhibit 256 – City of Lowell comments submitted at meeting	02/26/09
264.	Exhibit 257 – Mia Nelson comments submitted at meeting	02/26/09
265.	Exhibit 258 – City of Coburg comments submitted at meeting	02/26/09
266.	Exhibit 259 – City of Eugene comments re: data, methods, UT area	02/26/09
267.	Exhibit 260 – Lowell Urban Renewal Plan & Attachments	02/27/09
268.	Exhibit 261 – email forwarded from Mona re: her input to PSU	02/27/09
269.	Exhibit 262 – Lowell Grant to USDA Rural Development for Water system improvements and Map showing new services areas	02/27/09
270.	Exhibit 263 – email from Lowell re: inspect record	03/02/09
271.	Exhibit 264 – City of Cottage Grove comments to PSU	03/02/09
272.	Exhibit 265 – City of Springfield concerns re: OEA, Safe Harbor & ECONorthwest report on Eco Devo objectives	03/02/09
273.	Exhibit 266 – Lowell K-12 bill	03/02/09
274.	Exhibit 267 – WinterBrook memo comparison re: PSU & SmCtyPAPA	03/03/09
275.	Exhibit 268 – email fromC. Heinkel, Lowell, to WinterBrook	03/03/09
276.	Exhibit 269 – PSU response to City of Springfield re: OEA, Safe Harb	03/04/09
277.	Exhibit 270 – PSU response to Eugene re: data, methods, UT area	03/04/09
278.	Exhibit 271 – Mia Nelson memo to PSU re: Lowell	03/05/09

FILE RECORD CONTENT SHEET
Countywide Population Forecast to 2030
PA 08-5042

<u>No.</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Date</u>
279.	Exhibit 272 – process email for WEB placement of documents	03/18/09
280.	Exhibit 273 – PSU Response to Mona L. (Ex. 261)	03/13/09
281.	Exhibit 274 – Legal response from Small Cities re: eligibility to submit application, accuracy of any projection made, location within Lane Co. General Plan for forecast to be documented	03/13/09
282.	Exhibit 275 – PSU summary of revisions to first draft for final draft	03/18/09
283.	Exhibit 276 – Springfield Safe Harbor PAPA Notice of city hearing and Safe Harbor forecast for separated metro cities	
284.	Exhibit 277 – Small Cities Attorney re: satisfied w/forecast	03/24/09
285.	Exhibit 278 – PSU second draft of Forecast	03/20/09
286.	Exhibit 279 – Agenda, Handouts, Sign In Sheet, Minutes, DVD of final public meeting in Phase I , DRAFT forecast	03/26/09
* * * file no. 11 * * *		
287.	Exhibit 280 – Springfield email to PSU re: separated UT for Metro	03/27/09
288.	Exhibit 281 – Mia Nelson email to PSU re: methodology for Lowell	03/30/09
289.	Exhibit 282 – DLCD email re: TA Grant Deliverables & Timeline	04/01/09
290.	Exhibit 283 – email Fleenor to staff re: legal basis for PSU forecast	04/03/09
291.	Exhibit 284 – Update #7 to BCC from M. Laird	04/06/09
292.	Exhibit 285 – Fleenor response to #7, requesting joint LCPC/BCC	04/06/09
293.	Exhibit 286 – Lane Co. input to Springfield Metro PAPA	04/06/09
294.	Exhibit 287 – BCC Agenda, PSU forecast discussion under Commissioner’s business re: impacts of one on others	04/07/09
295.	Exhibit 288 – Register Guard article on County Population Forecasts	04/07/09
296.	Exhibit 289 – DLCD email to staff re: TA Grant deliverables	04/08/09
297.	Exhibit 290 – audio tape of DLCD meeting with staff re: TA Grant	04/14/09
298.	Exhibit 291 – County request for extension of time on TA Grant	04/14/09
299.	Exhibit 292 – DLCD response to TA Grant extension request	04/15/09
300.	Exhibit 293 – County BCC letter to Springfield requesting they do not proceed with Metro PAPA, wait for PSU	04/16/09
301.	Exhibit 294 – Mia Nelson email to PSU accepting DRAFT forecast	04/03/09