

W. 7.b.

AGENDA COVER MEMO

DATE: July 5, 2006 (Date of memo)
July 12, 2006 (Date of 2nd work session)

TO: LANE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

FROM: Public Works Department/Land Management Division (LMD)

PRESENTED BY: Kent Howe, Planning Director
Jeff Towery, Division Manager

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: BOARD DIRECTION ON LONG-RANGE PLANNING
WORK PROJECTS AND REVENUES DURING THE
FISCAL YEAR 2006-2007.

This memo links the LMD agenda cover memo to the Board of Commissioners dated June 1, 2006, with the Video Lottery application submitted to the Economic Development Standing Committee on February 14, 2006, and draws references to aspects of the Board's discussion on June 21, 2006, and provides a matrix for the Board in evaluating the priorities for the proposed projects and determining their relevance to economic development.

ISSUES AND DISCUSSION

1. What long-range work projects does the Board of County Commissioners want to see accomplished in FY 2006-2007?

On June 21st, the Board reviewed twelve Rural Comprehensive Plan work projects proposed by LMD and eleven Metro Plan issues being considered by one or more Metro partners. Please refer to the Agenda Cover Memo dated June 1st and the LMD memorandum "Draft List of Metro Issues in Need of Examination (August 2, 2005) that was distributed at the work session.

A. Rural Comprehensive Plan Work Projects (Proposed by LMD).

Source: Reproduced from information as it appeared in the BCC agenda cover memo, June 1, 2006 - work session, June 21, 2006.

Table with 5 columns: Projects, Project Cost, Grants, LMD Revenue, FTE. Lists various projects like GIS Zoning Diagrams/Website, Floodplain/CRS program, Metro - Small Cities, etc., with associated costs and revenues.

• PW-GIS Maintenance Contract	\$ 12,500.00	\$ 12,500.00	
• Eugene Airport Master Plan /LC 16.	\$ 8,660.00	\$ 8,660.00	0.10
• "Structural Defensible Space" (F2).	\$ 8,660.00	\$ 8,660.00	0.10
• Legislative updates LC 13 & 16.	\$ 15,855.50	\$ 15,855.50	0.20
• ORS 836 Private Airports.	\$ 8,398.00	\$ 8,398.00	0.10
• e-Government Fund	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	
• Contingency Fund	\$ 5,620.20	\$ 5,620.20	
Total	\$ 500,000.00	\$ 215,000.00	\$ 285,000.00 4.85

Additional analysis with the County Administrator and developing circumstances have led to some revisions to the scope of some proposed projects and the addition of other projects, which is discussed in the following sections.

B. Metro Plan Issues.

Source: LMD memo – Draft List of Metro Issues in Need of Examination, August 2, 2005.

There was discussion during the Board's work session on two issues in support of Issues No. 6 and 9, which are reproduced below:

"6. Role of MPC – Policy Development and Dispute Resolution.

The Board recalls when the role of MPC was policy development and dispute resolution. However, now when a dispute resolution comes up, the approach seems to be that each representative goes back to its governing body to determine a position rather than seek to resolve the dispute at the MPC table. MPC has also been consumed by the MPO role for transportation issues in the Metro area. The Board wants to look at the appropriateness of MPC in that function."

It is difficult to estimate the course, effort, or expenses required to undertake a meaningful discussion between the Eugene, Springfield and Lane County elected officials and staffs on Issue No. 6 above. If the Board directs staff to follow-up on this issue, LMD will contact their counter parts in the two Cities and report back to the Board on the level of commitment in the urban jurisdictions to proceeding with a study.

"9. RTP / Trans Plan.

The effort involved with three jurisdictions having both a regional and a comprehensive transportation plan for the Metro Area seems duplicative. Can one transportation plan meet both the local and regional needs and requirements?"

The Lane County Public Works – Transportation Division is the logical staff to advise the Board on the current need for a regional TSP. Funding for regional plans is available through Title I allocations if there is a willingness of the triad (cities and county) to pursue the practicality of the issue.

2. What funds are available to support the long-range work projects?

LMD anticipates revenues during the Fiscal Year 2006-2007 in the amount of \$500,000.00 for long-range planning projects. There are currently four sources for these revenues:

- Long Range surcharge on LMD permit fees (7.5%) (Projected revenue) \$ 285,000.00

• EDSC Video Lottery Standing Committee grant	\$ 170,000.00
• DLCD Technical Assistance grant (Dredge Materials Disposal Plan)	\$ 30,000.00
• <u>DLCD Periodic Review grant (CRMP Periodic Review)</u>	<u>\$ 15,000.00</u>
Revenue	\$ 500,000.00

3. What additional funding source(s) is necessary in support of the processing of unfunded, mandated Ballot Measure 37 claims and anticipated appeals of subsequent development permits during FY 2006-2007?

a. Ballot Measure 37 Processing. \$ 48,601.40 FTE: 0.50

Under the current BM 37 process, only a minimal fee is charged the claimant to process a BM 37 claim with the Board of Commissioners and the BM 37 process is subsidized by the long-range surcharge fees on all other land use and development permit fees. In effect, the fees of the many go for the benefit of the few.

The current \$850 application fee for a Ballot Measure 37 claim is approximately two-thirds of the building permit fee for an average mobile home placement permit or one-third the building permit fee for the construction of an average-size, single family dwelling.

LMD currently collects a 7.5% surcharge fee on land use, building and sanitation permits. The projected revenue for FY 2006-2007 is \$285,000 in support of approximately 2.5 FTE in the long-range section of the Planning Program. In the June 21st agenda cover memo, LMD initially proposed using \$48,600 (17%) of the \$285,000 to fund 0.5 FTE Planner for processing the BM 37 claims in FY 2006-2007.

Some Commissioners and the County Administrator have concerns that the 0.5 FTE is insufficient to meet the growing unfunded and mandated commitment and has indicated a full-FTE Planner may be required. In addition, the onset in FY 2006-2007 of land use development permits in follow-up to the waivers granted in FY 2005-2006 will generate opposition from special interests and impacted rural neighbors resulting in the County processing appeals to land use, building and sanitation permit decisions with a state-mandated, appeal fee of \$250. This situation will include indirect charges for county administration and legal counsel in addition to LMD participation in the appeals process.

Funding for the initial claims and sequential development permit appeals can be calculated somewhat accurately based on the FY 2005-2006 data. If a majority of the Commissioners seek this more detailed information, County Administration, Legal Counsel and LMD could provide the projected estimates in a few weeks time for this specific work project.

Three possible avenues for additional BM 37 funding were discussed by the Board:

A. Raise BM 37 application fees to fully cover expenses in processing of claims.

This avenue would require Board adoption of an order to amend the \$850 application fee in Lane Manual 60 to fully cover the county administrative and counsel indirect costs, and LMD staff expenses. An order would require documentation of the projected expenses for County department staffs and three to four months in processing time to comply with notice and adoption requirements.

From the standpoint of equity, this is the fairest solution to the situation in that it places the burden on the individual parties who would potentially reap the benefits. Acting to require that the private developer pay their way through the BM 37 process could potentially result in the risk that some claimants would refuse to pay the equitable fee and elect to go to Circuit Court.

B. Supplemental budget allocation from the general fund to offset expenses in processing of BM 37 claims and directly-related development permit appeals.

Processing BM 37 claims and future appeal fees arising from challenges to development permits will most likely not be fully funded by application fees.

From the standpoint of equity, this is the fairer of the two solutions (B. or C.) for public funding in that it would place the financial burden on the majority of the general public that supported the unfunded mandate imposed by BM 37.

C. Dedicating the long-range surcharge fees to cover the costs of processing claims.

Under this scenario, the fees of the many would continue to benefit the few. Using the revenue from long-range surcharge fees to subsidize the public defense of benefits gained through the BM 37 waiver process raises three questions for the Board:

- What was the underlying policy at the time of adoption of the long-range surcharge fees?
- What was the surcharge revenue intended to fund?
- Is subsidizing BM 37 claimants an appropriate use of the revenue?

This course of action would not require any formal action on the part of the Board other than directing staff to dedicate a certain level of the surcharge revenue to BM 37 claim processing.

From the standpoint of equity, this is the least fair solution in that it places the financial burden for subsidizing BM 37 claims on rural property owners who are paying surcharges for individual development permits that are not connected with BM 37 claims.

4. What modifications should be made to the proposed work projects?

a. Overhaul of Lane Code 10 and 16 \$ 20,632.45 FTE: 0.25

LMD is proposing to narrow the scope of the overhaul to Lane Code Chapter 10 by limiting the housekeeping amendments to:

- Correcting outdated text and cross-section references to other Lane Code or Lane Manual provisions;
- Clarifying terminology to bring such terms into conformity with State law and more contemporary Lane Code Chapter 16; and
- Eliminating redundancies in the Chapter 10 sections where possible to simplify the processing of development permits.

Limiting the scope of the Lane Code 10 portion of the proposed overhaul would reduce projected FTE from 0.50 to 0.25 and the originally projected expense of \$41,2649.90 down to \$20,632.45 for drafting of the scope of the RFP and coordinating selection of the private consultant firm.

b. Minimum Lot Sizes RC, RI, RPF. \$ 18,700.00 FTE: 0.15

This work project has been eliminated at a savings of 0.15 FTE and \$ 18,700.00.

Land Management Division began discussions with Department of Land Conservation & Development in January-February 2006 on the feasibility of the Land Conservation and Development Commission adopting amendments to OAR 660-004-0018 to bring the “single numerical minimum lot size” standard for commercial, industrial and public facility lands in the administrative rule into conformity with the “carrying capacity” criteria of OAR 660-0022 (Unincorporated Community Rule).

On June 16th, sixteen OAC Planning Directors voted unanimously to recommend to DLCD and LCDC to adopt a minor housekeeping amendment to OAR 660-004-0018 to achieve this conformity.

