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Welcome, Opening Remarks, and Agenda Review
Sylvia Ciborowski, facilitator, opened the meeting and welcomed the meeting participants.

Chair Robin McArthur provided opening remarks and welcomed participants to the final meeting of the Rulemaking Advisory Committee (RAC). She shared gratitude for the RAC on behalf of the LCDC for their time and attention spent on developing and crafting the rules. Chair McArthur reflected on the importance of the feedback from the RAC meetings, Commission meetings, and written comments as they have helped shape the rules. She also shared appreciation to DLCD staff for their commitment to incorporating input into the rules and ensuring they are written in a way that makes sense and are
implementable on the ground to achieve the desired results in Climate Friendly Areas (CFAs) and equitable communities in Oregon.

The Commission has heard from local jurisdictions that increased resources are needed to implement the work, and in response, Director Rue and Chair McArthur will request funds from the Oregon Transportation Commission for this effort. She noted there are several future scheduled Commission meetings and approximately four months for the rules to evolve before the proposed adoption. Chair McArthur encouraged RAC member input at the upcoming Commission meetings and noted that DLCD will most likely continue to reach out to local jurisdictions and others as they try to evolve the rule language further. She concluded her remarks by reiterating gratitude to the RAC members for their effort.

Sylvia provided an overview of the meeting agenda noting the key topics. The key topics included rule updates for CFAs (Divisions 8 and 12), Metropolitan greenhouse gas reduction targets (Division 44), reform parking management and support electric vehicle charging (Division 12), transportation system planning (Division 12), and a review of the fiscal impact statement, housing impact statement, and racial equity impact statement. She then offered participation and meeting logistic tips as well as committee discussion guidelines to ensure the RAC operates in a collaborative fashion.

Bill Holmstrom, DLCD, provided an update on the upcoming rulemaking schedule. He noted that today’s meeting focuses on rule refinements and reviewing impact statements. On February 3, 2022, the LCDC will review the draft rules and impact statements and discuss policy questions. Throughout February, the draft rules will be reviewed by the Department of Justice and DLCD will submit the draft rules for publication by the Secretary of State. The first public hearing will be held on March 31 – April 1 and the final hearing and adoption is expected to occur on May 19 – 20. Bill then provided a brief update on the engagement conducted in December 2021 which consisted of more than fourteen meetings, including six practitioner roundtables, eight topic-specific work groups, and additional presentations and meetings.

Questions and Comments:

- A RAC member sought clarity on the purpose of the work session scheduled the week of 1/24/22 and sought the deadline to provide comments prior to the February Commission meeting.

Response: DLCD replied the Commission is holding a work session on Tuesday, January 25th with DLCD staff to discuss the rules and for DLCD to provide background information and answer questions from the Commission. The Commission will not receive public testimony at the work session, nor will they provide guidance to DLCD staff. DLCD also explained they accept written testimony all the way up to the February Commission meeting; however, they recommended RAC members to submit comments or testimony by 1/27/22.

Rule Updates Overview and Discussion – Climate Friendly Areas (Divisions 8 and 12)

Kevin Young, DLCD, reviewed the updates for the CFAs rules. He thanked work group members for their input on the rules and then walked through the key changes made to the rules. These changes included the following:
• Housing Rule Revisions (Division 8):
  o 660-008-0010 – Revised to better differentiate how a local government is to plan and zone CFAs based on zoning capacity, and how residential land needs over time will continue to be determined based on actual development activity in residential areas.
  o 660-008-0050 – Adds actions taken to promote the production of housing accessible to persons with disabilities to the required analysis Fair and Equitable Housing Outcomes.