On June 30th, the LCDC approved without dissent the recommendation and directed DLCD to prepare the appropriate language amendment for review and action. This action by LCDC and DLCD eliminates the anticipated need for Lane County to undertake a lengthy and expensive independent amendment process.

5. a. What work projects qualify for Video Lottery “economic development” grant funding; and

Lane Manual Chapter 4 provides the scope for the review by the Economic Development Standing Committee and the Board of Commissioners of grant applications and awarding economic development funding.

Lane Manual 4.105 includes in its definition of “Economic Development” -- *(1) Business Development. Programs that encourage business growth and investment that create new employment opportunities, attract and expand business, increase tourism, and facilitate start-up and emerging businesses.*

Lane Manual 4.110 *Allocation* subsection provides for allocations between two economic development categories. LM 4.110(1) *Category 1 – General Allocation for Economic Development Program* states that *50% of the County’s annual receipts shall pay for ongoing County programs and services which meet the adopted definition of economic development. The rationale is that citizens, tourists, employees and potential business owners shall benefit from a stable economic base, prepared and ready work force, nurturing atmosphere for business growth and investment and consistent and knowledgeable development staff.*

b. How does the Board of Commissioners want to allocate the available funds for the work projects?

The Lane County Board of Commissioners has traditionally viewed the “economic development” label as one that is inclusive of the interests of rural private citizens and not just limited to the urban job market. If a benefit to the private citizen’s lifestyle, welfare, or sense of community is realized as a result of an allocation of Vidlot funding, then that benefit

has been acknowledged and embraced. Economic development does not necessary equate to a new single job for an individual. It can equally be beneficial if it relieves a financial burden of a large number of private citizens, reduces the complexity and simplifies the understanding and compliance with mandated regulations, and provides for e-commerce and e-government improvements promoting more convenient access and services for the citizens. Staff does not see the Board's discussion on June 21st as a challenge to the Economic Development Standing Committee's recommendation on the allocation of Vidlot funds to specific work projects. Staff sees the discussion as an open forum on the direction the Board needs to take annually in response to changing circumstances. Public debate could result in the decision to limit Vidlot allocations only to subsidizing the private sector with the assumption that new jobs will result but to do so risks the lost of a dynamic long-range planning work program that is responsive to the needs of citizens in all aspects of their lives including employment.

The above analysis and amendments to the initial work projects proposed in the June 21st agenda cover memo are reflected in the revised project list and funding proposals below.

Staff has inserted statements where appropriate to clarify how past Board decisions have supported Vidlot funds for similar or continuing work projects.

The Board may feel comfortable in a general determination that the allocated \$170,000 Video Lottery grant will be divided out over the qualifying aspects of the work projects presented below. The Board may also seek to apply portions of the funding specifically to individual projects in the actions they take on July 12th or 19th. In either instance, the following analysis is intended as a matrix and guideline for discussion on how to authorize expenditure of the \$170,000 Vidlot grant.

Work Projects	Project Expenditure	DLCD Grants	Vidlot Economic Development	FTE
GIS Zoning Diagrams/Website.	\$ 54,475.60		\$ 54,475.60	0.45
<u>Project Budget</u>				
<u>Classification</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Expenditure</u>		
Planning Director	0.05	\$ 3,660.80		
Associate Planner	0.1	\$ 4,143.40		
Planner	0.2	\$ 8,740.60		
Land Mgt Technician	0.1	\$ 3,563.00		
FTE Subtotal	0.45	\$ 20,107.80		
Indirect (x.814)		\$ 16,367.80		
TransMap GIS data		\$ 18,000.00		
(*funds to be allocated to LCPW GIS Project)				
<u>Total</u>		\$ 54,475.60		

The February 14, 2006 EDSC application is enclosed as Attachment B. It includes a discussion on the qualification of this project for Video Lottery funding and outcomes/products. Please refer to "Project A" in the attachment. Base parcel mapping with ORMAP accuracy, rural addressing overlays, and land use zoning designation overlays were created by Public Works GIS during the 2003-2006 period with financial support from a variety of State and County grant sources. Adoption of the base maps and overlays and access via a County website will provide a very valuable, readily available, resource to the private citizens, the development community and public agencies.

Floodplain/CRS program.	\$ 28,782.00		\$ 28,782.00	0.40
--------------------------------	--------------	--	--------------	------

<u>Project Budget</u>		
<u>Classification</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Expenditure</u>
Planner	0.2	\$ 8,740.60
Land Mgt Technician	0.2	\$ 7,126.00
FTE Subtotal	0.4	\$ 15,866.60
Indirect (all) (x.814)		\$ 12,915.40
<u>Total</u>		<u>\$ 28,782.00</u>

The February 14, 2006 EDSC application is enclosed as Attachment B. It includes a discussion on the qualification of this project for Video Lottery funding and outcomes/products. Please refer to "Project B" in the attachment. Participation in the Community Rating System provides opportunities to reduce insurance premium rates from 5% to 45% for all NFIP policy holders and implements improved standards for flood hazard protection on a Countywide basis.

<u>Project Budget</u>					
<u>Classification</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Expenditure</u>			
Planner	1.0	\$ 45,073.60			
Land Mgt Technician	0.1	\$ 3,563.00			
FTE Subtotal	1.1	\$ 48,636.60			
Indirect (all) (x .814)		\$ 39,590.20			
<u>Total</u>		<u>\$ 88,226.80</u>	\$ 88,226.80		1.10

The February 14, 2006 EDSC application is enclosed as Attachment B. It includes a discussion on the qualification of this project for Video Lottery funding and outcomes/products. Please refer to "Project C" in the attachment. The one FTE planner funded by Vidlot is assigned to coordination and co-application processing for the Metro Area, and Cities of Eugene, Springfield, Dunes City, Florence, Veneta, Junction City, Coburg, Creswell, Cottage Grove, Lowell, Westfir and Oakridge. The planner also collaborates on regional and special district planning exercises. All of these efforts are directly tied to economic development within the urban jurisdictions of the incorporated areas of Lane County.

<u>Project Budget</u>					
<u>Classification</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Expenditure</u>			
Principal Planner	0.2	\$ 11,752.00			
Associate Planner	0.2	\$ 11,477.40			
Land Mgt Technician	0.1	\$ 3,563.00			
FTE subtotal	0.5	\$ 26,792.40			
Indirect (all) (x .814)		\$ 21,809.00			
<u>Total</u>		<u>\$ 48,601.40</u>	\$ 48,601.40		0.50

Ballot Measure 37 Processing.
LMD agrees with the County Administrator and members of the Board that this unfunded mandate should be funded fully by the claimant's application fees and/or a supplemental add package for a general fund allocation. LMD also recommends that the Board factor County Counsel's expenses in reviewing BM 37 claims and processing anticipated appeals of development permits that result from BM 37 waivers into the general fund allocation.

Please refer to "Project D" in the attachment. This unfunded mandate requires extensive involvement by LMD staff, Legal Counsel and the County Administrator to review and process the BM 37 claims for Board decisions on compensation, waiver or denial. BM 37 also requires extensive research and services to the public on determination of applicable zoning ordinances and land use regulations as a forerunner to the filling of claims. The crux of the BM37 movement was to provide retroactive property rights to individuals to develop their lands for economic benefit.

Overhaul of Lane Code 16.			\$ 20,632.45	\$ 20,632.45	0.15
<u>Project Budget</u>					
<u>Classification</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Expenditure</u>			
Planning Director	0.025	\$ 1,830.40			
Principal Planner	0.025	\$ 1,469.00			
Planner	0.1	\$ 8,974.60			
FTE Subtotal	0.15	\$ 11,374.00			
Indirect (all) (x .814)		\$ 9,258.45			
<u>Total</u>		\$ 20,632.45			

The February 14, 2006 EDSC application is enclosed as Attachment B. It includes a discussion on the qualification of this project for Video Lottery funding and outcomes/products for both Lane Code 10 and 16. Please refer to "Project H" in the attachment. Lane Code 16 represents the guidelines for application processing and development of "rural" lands. It is needlessly complex and confusing. The general public is not able to readily understand and comply with the land use process. Revisions to LC 16 will be housekeeping in scope and allow LMD opportunities to improve customer service and application processing with the general public.

Dredge Materials Disposal Plan.			\$ 53,875.80	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 23,875.80	0.45
<u>Project Budget</u>						
<u>Classification</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Expenditure</u>				
Associate Planner	0.2	\$ 11,465.00				
Land Mgmt Technician	0.2	\$ 6,922.00				
Engineering Tech II	0.2	\$ 9,618.00				
OA II Office Assistant	0.05	\$ 1,695.00				
FTE Subtotal	0.65	\$ 29,700.00				
Indirect (all) (x .814)		\$ 24,175.80				
		\$ 53,875.80				
DLCD Grant TA-R-07-009 (-)		\$ 30,000.00				
<u>EDSC funding request</u>		\$ 23,875.80				

The February 14, 2006 EDSC application is enclosed as Attachment B. It includes a discussion on the qualification of this project for Video Lottery funding and outcomes/products. Please refer to "Project F" in the attachment. LMD has secured a DLCD \$30,000 grant to partially fund the revisions to the DMDP. The remainder is for in-kind expenses. Collaboration with the USACOE, DSL and the Port of Siuslaw will result in revisions to the Dredge Materials Disposal Plan (1978) and include evaluation of the existing dredge material disposal sites under current local, State and Federal conservation and development regulations. The scope of the project includes co-adoptions with the City of Florence of amendments to the DMDP and inventory. Opportunities to address conservation and development activities in the west Lane region through use of the dredge materials to enhance habitat or elevate development sites will potentially provide economic development activities.

CRMP Goals 16-17 PR work tasks.			\$ 32,959.80	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 17,959.80	0.15
DLCD provided a periodic review grant in 2000 which included payments to LCOG to complete Work Task 3. a. iii-iv. The						

required tasks were not completed. LMD has secured a DLCD \$15,000 grant to partially fund the completion of the work tasks with LMD staff. The remainder is for in-kind expenses.

<u>Project Budget</u>		
<u>Classification</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Expenditure</u>
Associate Planner	0.15	\$ 8,598.80
Land Mgmt Technician	0.1	\$ 3,461.00
Engineering Tech II (GIS)	0.2	\$ 6,140.00
Subtotal	0.45	\$ 18,199.80
Indirect (all) (x .814)		\$ 14,750.00
Subtotal		\$ 32,959.80
DLCD PR-R-07-002 grant (-)		\$ 15,000.00
EDSC funding request		\$ 17,959.80

The February 14, 2006 EDSC application is enclosed as Attachment B. It includes a discussion on the qualification of this project for Video Lottery funding and outcomes/products. Please refer to "Project G" in the attachment. This is the final set of work tasks associated with the Periodic Review Work Program which was funded in part by EDSC Vidlot grants from June 2000 through June 2005.

Title III CWPP Implementation grant \$ 16,829.00 No EDSC funds requested. 0.25

The Board reduced the proposed \$151,000 implementing grant to address wildland-urban interface action items to \$55,000. LMD's participation in the CWPP action was \$16,829 (8.9%) of the \$151,000. The LMD participation included coordinating the County's role in the interagency partnership with the Lane County Fire Defense Board, Fire Prevention Co-Op, State Fire Marshall, Oregon Department of Forestry, Bureau of Land Management, and U. S. Forest Service. It also includes assessing the evolving data from fire professionals and revisions to the Risk Assessment plots for Lane County. It included funds for LMD to coordinate and submit Title II and Title III grant applications to the Hood-Willamette, Siuslaw, Umpqua and BLM RACs on behalf of the CWPP. Finally, it included LMD as the fiscal agent for the CWPP to monitor and authorize payments for community outreach and education expenditures and services rendered by the partners.

Supreme Court Opinion "signs", \$ 14,160.00 \$ 14,160.00 0.10

The Supreme Court opinion in March 2006 is an unfunded mandate requiring amendments to change restrictive language in Lane Code 16 sections.

<u>Project Budget</u>		
<u>Classification</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Expenditure</u>
Planner	0.10	\$ 4,487.30
Land Mgt Technician	0.10	\$ 3,563.00
FTE Subtotal	0.20	\$ 8,050.30
Indirect (all) (x.814)		\$ 6,109.70
Total		\$ 14,160.00

The Oregon Supreme Court's *Outdoor Media Dimensions vs. ODMV* opinion in March 2006 addressed the content of signage. Lane Code 16 regulates signage by content and location in various rural zoning designations. Off-sight advertising restrictions and placement limitations by zones need to be reviewed in all LC 16 designations for compliance with the opinion. Revisions to LC 16 subsections may be required.

Middle Fork Willamette Watershed. \$ 32,628.00 \$ 32,628.00 0.35

Video Lottery funds were allocated from June 2002-June 2005 to partially offset the cost in adopting plan amendments to conform land use designations for rural properties to past and current lawful uses. Four watersheds were processed under the Vidlot grants. The Middle Fork watershed is the final remaining region for processing of amendments for 47 properties.

<u>Project Budget</u>		
<u>Classification</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Expenditure</u>
Associate Planner	0.30	\$ 16,216.10
Land Mgt Technician	0.05	\$ 1,781.50
FTE Subtotal	0.35	\$ 17,997.60
Indirect (all) (x.814)		\$ 14,650.40
<u>Total</u>		<u>\$ 32,628.00</u>

Forty-seven developed and committed properties will be subject to review by the Board as plan amendments and zone change amendments to bring the historical and existing land uses into conformance with the designated land use zone. Adopting the appropriate zoning designation will stimulate development of the subject properties and potentially stimulate the local economy and employment opportunities in rural areas of Lane County.

PW-GIS Maintenance Contract \$ 12,500.00 \$ 12,500.00
 During 2003-2006, LMD and Public Works GIS have coordinated on developing an accurate parcel base, zoning diagram base, rural addressing base, combining overlay zoning boundaries, and other information data layers. Use and analysis of the data for ongoing projects will require supporting revenue to compensate PW-GIS.

Eugene Airport Master Plan /LC 16. \$ 8,660.00 \$ 8,660.00 0.10
 City of Eugene has drafted a revised Airport Master Plan and implementing Lane Code 16 provisions which the County must process as components of the Rural Comprehensive Plan and Metro Plan.

<u>Project Budget</u>		
<u>Classification</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Expenditure</u>
Planner	0.10	\$ 4,765.00
Indirect (all) (x.814)		\$ 3,895.00
<u>Total</u>		<u>\$ 8,660.00</u>

Adoption of the Airport Master Plan and implementing subsections to Lane Code 16 will bring the expansion of the airport runways and the future development of the facility to accommodate expanded services in the decades ahead.

“Structural Defensible Space” (F2). \$ 8,660.00 Does not qualify. 0.10

Board directed LMD in May 2006 to amend LC 16.211 to implement the "structural defense space" recommendations arising out of the CWPP action item.

<u>Project Budget</u>		
<u>Classification</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Expenditure</u>
Planner	0.10	\$ 4,765.00
Indirect (all) (x.814)		\$ 3,895.00
Total		\$ 8,660.00

The work project is the result of the Board's direct action in the review of the Lane Code 16.266 work project.

Legislative updates LC 13 & 16. \$ 15,855.50 \$ 15,855.50 0.20
 Oregon Legislative Assembly enacted revisions to the Oregon Revised Statutes and thus LCDC adopted amendments to the Oregon Administrative Rules during the 2003-2005 period that require amendments to Lane Code 13 (Divisions) and 16 (Land Use).

<u>Project Budget</u>		
<u>Classification</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Expenditure</u>
Planner	0.20	\$ 8,740.60
Indirect (all) (x.814)		\$ 7,114.90
Total		\$ 15,855.50

Amendments to Lane Code Chapter 16 regulations will bring the partitioning and subdivision criteria standards of Lane Code Chapter 13 into compliance with State law. These amendments could potentially be applicable to any rural citizen striving to divide their property for conveyance or development purposes.

ORS 836 Private Airports. \$ 8,398.00 \$ 8,398.00 0.10
 Revisions to ORS occurred in 1997, one year after Lane County adopted the 1996 Periodic Review Work program. State mandate requires this be included in the next Periodic Review work program.

<u>Project Budget</u>		
<u>Classification</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Expenditure</u>
Planner	0.1	\$ 4,630.00
Indirects (x .814)		\$ 3,768.00
		\$ 8,398.00

The February 14, 2006 EDSC application is enclosed as Attachment B. It includes a discussion on the qualification of this project for Video Lottery funding and outcomes/products. Please refer to "Project I" in the attachment. This is an unfunded mandate from the Oregon Legislative Assembly to the local jurisdictions intended to facilitate small, private airport operations. The completion of this project will economically benefit rural airport operators in Lane County.

e-Government Fund \$ 10,000.00 \$ 10,000.00

Work Project Subtotals \$ 455,047.35 \$ 384,558.35

Work Project Subtotals	\$ 455,047.35
<u>Long-Range Contingency Fund</u>	<u>\$ 44,952.65</u>
Total	\$ 500,000.00

Work Projects partially or in full qualifying for Video Lottery funding \$ 384,558.35

Grants:

DLCD Technical and Periodic Review	\$ 45,000.00
Video Lottery Economic Development	<u>\$ 170,000.00</u>
Total	\$ 215,000.00

Long Range Surcharge Revenue	<u>\$ 285,000.00</u>
Total	\$ 500,000.00

RECOMMENDATIONS

Prioritizing of work projects.

Staff recommends that the Commissioners focus initially on the list of work projects that they feel should receive priority in FY 2006-2007. Once the Board has identified the projects that have support by a majority or all Board members, the source of preferable funding can be discussed and direction given to staff on how to proceed with funding allocations.

Qualifying for Vidlot Economic Development funding.

Staff thinks that \$ 384,558.35 of the proposed work project expenditures and 13 of the 15 identified projects would qualify for the \$ 170,000 grant funding under the guidelines of EDSC Video Lottery economic development program.

Direction to County staff.

Land Management Division is requesting direction from the Board of Commissioners as to any additional information desired as well as the process the Board wants to use to evaluate and direct LMD on the projects included in this analysis, or other projects of the Board's choosing.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Agenda Cover Memo to Board, June 1, 2006 (Work Session: June 21, 2005).
- B. Video Lottery application – Economic Development Standing Committee, February 14, 2006.
- C. LMD memo: Draft List of Metro Issues In Need of Examination, August 2, 2005.

AGENDA COVER MEMO

DATE: June 1, 2006 (Date of memo)
June 14, 2006 (Date of work session)

TO: LANE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

FROM: Public Works Department/Land Management Division (LMD)

PRESENTED BY: Kent Howe, Planning Director
Jeff Towery, Division Manager

**AGENDA ITEM TITLE: BOARD DIRECTION ON LONG-RANGE PLANNING
WORK PROJECTS AND REVENUES DURING THE
FISCAL YEAR 2006-2007.**

ISSUE

Land Management Division (LMD) conducts long-range planning activities based on available funding sources and the expressed priorities of the Board of County Commissioners.

DISCUSSION

LMD anticipates revenues during the Fiscal Year 2006-2007 in the amount of \$500,000.00 for long-range planning projects. There are four sources for these revenues:

1. Long Range surcharge on LMD permit fees (7.5%)	\$ 285,000.00
2. EDSC Video Lottery grant	\$ 170,000.00
3. DLCD Technical Assistance grant (Dredge Materials Disposal Plan)	\$ 30,000.00
4. <u>DLCD Periodic Review grant (CRMP Periodic Review)</u>	\$ 15,000.00
Revenue	\$ 500,000.00

LMD is also involved in discussions with the Economic Development Standing Committee (EDSC) for approval of a second Video Lottery grant during FY 2006-2007 to secure an additional \$100,000 following the Request For Proposals evaluation and selection process for securing a contract with a private consulting firm to overhaul the Lane Code Chapter 10 land use regulations within the urban growth boundaries of Florence, Veneta, Junction City, Coburg, Creswell, Cottage Grove, Lowell, Westfir and Oakridge, and Lane Code Chapter 16 land use regulations within the Metro Plan area and rural Lane County. If the second EDSC grant is authorized, LMD's anticipated revenues for long range planning projects in FY 2006-2007 will be \$ 600,000.00. This item was presented to the Budget Committee as an add package (approved) and is discussed in further detail in the Economic Development Standing Committee subsection.