• Transportation Rule Revisions (Division 12):
  o 660-012-0012: Reorganized the section regarding effective dates. Local governments are required to submit a CFA study by June 30, 2023. Zoning and Comp Plan Amendments are due by June 30, 2024, and Metro is to adopt requirements by Dec. 31, 2024. Within the Metro region, cities and counties that have yet to adopt, must adopt and zone Region 2040 centers by Dec. 31, 2025.
  o 660-012-0310: This section was reorganized for clarity. It contains locational requirements for CFAs, contains minimum dimension for CFAs, and clarifies that only county areas provided with urban water, sanitary sewer, stormwater, and transportation services within an identified urban growth boundary (UGB) are subjected to CFA requirements.
  o 660-012-0315: The section now provides detail for how to calculate average buildable residential area in a CFA; details the information and analysis required in the CFA study to be submitted by June 30, 2023; and provides the process for public and department review and comment on CFA studies.
  o 660-012-0320: A number of changes were made in the land use requirements in the CFAs. These changes included adding more flexibility in housing types; established a maximum 350-ft block length standard, with redevelopment thresholds; no minimum density if mixed use with 2.0 FAR or greater; standards for cities with more than 100,000 population the same as for cities more than 50,000, but less than 100,000; and all cities over 25,000 may choose to designate non-primary CFAs with less intensive standards.

Sylvia, facilitator, opened the meeting for discussion and requested for RAC members to provide written comments via the Jamboard.

Climate Friendly Areas Jamboard link:
https://jamboard.google.com/d/1xOy9c1Qqb00UBnBbb0FvCJepwNokrAfECtPWfJxewa8/viewer?f=0

Questions and Comments:

• A member sought clarity if the intent is to tie growth opportunities and the amount of land within an Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) expansion based on existing residential development and type of buildout.

Response: DLCD explained that is correct, and the way the system currently operates. DLCD is not intending to interfere with that system. Cities can continue to plan to meet their residential land needs based on prior housing production by zone, which will include CFAs over time. DLCD hopes to see increased housing development within those areas.

• Members shared concern regarding the rules and density land use requirements and questioned whether they are moving in the right direction if trying to achieve the dual goal
of meeting housing needs and solving the housing crisis. They shared concern the rules would freeze residential development in many communities. They recommended an analysis of land prices for where the CFAs will be and how development will be impacted. A member shared concerns about the ability to bring affordable housing products to market and noted there seems to be no flexibility or allotment for single family development based on the rules. The member requested an extension for the CFA rules to move housing production forward.

**Response:** Regarding the requested extension, DLCD explained it is matter for the Commission as they have been clear with their timeline and intent to adopt final rules in May 2022.

- A member sought further detail on the intensive standards required by cities within the CFA rules.

**Response:** DLCD explained a large city over 50,000 would have to designate a primary CFA to meet more intensive standards but could then designate other CFAs based on lower densities and building height standards for smaller cities.

- A member sought clarity on how a city is ensured to meet its needs. They shared concern regarding the portion of the rules requiring increased designation of CFAs.

**Response:** DLCD explained they are adjusting standards to allow local governments to calibrate CFAs based on where they think markets will respond. The rules do not, and cannot, require development to occur in a CFA, but to zone and accommodate a certain level of residential development. If it turns out the rules are not working, DLCD will return to the Commission to make the appropriate adjustments.

- A member shared support for the CFA study.
- Another member sought clarification on Rule 0315, under section 4F regarding plans for achieving fair and equitable housing outcomes; they inquired whether that would be the element of the CFA where local jurisdictions will outline what the potential impacts might be to certain state and federal protected classes and identify actions that cities will take to help mitigate displacement. Related to that, regarding the adoption of land use requirements and the CFA element, the member inquired if section 6A-D represents the sum for what would be considered a CFA element; the member requested technical guidance or a one-pager that clearly explains the elements for CFAs.

**Response:** Regarding section 4F, DLCD explained that is the area where local governments would look at the potential for displacement and identify potential tools used for mitigation of displacement of protected classes. Section 6 describes the step where local governments adopt zoning and comp plan amendments to implement CFAs.

- A member shared appreciation of the changes made to Rule 0315 regarding accessibility, including requiring documentation of accessible units. They inquired under paragraph 2C, if DLCD thinks the language is sufficient to influence behaviors by cities and developers to produce accessible units. The member requested if the rules could permit all new housing has at least one zero step entrance. They further inquired how the language is defining what constitutes an accessible unit.
**Response:** DLCD replied the first provision allows a height bonus in addition to affordable and accessible units and is a tool that local governments may use. Regarding accessible housing units, DLCD lacks legal authority to require construction that exceeds building code requirements. DLCD can focus on incentives that local government or funders can provide to build more accessible units; one potential useful tool is the housing production strategy work. DLCD explained there are definitions of accessible units embedded in the section 0315 language.