All of the grants that have been approved, including the EDSC funding referenced above, are allocated to specific work projects and specific products or actions and are accountable to the sources allocating the funds. This memo will identify the specific projects and the funding sources currently in place.

Economic Development Standing Committee

In February 2006, LMD submitted an application to the Economic Development Standing Committee identifying nine projects with anticipated expenses totaling \$327,439.80. LMD requested funding in the amount of \$170,000.00 to partially offset the anticipated budgets.

The nine projects were:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>FTE**</u>
• GIS Zoning Diagrams/Website	\$ 54,475.60	0.45
• Floodplain/CRS (Community Rating System) program	\$ 28,782.00	0.40
• Metro – Small Cities Urban Planning	\$ 88,226.80	1.10
• Ballot Measure 37 Preparedness and Processing	\$ 48,601.40	0.50
• Legislative updates to LC Chapters 13 and 16	\$ 15,855.50	0.20
• Siuslaw River Dredge Materials Disposal Plan	* \$ 23,875.80	0.45
• Coastal Resource Management Plan (Periodic Review)	# \$ 17,959.80	0.25
• Overhaul of Lane Code Chapters 10 (Urban) and 16 (Rural)	\$ 41,264.90	0.50
• <u>ORS 836 Private Airport Planning</u>	\$ 8,398.00	0.10
Totals	\$ 327,439.80	3.95

Note: * Anticipated expenses and FTE in addition to the DLCD grant in the amount of 30,000.00.

Anticipated expenses and FTE in addition to the DLCD grant in the amount of 15,000.00.

** FTE includes both LMD and PW-GIS personnel.

In discussions with the EDSC it was acknowledged that LMD would use the grant funds spread over five of the nine projects, based on the most appropriate uses of the funds under the economic development guidelines. The five identified projects were:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Expense</u>	<u>FTE</u>
• GIS Zoning Diagrams/Website	\$ 54,475.60	0.45
• Floodplain/CRS (Community Rating System) program	\$ 28,782.00	0.40
• Metro – Small Cities Urban Planning	\$ 88,226.80	1.10
• Ballot Measure 37 Preparedness and Processing	\$ 48,601.40	0.50
• <u>Overhaul of Lane Code Chapters 10 (Urban) and 16 (Rural)</u>	\$ 41,264.90	0.50
Totals	\$ 261,350.70	2.95

It was understood that LMD would utilize \$91,350.70 from the annual LR surcharge on permit fee revenue to supplement the difference between the EDSC grant and the total expenses for the five projects. This would leave \$193,649.30 of the surcharge to be allocated to additional projects.

As mentioned above in the EDSC discussions, it was also understood that LMD was proposing a three-year project linked to the EDSC \$41,264.90 allocation that would initiate actions in preparation for an in-depth overhaul of the Lane Code Chapter 10 land use regulations applicable to inside urban growth boundaries (UGB) of the ten small cities of Lane County, and the Lane Code Chapter 16 land use regulations that apply within the Metro Plan Boundary and the Rural Comprehensive Plan areas outside the UGBs within the County. FY 2006-2007 actions will include scoping the project requirements, compiling necessary documentation, preparing a request for proposal guidelines, and processing the submittals to select a qualified consulting firm.

LMD has submitted additional information to EDSC which is currently being reviewed by staff and will be initially discussed by the Standing Committee on June 1. Any action or recommendation by the committee will be provided to the Board as supplemental information or incorporated into the staff report for this item. This will be the first in a series of four grant requests over four consecutive, fiscal years. The EDSC Video Lottery grant will request \$100,000.00 to hire the selected consulting firm from the private sector to initiate the project in the latter part of FY 2006-2007. Dependent on the success of negotiations for a final contract for services, LMD anticipates annual requests to EDSC in the range of \$100,000 to \$150,000 during FY 2007-2008 through FY 2009-2010, to complete the project with adoption by the Board of County Commissioners of implementing ordinances by June 30, 2010.

Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)

The two DLCD grants partially fund the Coastal Resource Management Plan projects. Additional funds are needed to complete the projects and qualify for reimbursement under the grants.

<u>Project</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>DLCD Grant</u>	<u>LR Revenue</u>	<u>FTE</u>
• Siuslaw Dredge Materials Disposal Plan	\$ 53,875.80	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 23,875.80	0.45
• Coastal Resource Management Plan	\$ 32,959.80	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 17,959.80	0.15
Totals	\$ 86,835.60	\$ 45,000.00	\$ 41,835.60	0.60

The County has secured a grant to partially fund the coordination between the jurisdictions of Lane County, City of Florence, Port of Siuslaw, and the Corps of Engineers is essential to ensure that the Siuslaw Dredge Materials Disposal Plan will provide an opportunity for environmental protection and economic development within the Siuslaw River basin in the decades ahead. The jurisdictions will incorporate the expertise and interests of the Siuslaw Watershed Council, Siuslaw National Forest, Oregon Division of State Lands, West Lane Soil & Water Conservation District, and private property owners in the process to make necessary revisions to the Plan and designated dredge material disposal sites.

The County has also secured a grant to partially fund completion of the final periodic review work tasks under the Goal 16 - Estuarine and Goal 17 - Shorelands guidelines. The tasks include analysis of water-related and water-dependent uses in the Rural Commercial and Rural Industrial zones.

This would leave \$ 151,813.70 of the surcharge to be allocated to additional projects.

Lane County Legislative Committee Title III

The Community Wildfire Protection Plan Steering Committee has a pending Title III grant application before the Legislative Committee in the amount of \$150,538.00. The funding is spread over 12 action items to fund outreach, education, training and planning activities with allocations to the Lane County Fire Defense Board, Lane County Fire Prevention Cooperative, Oregon Department of Forestry, LC Public Works, and LMD. The LMD requested funds for coordination and planning with the other CWPP partners is in the amount of \$16,829.00. LMD considers the work of the Steering Committee crucial to the protection of lives, property and resources in rural Lane County. The Board's adoption of the CWPP in July 2005 commits LMD to participation on the Steering Committee. If the Board does not approve the Title III grant application then LMD will be obliged to fund the \$ 16,829.00 out of the LR surcharge revenue reducing the available surcharge revenue from \$ 151,813.70 to \$ 134,984.70.

Unfunded and mandated projects

Lane County has inherited policy decisions stemming from unfunded mandates resulting from LUBA and Oregon Supreme Court opinions.

Depending on the Board's direction in future work sessions, LMD may be amending the regulations in Rural Commercial (RC), Rural Industrial (RI), Rural Public Facility (RPF) in response to the 2002 LUBA decision *Doty vs. Coos County*. The opinion has resulted in a challenge to the County's annual post-acknowledgement plan amendments to conform zoning designations to uses or circumstances on specific properties within the Coast Fork Willamette and the Middle Fork Willamette Watersheds. Twenty-three of the 36 properties in the Coast Fork are in one of the three designations, within developed & committed exception areas outside designated rural communities. Approximately 30 of the 43 properties in the Middle Fork are in this same situation. Moving ahead on the amendments to the D&C properties would require amendments to LC 16.291 (RC), LC 16.292 (RI), and LC 16.293 (RPF) and the establishment of "single numerical minimum lot sizes". The current minimum parcel size in the three sections of Lane Code is based on "carrying capacities" to address the projected intensity of a use rather than a one-size-fits-all, density by square footage or acres. If the Board determines that the proposed amendments into any of these three zonings designations should be retained in Lane Code, then a work program including a Ballot Measure 56 notice would be required with an anticipated budget of \$12,700 and approximately \$6,000 for the notice.

The Oregon Supreme Court issued the *Outdoor Media Dimensions vs. ODMV* opinion on March 26, 2006 addressing the content of signage in some zones. Lane Code provisions restrict off-sight advertising in some zone designations and "outdoor advertising" to the Rural Industrial Zone. To bring Lane Code into compliance will require an expenditure of \$8,160 for the work project and an additional \$6,000 for Ballot Measure 56 notice.

<u>Project</u>	<u>Project Budget</u>	<u>BM 56 Notice</u>	<u>LR Total</u>	<u>FTE</u>
• Minimum Lot Standards RC, RI, RPF	\$ 12,700.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 18,700.00	0.15
• Supreme Court Opinion "Content of signs".	\$ 8,160.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 14,160.00	0.10
Totals	\$ 20,860.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 32,860.00	0.25

Responding to these two mandates would leave \$102,124.70 of the available surcharge to be allocated to additional projects.

Other work projects

Post-acknowledgement plan amendments

Ordinances implementing post-periodic review actions in the McKenzie (2003), Siuslaw (2004) and Long Tom (2004) watersheds have been adopted by the Board of Commissioners. Post-acknowledgement plan amendments (PAPA) have resulted in zoning designation amendments for multiple properties in each of the watersheds.

Ordinance No. PA 1226 proposing amendments for 36 properties in the Coast Fork Willamette Watershed have been processed by the Planning Commission and deliberations have been completed on recommendations to the Board. Actions on 23 of the 36 subject properties in Ordinance No. PA 1226 are contingent on the Boards' policy direction on whether or not to amended the minimum lot size in the RC, RI and RPF zones as discussed in the Unfunded and

mandated projects subsection above. No additional funding is required to complete the processing of this ordinance before the Board.

Work on the Middle Fork Willamette Watershed PAPA ordinance was halted in 2005 until direction from the Board of Commissioners to LMD staff had been completed via Ordinance No. PA 1226. If minimum lot size amendments are adopted in the RC, RI and RPF Lane Code regulations, then staff will prepare an ordinance and staff reports for the 47 Middle Fork properties. This would commit staff during FY 2006-2007 in the following manner:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Project Budget</u>	<u>LR Revenue</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Middle Fork Willamette Watershed PAPA	\$ 32,431.00	\$ 32,431.00	0.3

This budget would include providing written formal notice to property owners surrounding the 47 subject properties and conducting public hearings with the Planning Commission and the Board.

Processing the Middle Fork Willamette Watershed ordinance would leave \$69,693.70 of the surcharge revenue for other projects.

GIS maintenance and digitizing contract

Over the past two years LMD has secured grant funding for the LC Public Works GIS section to digitize zoning designation layers registered to the PW-GIS created parcel base. The GIS effort has resulted in the completion of the initial designations that are currently being checked for accuracy against the official paper plots. LMD is proposing to set aside \$12,500 of LR revenue to address GIS maintenance and revisions (\$2,500), analysis and production of GIS data and plots to support LMD long-range projects (\$5,000), and digitizing of new GIS layers on a priority basis for LMD as identified (\$5,000).

Allocating the GIS maintenance and project funding would leave \$57,193.70 of the surcharge revenue for other projects.

Eugene Airport Master Plan

Expansion of the runways at the Mahlen Sweet Airport in 2002 has resulted in required amendments to the implementing Lane Code 16 airport safety regulations. LMD needs to process the proposed amended regulations through the Planning Commission and the Board of Commissioners. The Airport staff is also embarking on an update to the Eugene Airport Master Plan that will result in adoptions to the Rural Comprehensive Plan and the Metro Plan. LMD staff commitment will result in the following expenditures:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Project Budget</u>	<u>LR Revenue</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Eugene Airport Master Plan and LC 16 amendments	\$ 8,660.00	\$ 8,660.00	0.1

Funding this project would leave \$48,533.70 of the available surcharge revenue for other projects.

Fire Safety Standards (F2)

The Board of Commissioners provided direction to staff following the May 24th work session on the proposed implementation of “structural defensible space” standards for new residential development in the wildland-urban interface of rural Lane County. The Board opted to apply the fire safety standards as advisory in all zoning designations other than the Impacted Forest Land

Zone. The Board opted to amend Lane Code 16.211(8)(c) fuel break standards to comply with the “structural defensible space” modeled on SB 360 (1997) and current recommendations of fire professionals.

<u>Project</u>	<u>Project Budget</u>	<u>LR Revenue</u>	<u>FTE</u>
“Structural Defensible Space” (F2) LC 16.211(8)(c)	\$ 8,660.00	\$ 8,660.00	0.1

Funding this project would leave \$39,873.70 of the available surcharge revenue for other projects.

Bi-Annual Legislative Updates

After each legislative session, LMD amends Lane Code 10, 13, 14 and 16 to comply with revisions to the Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) and Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR). Due to staff shortages and BM37 processing demands, the amendments mandated by the 2003 and 2005 Legislative Assembly have not occurred. This project will bring the local codes into compliance with state law.

<u>Project</u>	<u>Project Budget</u>	<u>LR Revenue</u>	<u>FTE</u>
• Legislative updates LC 13 & 16	\$ 15,855.50	\$ 15,855.50	0.2

Funding this project would leave \$ 24,018.20 of the available surcharge revenue for other projects.

Small Airport Planning

ORS 836 and OAR 660-013-0155 require that local jurisdictions bring airport safety and planning processes up to date with state regulations. In this particular instance, State law addresses Private Airport Planning sites within the rural area.

<u>Project</u>	<u>Project Budget</u>	<u>LR Revenue</u>	<u>FTE</u>
• ORS 836 Private Airports	\$ 8,398.00	\$ 8,398.00	0.1

Funding this project would leave \$ 15,620.20 of the available surcharge revenue for other projects.

e-Government and Contingency Fund

LMD is proposing to set aside \$ 10,000.00 earmarked for contributions to e-Government projects as they develop over the FY 2006-2007 cycle.

This final proposal would reduce the anticipated surcharge revenues to \$ 5,620.20 to meet unforeseen expenses in the work projects outlined in this proposal.

LANE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

In the Planning Commissions annual report to the Board, the LCPC prioritized ten work projects that they felt the long-range planning staff should concentrate on in the FY 2006-2007 work program. Six of eight on the LCPC “high” priority list are included in this proposal. The report is attached as Attachment “A”.

B. Video Lottery application – Economic Development Standing Committee, February 14, 2006.

DATE: February 14, 2006

TO: Economic Development Standing Committee
Peter Thurston, Community and Economic Development Coordinator

FROM: Land Management Division (LMD)
Jeff Towery, Division Manager
Kent Howe, Planning Director

PROJECT TITLE: Request for renewal of a Video Lottery General Allocation grant to support long-range comprehensive planning projects during the FY 2006/2007.

PROJECT PURPOSE: To complete comprehensive land use planning tasks in Fiscal Year 2006-2007 including the development of e-Government improvements, response to State of Oregon and voter mandates, pursue collaborative projects with local jurisdictions including Metro Plan partners and small cities, and participate in regional planning projects.

PROJECTS BUDGET:	A. GIS Zoning Diagrams/Website	\$ 54,475.60
	B. Floodplain/CRS program	\$ 28,782.00
	C. Metro – Small Cities Planning	\$ 88,226.80
	D. Ballot Measure 37 Preparedness	\$ 48,601.40
	E. Legislative updates to LC Chaps.13 & 16	\$ 15,855.50
	F. Siuslaw River Dredge Materials Disposal Plan	\$ 23,875.80
	G. Coastal Resource Mgmt Plan (Periodic Review)	\$ 17,959.80
	H. Overhaul LC Chapters 10 and 16	\$ 41,264.90
	<u>I. ORS 836 Private Airport Planning</u>	<u>\$ 8,398.00</u>
	Projects A. – I. (Total)	\$ 327,439.80
	EDSC Grant Request	\$ 170,000.00

Land Management Division is requesting that the Economic Development Standing Committee allocate \$170,000.00 to partially fund the nine long-range planning projects listed above and described in the attached proposals.

Please contact me if the EDSC needs additional information in support of this grant request.

Jeffrey Towery
LMD Division Manager

A. Continued GIS digitized plan and zoning diagrams in the rural areas of Lane County.

Project Budget		
Classification	FTE	Expenditure
Planning Director	0.05	\$ 3,660.80
Associate Planner	0.1	\$ 4,143.40
Planner	0.2	\$ 8,740.60
Land Mgt Technician	0.1	\$ 3,563.00
FTE Subtotal		<u>\$ 20,107.80</u>
Materials & Services (all) (x.814)		<u>\$ 16,367.80</u>
*TransMap data development		\$ 18,000.00 (*funds to be allocated to LCPW GIS Project)
Total		\$ 54,475.60

* Please refer to Attachment "A" LMD Data Development – Potential TRANSMAP Data Enhancements for list of 29 proposed mapping projects. LMD proposes to complete 27 on the list.

In the past, Video Lottery grants have funded the annual updating of the Official Plan and Zoning Maps which, until 2005, only existed as paper plots. Each plot is 7" x 12" and there are approximately 650 plots. Access by the public was very limited and required a visitation to Land Management Division during working hours. Maintenance of these plots was difficult, time consuming and prone to error.

In FY 2003-2004, Lane County Public Works Department and the Lane County Assessment & Taxation Department established a GIS Project at the Delta Shops and initiated the creation of a GIS parcel file based on ORMAP specifications. In 2004, the Land Management Division secured a \$35,000 grant from Oregon Department of Conservation & Development to digitize the zoning plots and create a zoning overlay on the GIS parcel base. This has resulted in the creation of digital zoning maps for the "rural" area of Lane County located outside the urban growth boundaries of the twelve incorporated cities and the Metro Plan boundary. GIS Project is currently working on the parcel base and zoning overlay within the Metro Plan surrounding Eugene and Springfield UGBs.

Completion of the digital zone maps will lead to creation of a secure, online source for citizens to access the zoning data for individual properties and move the County away from dependence on the 1980's paper plots. The creation of these digital maps will result in a more accurate product that will be readily available to the public. These maps will also require regular maintenance to reflect zone changes and plan amendments that occur in the future. Rather than an annual update, these changes will occur as soon as the County Commissioners adopt an ordinance that rezones or changes the plan designation for a property. The Land Management Division will coordinate with the GIS Project and LC Information Services (LCIS) to establish a secure site and interface for public access.

The Economic Development Standing Committee recommended allocation of funding in the amount of \$51,000 in FY 2005-2006 for adoption of the digitized zoning maps by the Board of County Commissioners and creation of the secure website for public access. This work is progressing on a schedule for adoption of the maps in each of the five watersheds over the next five months.

In addition to the maintenance of the pending adoption of the rural lands zoning designations, LMD is proposing to undertake enhancements of the TransPlan digitized layers and the LMD zoning layers. Twenty-nine projects have been proposed in Attachment "A" below. LMD is proposing to include 27 in the FY 2006-2007 work program.

(1) Outcomes

What will result from the activities and products that address the economic development goals of the Strategic Plan?

Having easily accessible and accurate zoning maps on an Internet website is vital to Lane County's transformation to a more efficient e-Government land use program.

(2) Partnerships

Lane County Public Works Department – GIS Project
Lane County Department of Assessment & Taxation
Lane County Information Services

(3) Measures of Success

How will the successful completion of this project or program be determined?

With the adoption by the Board of County Commissioners in June 2006 of the rural GIS plan and zoning maps and enhanced GIS layers described in Attachment "A", and creation of a secure online interface that supports public access to the zoning data.