- A RAC member sought clarity and recommended DLCD to provide the basis for block lengths and dwelling units and jobs per acre; another member emphasized the standards should be based on empirical evidence. The member noted connectivity is good for walkability within neighborhoods but comes at the expense of developing more units and costs, and development outside of CFAs will not have to bear the same costs. They also requested DLCD to consider a larger block minimum length standard and a more attainable prescriptive route for meeting the density for both residential units and jobs.
- Another member commented the rulemaking is an effort dealing with climate change, and urban areas will need to look differently than they do today. They added that the market application conversation has been occurring for decades, and there are presently many areas that have mixed use building and ownership opportunities. The member emphasized people must not continue to think an urban form that is mostly single-family homes is going to address the ability of people who choose to not drive.
- A member observed the recent changes to the rules delink the housing capacity and needs analysis process from the CFA capacity process in a way that will allow them to converge over time. The member also noted the methodology is not simply a straight-line extension of past market forces and commented on the growing gap in black and white home ownership and emphasized the rules must accommodate long-term stability for households and access to areas of opportunity.
- A RAC member inquired why only block length has been reincorporated, and not block perimeter. They noted pairing of block perimeter and length can create more flexibility, and block length alone may constrict the ability to meet different context in local communities. The member shared concerns regarding feasibility and limitation on the minimum CFA width.
- Another member commented that the issue of both gentrification and urban heat islands needs to be considered within the rules.
- A couple of members shared support for an additional RAC meeting.

**Rule Updates Overview and Discussion – Metropolitan Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets (Division 44)**

Cody Meyer, DLCD, provided an overview of the updates for the Metropolitan greenhouse gas reduction targets rules. Cody reminded the RAC of the Governor’s direction to DLCD and ODOT, as well as the Commission’s charge to the RAC. He then presented a diagram that explained the relationship of the State’s transportation plans to meet the overall climate goals. The rule updates were the following:

- The targets are set for actions ‘above and beyond fleet, fuel, technology’ changes.
- Targets are set for actions that reduce vehicles miles traveled (VMT).
- Regional models that project VMT/GHG will be used.
- The rules do not require financial constraint.
In addition, the Transportation System Plans (TSP) contain projects that affect VMT use travel demand models that project VMT and contain financially constrained and unconstrained project lists. Cody reviewed the summary of feedback on regional scenario planning and provided the reasons to require and not require the plans. The reasons to require the plans are the following:

- The Transportation Planning Rules (TPR) include targets for reducing VMT, and targets work best when applied to regional rather than cities and counties.
- The scenario planning process should be required for all metropolitan areas with a clear timeline for completion no later than 2030.

Reasons not to require regional scenario plans are the following:

- Cities and counties make the decisions that reduce VMT and GHG.
- The TPR include a requirement to reduce VMT.
- Regional planning and coordination delays changes to local plans and adds expense.

Sylvia, facilitator, opened the meeting for discussion and requested for RAC members to provide written comments via the Jamboard.

**Metropolitan Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets Jamboard link:**
https://jamboard.google.com/d/1kJbTZfDrzA2DSVjnrrlZ8oTQkM3OH-k8IDuTanWkcRck/viewer?f=0

**Questions and comments:**

- A member noted that the scenario planning requirements for the Salem/Keizer area will delay and impede its ability to take quick action. The City of Salem has recently done scenario planning, is soon launching adoption, and is ready to update the TSP that will support policy objectives closely aligned with CFEC policy objectives. The member noted that inserting the requirement for scenario planning to occur at the same time is going to complicate the city’s ability to implement changes in their TSP, therefore the member encouraged DLCD to remove that requirement or delay it.

**Response:** DLCD responded that there needs to be a connection between the regional GHG targets and local transportation plans. The TPR requirement requires the plans be developed to meet the VMT reduction of GHG reduction targets.