B. Participation in the National Flood Insurance Program - Community Rating System

<u>Classification</u>	<u>Project Budget</u>	
	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Expenditure</u>
Planner	0.2	\$ 8,740.60
Land Mgt Technician	0.2	\$ 7,126.00
	FTE Subtotal	\$ 15,866.60
Materials & Services (all)	(x.814)	\$ 12,915.40
	Total	\$ 28,782.00

The Land Management Division through the Planning Program, is the agency responsible for implementing the flood insurance program for rural Lane County. As part of its responsibilities, LMD will request to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program's (NFIP) Community Rating System (CRS). This is a voluntary incentive program that recognizes floodplain management activities that exceed the minimum NFIP requirements. Flood insurance premium rates are discounted to reflect the reduced flood risk. Upon acceptance into the program, the rates will be reduced by 5%. Through participation in the CRS program, the premiums can be lowered up to 45%, depending on specific actions taken by LMD. For example, all new structures in the floodplain must be elevated 12 inches of the base flood elevation. If Lane County increases the minimum elevation to 24" above the base flood elevation, it would be considered an action that reduces the flood hazards risk and could lower the premiums an additional 5%, for a total reduction of 10% for all policy holders in rural Lane County.

(1) Outcomes

What will result from the activities and products that address the economic development goals of the Strategic Plan?

Upon acceptance in the CRS program, the flood insurance premiums for policy holders in rural Lane County will be reduced by 5%. After that, LMD will conduct a public involvement process to determine which actions to take, if any, to lower the rates even further.

(2) Partnerships

DLCD: Floodplain/Natural Hazards Coordinator
 FEMA
 Lane County – County Counsel

(3) Measures of Success

How will the successful completion of this project or program be determined?

Reduction of the flood insurance premiums for policy holders in rural Lane County.

C. Metro Plan and Small Cities coordination and processing of land use applications.

Classification	FTE	Expenditures
Planner	1.0	\$ 45,073.60
Land Mgt Technician	0.1	<u>3,563.00</u>
	FTE Subtotal	\$ 48,636.60
Materials & Services (all) (x .814)		<u>39,590.20</u>
	Total	\$ 88,226.80

Under State law, Lane County is partner to the decisions pertaining to any expansion of urban growth boundaries (UGB) or plan amendments within the Metro Plan Boundaries or UGBs of the ten small incorporated cities in Lane County. The Metro Plan is a triad with Lane County, the City of Eugene and the City of Springfield. The ten smaller cities include Dunes City, Florence, Veneta, Junction City, Coburg, Creswell, Cottage Grove, Lowell, Westfir and Oakridge. Land Management Division has assigned one full time planner to coordination with Eugene, Springfield and the ten smaller cities as well as special service districts such as Springfield Utility Board, Eugene Water & Electric Board, Willamalane, and the Metropolitan Waste Management Board.

During the FY 2005/2006, LMD accomplished the following tasks:

Metro Plan Projects

1. Lane Code Chapter 10 – City of Springfield Development Regulations within UGB.
2. Eugene/Springfield Metro Plan - Public Safety Special District.
3. Eugene Goal 5 Natural Resources Conservation Project.
4. Eugene./Springfield Metro Plan - Plan amendment from EFU to Sand, Gravel & Rock.
5. Glenwood Riverfront Plan Implementation

Small Cities Projects

1. Junction City UGB Plan Expansion (Country Coach)
2. Amend Florence Comprehensive Plan 2000/2020 (CRMP)

Regional Projects

This planner also serves on regional study groups and committees such as the Southern Willamette Valley Group study of groundwater issues in the Coburg area; Metro Waterways multi-jurisdictional study of floodplain and riverine habitat issues of the Willamette–McKenzie Rivers; and the Region 2050 project. All of these studies require in-kind services by LMD for coordination of the regional interests for conservation and development, both of which bear on the livability issues and opportunities afforded through coordinated planning.

1. Region 2050
 - a. Created and appointed membership in Farm and Forest Task Force to conduct Farm and Forest Evaluation for Goals 3 & 4 compliance through the Regional Problem Solving Statute.
 - b. Participated in RTAC monthly meetings, facilitated at five rural community public outreach workshops during summer 2005.
2. Metro Waterways
 - a. Participated in monthly Technical Study Team Meetings, review and development of the ‘Without Project Conditions Report’; facilitated two public workshops Feb. 2005, agency

field trip to Amazon Creek and Cedar Creek sub-basins in Spring 2006.

Some of the Metro and small cities projects itemized above are ongoing and will require LMD staff participation in FY 2006-2007 including monthly participation in Region 2050 and Metro Waterways, and the 'upriver' Willamette Restoration Initiative ACOE projects. New legislative and quasi-judicial projects will also be forthcoming from the twelve incorporated jurisdictions in that period and will be coordinated by this funded position.

(1) Outcomes

What will result from the activities and products that address the economic development goals of the Strategic Plan?

Coordination with other jurisdictions on the processing of plan amendments or UGB expansions is essential from the beginning of a proposed change through the adoption of the proposal. LMD's role is to ensure that County processes are followed and that the Board of Commissioners is presented with an application in compliance with local and state law. These types of activities directly bear on the quality of life, buildable lands inventories, and planned for development issues along the urban edge.

Staff anticipates this level of activities will continue throughout FY 2006-2007.

(2) Partnerships

Incorporated communities: Dunes City, Florence, Veneta, Junction City, Coburg, Eugene, Springfield, Creswell, Cottage Grove, Lowell, Westfir and Oakridge.

Special service districts.

State and Federal agencies.

(3) Measures of Success

How will the successful completion of this project or program be determined?

With the informed decisions by the Board of County Commissioners on land use applications and regional studies.

D. Ballot Measure 37 claims application processing and required research of origins of initial zoning designations.

Classification	Project Budget	
	FTE	Cost
Principal Planner	0.2	\$ 11,752.00
Associate Planner	0.2	\$ 11,477.40
Land Mgt Technician	0.1	\$ 3,563.00
	FTE subtotal	\$ 26,792.40
Materials & Services (all) (x .814)		\$ 21,809.00
	Total	\$ 48,601.40

This funding request is contingent on the Oregon Supreme Court ruling expected this summer.

Ballot Measure 37 presents voter-mandated responsibilities for Land Management Division that were not funded by the proposition. During the past year LMD has processed 15 claims with the Board of Commissioners. Twenty claims are currently being processed and 39 have been put on hold by the claimants pending the Oregon Supreme Court handing down an opinion.

Summary of Measure 37 Claims

In process	20
On Hold at request of applicant	39
Final determination	15
Total Number of Claims	74

The first BM 37 claim was presented to the County Commissioners on May 11, 2005. Since that date, 14 more applications have received a final determination. From May 1, 2005, to December 31, 2005, BM 37 processing has required the equivalent of .75 FTE. This exceeded the \$27, 241.00 that was previously requested. This overage is the result of the number of claims and the unexpected complexity of each claim. This resulted in a diversion of limited staff resources from customer service, land use application processing, and long-range planning projects that serve the needs of the collective rural citizens, to the needs of individual BM 37 claimants. Several long range projects have been delayed until April 2006 and planning applications have not been processed within a 35 day timeline, resulting in a backlog of applications. Since January 1, 2006, BM 37 processing has required only .25 FTE.

Because the County Commissioners have given direction on several key issues that are common to BM 37 claims, the processing time for each application has been reduced, as reflected on the FTE since January 1 of this year.

If the BM 37 processing effort remains at this manageable level, the Land Management Division will be able to compile a copy of all of the implementing ordinances and exhibits. Once that research is completed, LMD will coordinate with LC Information Services to create a secure Internet website for viewing and downloading of documents by private citizens.

(1) Outcomes

What will result from the activities and products that address the economic development goals of the Strategic Plan?

The review and processing of claims in compliance with the requirements of Ballot Measure 37 and Lane County policies and regulations.

(2) Partnerships

Lane County – County Counsel
Lane County Information Services (LCIS)
Lane County Deeds and Records
Lane County Assessment & Taxation Department

(3) Measures of Success

How will the successful completion of this project or program be determined?

Timely decisions on the complete BM 37 applications received.

E. Legislative Updates to Lane Code Chapters 13 and 16.

Classification	Project Budget	
	FTE	Expenditure
Planner	0.2	\$ 8,740.60
Materials & Services		\$ 7,114.90
		<u>\$ 15,855.50</u>

After each legislative session, the Land Management Division revises Lane Code Chapters 10, 13, 14 and 16 to comply with any changes made to the Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) and the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR). Due to staff shortages and the demands of processing BM 37 claims, the changes from 2003 and 2005 have not occurred.

These changes include new definitions and new allowed uses, a change to the standards for new dwellings in the farm and forest zones, new allowed industrial uses and extension of timelines, revised notice requirements for land use decisions, a change to actions on final plats, as well as other revisions. None of the revisions are expected to be controversial or generate large amounts of public comment. The revisions will be included in a single ordinance that will be presented to the Lane County Planning Commission and then to the County Commissioners. The entire process will take approximately 4 months.

(1) Outcomes

What will result from the activities and products that address the economic development goals of the Strategic Plan?

Amendment of Lane Code Chapters 13 and 16 to comply with recently amended sections of the ORS and OAR.

(2) Partnerships

Oregon Department of Land Conservation & Development
Lane County – County Counsel

(3) Measures of Success

How will the successful completion of this project or program be determined?

Adoption by the Board of County Commissioners of amendments to the Lane Code.

F. Siuslaw River Dredge Materials Disposal Plan

<u>Project Budget</u>		
<u>Classification</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Expenditure</u>
Associate Planner	0.2	\$ 11,465.00
Land Mgmt Technician	0.2	\$ 6,922.00
Engineering Tech II	0.2	\$ 9,618.00
OA II Office Assistant	0.05	\$ 1,695.00
	Subtotal	\$ 29,700.00
Materials & Services (all) (x .814)		\$ 24,175.80
		\$ 53,875.80
DLCD Grant TA-R-07-009 grant (-)		\$ 30,000.00
EDSC funding request		\$ 23,875.80

Lane County adopted the Coastal Resource Inventory (Wilsey & Ham, October 1978) and the Siuslaw River Dredged Material Disposal Plan (Wilsey & Ham, November 1978) as part of Lane Code Chapter 10 in 1980, approximately 25 years ago. Since that time new regulatory overlays including FIRM flood hazard areas, National Wetland Inventory, Oregon Division of State Lands Goal 5 Rule for protection of wetlands, and the ESA 4d rule have become applicable on and adjacent to the inventory sites selected in 1978-1980.

Coordination of this project between the Port of Siuslaw, Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, the City of Florence, and Lane County was initiated in early 2004. Collaborative efforts and common goals between the five public agencies and the Siuslaw River stakeholders prompted a joint-effort to fund the federal, county and special district components of the re-drafting of the Dredged Material Disposal Plan.

LMD has received a \$30,000 technical assistance grant from the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) to offset the expense of this project.

Federal funding has been allocated for an in-river survey completed in 2005 and initial dredging activities around the Port of Siuslaw boat basin in 2005-2006, which is discussed below.

(1) Outcomes

What will result from the activities and products that address the economic development goals of the Strategic Plan?

1. Amend Lane County’s Coastal Resource Management Plan Policies and Lane Code 16.242 Dredge Material Mitigation Site Combining Zone (/DMS –RCP) for implementation of Statewide Goal 17 Shorelands policies and Oregon Administrative Rules 660-017 and 660-037; to designate and protect dredge material disposal sites on rural and urban lands within the Siuslaw Watershed; and
2. Adopt amendments to the Siuslaw River Dredged Material Disposal Plan (1978) and the CRMP Plan and Zoning Diagrams depicting the Dredged Material Disposal Sites Inventory.
3. Amend Lane Code 16.242 Dredge Material Mitigation Site Combining Zone (/DMS – RCP) for implementation of Statewide Goal 17 Shorelands policies and Oregon

Administrative Rules 660-017 and 660-037; to designate and protect new dredge material disposal sites on rural and urban lands within the Siuslaw River Watershed.

4. Coordination with the City of Florence for amendments to plan policies and regulations within the UGB, and amendments to the Coastal Resource Management Plan (CRMP) and the Siuslaw River Dredged Material Disposal Plan.
5. Collaboration with the US Army Corps of Engineers, Oregon Division of State Lands, Port of Siuslaw, City of Florence, and private property owners to determine quality and quantity guidelines for dredge material disposal (2005-2025), and identify and secure appropriate sites for the use.

(2) Partnerships

Federal Agencies:	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Marine Fisheries Service U. S. Forest Service (Siuslaw National Forest) U. S. Bureau of Land Management Federal Emergency Management Agency
State Agencies:	Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Oregon Division of State Lands
Municipality:	City of Florence
Service Districts/Councils:	Port of Siuslaw Siuslaw Soil & Water Conservation District Siuslaw Watershed Council
Rural citizen involvement:	Individuals, special interests, professionals, and neighborhood groups.

(3) Measures of Success

How will the successful completion of this project or program be determined?

The Board of Commissioners will adopt ordinances addressing:

1. Coastal Resource Management Plan including policies and implementing combining zone regulations;
 2. 1980 Dredge Materials Disposal Plan and Mitigation Site inventory; and
 3. Coastal Resource Management Plan Shorelands (Goal 17), Estuarine (Goal 16) and Beaches and Dunes (Goal 18) combining zone overlay boundaries with the Rural Comprehensive Plan base zoning designations and the GIS parcel base created by Lane County Public Works - GIS Group in 2004-2005.
-

G. Coastal Resource Management Plan (Periodic Review)

<u>Classification</u>	<u>Project Budget</u>	
	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Expenditure</u>
Associate Planner	1.5	\$ 8,598.80
Land Mgmt Technician	0.1	\$ 3,461.00
Engineering Tech II (GIS)	0.2	\$ 6,140.00
	Subtotal	\$ 18,199.80
Materials & Services (all) (x .814)		\$ 14,750.00
	Subtotal	\$ 32,959.80
DLCD PR-R-07-002 grant funding (-)		\$ 15,000.00
EDSC funding request		\$ 17,959.80

Coastal Resource Management Plan (Work Task 3.a. Goals 16 and 17.

Lane County has completed the Periodic Review Work Program for the five watersheds [McKenzie (2002), Siuslaw (2003), Long Tom (2003), Coast Fork Willamette (2005) and Middle Fork Willamette (2005)] with one exception. Work Task 3.a.iii. and iv. is the final component of the Work Program in the Siuslaw Watershed and requires analysis of inventories and completion of reports pertaining to water-dependent uses on commercial and industrial properties within developed and committed exception areas subject to the Coastal Resource Management Plan (CRMP) and Goals 16 and 17.

Lane County LMD proposes to conclude completion of the task in a collaborative effort with the City of Florence and the Port of Siuslaw.

LMD has received a \$15,000 periodic review grant from the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) to offset the expense of this project.

(1) Outcomes

What will result from the activities and products that address the economic development goals of the Strategic Plan?

1. Complete an analysis of cumulative impacts of anticipated development for Siuslaw River Estuary pursuant to *Goal 16 "Comprehensive Plan Requirements," item 5.*
2. Complete an analysis of shorelands within developed & committed areas to determine if they should be protected for water dependent recreational, commercial and industrial use based on criteria stated in the *Goal 17 Shorelands.*
3. Complete an analysis to determine whether or not there are any existing, developed commercial or industrial waterfront areas suited for redevelopment but not designated as especially suited for water dependent uses (*Goal 17 Coastal Shorelands*).
4. Compile data and inventory dune areas to determine if grading or sand movement within developed and committed lands and lands within the Florence UGB should be allowed by means of a foredune grading plan which meets *Goal 18 Beaches and Dunes: "implementation requirements", item 7, criteria.*
5. Coordination with the City of Florence will be needed for amendments to plans and regulations within the UGB.

(2) Partnerships

Federal Agencies:	U. S. Army Corps of Engineers U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Marine Fisheries Service U. S. Forest Service (Siuslaw National Forest) U. S. Bureau of Land Management Federal Emergency Management Agency
State Agencies:	Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Oregon Division of State Lands
Municipality:	City of Florence
Service Districts/Councils:	Port of Siuslaw Siuslaw Soil & Water Conservation District Siuslaw Watershed Council
Rural citizen involvement:	Individuals, special interests, professionals, and neighborhood groups.

(3) Measures of Success

How will the successful completion of this project or program be determined?

As a result of completing this high-priority project, Lane County would accomplish the following:

1. Update elements of the Coastal Resource Management Plan including policies and implementing combining zone regulations;
 2. Complete the final task (3.a.1.-iii. and vi.) of the Periodic Review Work Program for the Coastal Resource Management Plan;
 3. Digitize elements of the Coastal Resource Management Plan Shorelands (Goal 17), Estuarine (Goal 16) and Beaches and Dunes (Goal 18) combining zone overlay boundaries with the Rural Comprehensive Plan base zoning designations and the GIS parcel base created by Lane County Public Works - GIS Group in 2004-2005; and
 4. Cooperate with the City of Florence, Port of Siuslaw, Oregon Division of State Lands, and the US Army Corps of Engineers on a regional project of the highest priority for all of the entities' responsibilities to address economical and conservation planning in the Siuslaw River watershed in a collaborative manner.
-

H. Overhaul of Lane Code Chapters 10 and 16.

Project Budget		
<u>Classification</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Expenditure</u>
Planning Director	0.05	\$ 3,660.80
Principal Planner	0.05	\$ 2,938.00
Planner	0.4	\$ 16,149.20
	Subtotal	\$ 22,748.00
Materials & Services (all) (x .814)		\$ 18,516.90
	Total	\$ 41,264.90

Economic development is implemented, in part, by the development code. This code must be clear and concise. If it is not, the code can impede efforts to develop a healthy and sustainable economic base. The development code for Lane County, also known as the zoning ordinance, is contained in Lane Code Chapter 10 within urban growth boundaries and Lane Code Chapter 16 in the rural lands of the County. These chapters implement the 19 statewide land use planning goals in Lane County.

These chapters contain specific requirements for all development outside city limits. For example, if a land owner wants to know the setbacks from a property or whether a proposed development requires a special use permit, these chapters provide the answer. However, it is very difficult to find these answers because the current code is organized and written in a needlessly confusing and complex manner. Lane Code Chapter 10 was written more than 30 years ago and contains numerous inconsistencies and outdated terminology. Chapter 16 is needlessly complex and confusing. In addition, many of the procedures required in these chapters reference sections of the Lane Manual that do not exist. Because of this, the Lane County development code is not user friendly and the general public has little hope of understanding the code without significant assistance from LMD.

The development code will be reformatted and updated to allow the general public to easily find answers to their questions. This project will not change any standards, it will simply clarify the existing rules and make the code easier to utilize. This effort will result in better customer service by reducing the time needed to process land use applications and increasing the ability of land owners to research and answer their questions online.

Because of the amount of work required to accomplish this project, a consultant will be hired and will work under the guidance of LMD. This cost estimate is for the staff time to write the RFP to find the consultant, to manage/direct/review the efforts of the consultant and to take the final revisions to Lane Code 10 and Lane Code 16 through the adoption process.

The entire process will take approximately 12 months.

(1) Outcomes

What will result from the activities and products that address the economic development goals of the Strategic Plan?

Reformatting and refinement to Lane Code Chapters 10 and 16 to remove inconsistencies, clarify standards, and remove duplicative approval processes.

(2) Partnerships

Interest groups

General public
Oregon Department of Land Conservation & Development
Lane County – County Counsel

(3) Measures of Success

How will the successful completion of this project or program be determined?

Adoption by the Board of County Commissioners of revisions to Lane Code Chapters 10 and 16.

I. Draft amendments to Lane Code for implementation of ORS 836 – Private Airport Planning.

	Project Budget	
Classification	FTE	Expenditure
Planner	0.1	\$ 4,630.00
Materials & Services (x .814)		\$ 3,768.00
		\$ 8,398.00

Oregon Revised Statute 836 and Oregon Administrative Rule 660-013-0155 require that local jurisdictions bring airport safety and planning processes up to date with the state regulations. In this particular case the ORS-OAR addresses Private Airport Planning sites within the rural area.

(1) Outcomes

What will result from the activities and products that address the economic development goals of the Strategic Plan?

Amendment of zoning and plan designations for existing private airports in the rural areas of Lane County, as required by ORS 836 and OAR 660-013-0155.

(2) Partnerships

Oregon Department of Transportation – Aviation Division
Oregon Department of Land Conservation & Development
Local private airfield operators.

(3) Measures of Success

How will the successful completion of this project or program be determined?

Adoption by the Board of County Commissioners of amendments to RCP Plan Policies, Lane Code, and Official Plan and Zoning Diagrams.

* * *

Attachment A -- LMD Data Development -- Potential TRANSMAP Data Enhancements

	Data Layer	Status	TP Staff	Est. Hours	\$/hr	Estimated Cost
1.	Base Zone RCP	Region 5 left, is half done. About 80 hours left to do	GS			Covered by Grant
2.	Combining Zone RCP	Need to review what is needed by LMD but includes some of the following:				
	Airport	Digitize airport safety zone from existing maps	AV	16	25	400.00
	Historic	Create polys from list of tax lots and sections	AV	8	25	200.00
3.	Base Zone UGB	Adam will meet with Keir to get process going	AV			Covered by Grant
4.	Combining District UGB	In the Q/C and review process. In a different geodatabase.	AV			Covered by Grant
5.	RCP Designations	Needs review with LMD to determine how to assign these. Are these mainly just the first digit of zoning? Could create initial file through some geoprocessing if so.	AV	4-20	25	100.00 – 500.00
6.	City Limits	Being adjusted by LCOG	CB			Covered by LCOG
7.	Metro Plan	Being adjusted by LCOG	CB			Covered by LCOG
8.	Roads	Functional class is part of existing Dyn Seg. system for County roads. Can be extracted for LMD use or LMD can look at TransMAP now.	LK			Done
9.	UGB Boundaries	Being adjusted by LCOG	CB			Covered by LCOG
10.	Floodplain	We will use existing DFIRM data as is. May also want to rectify .tif images of DFIRM maps. Need to review with LMD on this one.	CB	240	25	6,000.00 (DFIRM done-This is to rectify images)
11.	Greenway	TP staff will adjust existing Greenway file to fit new parcel base.	SB	180	12	2,160.00
12.	Class 1 Streams	Will use 'lhydro24k' file as initial data. Then assign class 1 stream designation based on maps from LMD.	LK/AV	80	25	2,000.00
13.	CRMP	Need to scan these maps, then rectify images for heads-up digitizing. Lee has contacted Kinkos, Office Max. Still want to check with EWEB and Central Blueprint for scanning.	LK	240	25	6,000.00

14.	Water Quality/Quantity Quality	This has been done by Gary Shiele, needs review by LMD	GS				done
	Quantity	Have Lane Manual list from LMD by section. Need to build section polygons. Parcel team is in process of creating section polys.	SB	8	12		96.00
15.	Building Inspector Areas	Need to get maps from LMD for estimate	TBD	?			??
16.	Compliance Officer Areas	Need to get maps from LMD for estimate	TBD	?			??
17.	Sanitation Inspection Areas	Need to get maps from LMD for estimate	TBD	?			??
18.	Local Wetland Inventories	Obtain LWI data from LCOG. Check to see if it has been reprojected to NAD83/91	AV	4	25		100.00
19.	Special Districts						
	Fire Districts	Adam is working on these	AV				Covered by Grant
	Neighborhoods	Need to get maps from LMD for estimate	TBD	?			??
	Ambulance	LCOG will adjust these to new parcel data. Hope to be done by April 2006.	CB				Covered by LCOG
	Water Districts	Need to determine which water districts are not part of Fire District data. Will then need to create polygons for those areas.	AV	240	25		6,000.00
20.	Scenic Byways	Extract the road line segments from the list (ORD #10-99) for CG Covered Bridge tour area. Is this a line layer or a polygon layer?	GL	12	25		300.00
21.	Cottage Grover Waterline	Cress will check with Fred Willer to see if Design has any digital data for this line. Otherwise we digitize off small sketch map.	AV	16	25		400.00
22.	Topography	Region has 10 meter DEM data. We can use this.	AV				Done
23.	Tsunami Inundation Area	Have this file from work LCOG has done.	AV				Done
24.	NWI Data	Have digital data for some of Lane County. Will use what we have for now.	AV				Done
25.	Historical Air Photos						
	1964 JC Flood	Need to review these	TBD		?		?
	1980 B/W county	Need to review these - not sure the format	TBD		?		?
	1986 B/W county	Cress will get a couple of the original mylars from LCOG and we will see if they can be scanned and registered. Estimate assumes we can.	AV	350	25		8,750.00
	2000 B/W county	These are done and available	LK				Done

26.	Current Air Photos	These are done for Spring 2004. Will be getting June 2005 photos in next few months.	LK			Done
27.	Setbacks	This is an application that would be developed to create a polygon around a selected area and then determine all the affected property owners. Needs more discussion and input to determine costs.	LK	?		??
28.	D&C Areas	LMD input needed. Not sure if we can extract these polygons from zoning data. LCOG created a D&C file that we can get a copy of.	AV	?		??
29.	Watersheds	These are done	AV			Done

STAFF KEY:

- AV - Adam Vellutini
- CB - Cress Bates
- GL - Gary Luke
- GS - Gary Schiele
- SB - Sara Bangen
- TBD - To Be Determined

C. LMD memo: Draft List of Metro Issues In Need of Examination, August 2, 2005.

Draft List of Metro Issues in Need of Examination

Board of County Commissioners

August 2, 2005

1. **Plan Architecture/Structure – 1 Metro Plan or Separate Plans?**
Should the jurisdictions dissolve the Metro Plan and adopt separate comprehensive plans for the City of Eugene and Springfield? The Board requested staff develop a matrix of the pros and cons of the Metro Plan.
2. **Metro Plan/refinement plan amendment procedures**
The Board expressed interest in reviewing the Metro Plan amendment procedures and requested staff to compile a table of information on the plan amendments processed during the last 5 years. Are there Plan amendments that are located wholly within Eugene or Springfield City Limits that are regional in character? If so, should all three jurisdictions, or the initiating city and the county jointly make the decision?
3. **Regional impacts – County/other City roles inside City Limits**
The Board is interested in reviewing significant development proposals that have a regional impact, even if they are located within the City Limits. An example is ODOT's request for \$8 million match for I-5/Beltline improvements arising out of the agreement with PeaceHealth.
4. **Urbanizable Land (inside UGB, outside City Limits) Administration**
 - a. **Who does planning and building permits?**
The Board is interested in looking at the Urban Transition Agreement that delegated the planning and building permitting authority to the two cities inside the UGB.
 - b. **Representation of citizens inside UGB, outside City Limits**
The Board wants to explore ways to improve how County citizens can be effectively dealt with by the City elected officials under the Urban Transition Agreement. Are differential fees for applications within and outside the city for the same permit appropriate? Should land owners between the City Limits and UGB have a right of appeal to their elected representatives?
5. **Statutory Coordination Role – LCOG or Lane County?**
Currently, the county has to be involved with all 12 cities for amendments to comprehensive plans located between the City Limits and the UGB. Does this result in duplication of service? The Board wants to look at the coordination role currently being provided by the LCOG and determine if it would be in the city's and county's interest to return the coordination role to Lane County.
6. **Role of MPC – Policy Development and Dispute Resolution**
The Board recalls when the role of MPC was policy development and dispute resolution. However, now when a dispute resolution comes up, the approach seems to be that each representative goes back to its governing body to determine a position rather than seek to resolve the dispute at the MPC table. MPC has also been consumed by the MPO role for transportation issues in the Metro area. The Board wants to look at the appropriateness of MPC in that function.
7. **Fundamental Principles**
 - a. **Compact Urban Growth?**
The Metro Plan is approaching 30 years of age. No UGB expansions are even on the horizon. Whereas, satellite communities such as Junction City, Creswell, Coburg and Veneta are growing rapidly and all but Veneta have recently expanded their UGB's. Portions of the Metro Area's infrastructure are enduring stress (roads) and others are expanding (MWMC). Do the compact urban growth policies still work today?
 - b. **With Measures 5, 47/50, are cities logical providers of urban services?**
Recently Eugene, Springfield and Lane County are learning that property tax revenue growth is not adequate to maintain current service levels. Are there certain services best provided by a district, be it special or county service to alleviate the steady erosion in service levels?

8. Inventory Development (Responsibility and Methodology)

- a. Residential, Commercial and Industrial land
- b. Goal 5 Natural Resources

Recently Eugene, Springfield and Lane County have developed separate inventories since they couldn't agree on significant criteria or who should conduct the inventory. Private parties are using the LCOG data to produce their own inventories. One of the advantages of the Metro Plan is avoiding duplication on these sorts of work tasks. Are we getting away from this advantage of the Metro Plan?

9. RTP / TransPlan

The effort involved with three jurisdictions having both a regional and a comprehensive transportation plan for the Metro Area seems duplicative. Can one transportation plan meet both the local and regional needs and requirements?

10. Effects of Ballot Measure 37

Identify mutual city/county issues of BM37 claims adjoining the UGB such as the effects new, urban-type uses may have on the fiscal and social health of the nearby city; the impacts such claims might have on current metro initiatives/questions regarding adequacy of commercial/industrial/residential inventories; the Goal 14 rule-making establishing new UGB amendment procedures; and the potential domino effect on surrounding land and the need for urban service extension.

11. Metro Plan area outside UGB

Should the Metro Plan boundary extend beyond the UGB? If so, the same issue is relevant in reviewing significant development proposals that have a regional impact, even if they are wholly located in the county jurisdiction, outside the UGB.