- Another member suggested to remove the scenario planning requirement for the Central Lane or Salem/Keizer area and to instead complete the comp plan amendment process, land use process, and TSP updates required in the Division 12 changes. They added that cities and counties do not have impact or effects on how efficient a fuel is, or how quickly older vehicles will be taken out of use and replaced with more efficient vehicles. Therefore, the target needs to focus on what cities and counties can do, and ensure their ability to have development that meets the new CFA rules and infrastructure for pedestrian/bike/transit.
- A member shared that for the Portland-Metro region, they have found value in conducting climate smart analysis and scenarios as part of their regional transportation plan.
- Members shared concern regarding staff capacity and time.
• Regarding community engagement for scenario planning, a member expressed the need to do public engagement for all the land use requirements. They inquired how to frame regional scenario planning in a way that makes sense for engaging communities.

**Response:** DLCD staff envisions the rules for scenario planning within an umbrella in which CFAs are identified as a necessary first step and public engagement would occur for the overall work program that ties in TSPs and CFAs.

**Rule Updates Overview and Discussion – Reform Parking Management and Support Electric Vehicle Charging (Division 12)**

Evan Manvel, DLCD, provided an overview of the updates to the reform parking management and support electric vehicle charging rules. Evan highlighted the changes as the following:

• **Clarity on the overall timeline**
  o Clearer draft in 660-012-0012 states cities and counties shall apply 0430 and 0440 to development applications received after June 30, 2022; choose and implement one of three parking approaches by March 31, 2023; and update parking maximums when updating the Transportation System Plan

• **Application in the Metro area**
  o Applies to communities in Metro area unless/until Metro proposes alternate approach and the Land Conservation and Development Commission approves alternative; parking maximums in Metro apply to cities of 25,000+ population; and provisions about parking reform in climate-friendly area apply in Metro’s regional and town centers

• **Parking Maximums**
  o The purpose is to avoid car-heavy uses in key areas and nudge the market to rethink old models. Populous cities set maximums in CFAs and along transit corridors and rail stops when updating TSPs. The rules set maximums for residential, commercial, and for uses 65,000+.

• **Additional updates**
  o Adjusted the solar/tree canopy provisions; acknowledged further work needed to make clear tree canopy provisions; clarified under reduced regulation approach communities can require vacancy registration; and updated the EV charging provisions to allow those providing Direct Current Fast Charging to provide fewer spaces. DLCD is meeting with the City of Portland and ODOT to further discuss EV charging details.

Sylvia, facilitator, opened the meeting for discussion and requested for RAC members to provide written comments via the Jamboard.

**Reform Parking Management and Support Electric Vehicle Charging JamBoard link:**
https://jamboard.google.com/d/1ce_QecsjtRAsq8N18bJvaiEQpTwEKp0uWbOCaQZqMLU/viewer?f=0
Questions and Comments:

- A member inquired why the rules are not requiring parking maximum in all of the CFAs.

Response: DLCD explained the rules as drafted require cities to set their parking maximums and is a work task DLCD was not intending to burden all cities with, however they can consider where the line is for smaller populations and cities.

- Another member inquired if there are other parking reform rules that are cross referenced in other parts of the rule regarding CFAs.

Response: DLCD clarified the Rule sections of the 300s and 400s cross reference each other and a lot of the CFAs will likely overlap with geographic transit corridors.

- A RAC member sought clarity around the ability for freight to deliver in commercial spaces of CFAs and if trucking companies have places to load and off load.

Response: DLCD responded that the rules as drafted state that parking maximums have to apply in CFAs and along transit corridors. DLCD encouraged the RAC member to provide language on the ability to submit a specific exemption regarding storage of semi-trucks. Presently, there is nothing in the parking standards that would preclude a local government from adopting requirements for loading zones in conjunction with commercial or industrial development.

- Another member inquired if Rule 0450, which applies to cities with populations over 100,000, if those cities only have two parking approaches to choose from.

Response: Section 425 – 450 is the remainder of the two approaches, but is unique to the cities of Eugene, Salem, and Portland. Those cities over 100,000 choose one of the two approaches. DLCD shared that they could follow up with the RAC member to provide further clarification.

- A member noted that certain cities must follow state rules on having clear and objective standards when reviewing and approving housing; some portions of the rule are not clear or consistent with the city’s requirement.

Rule Updates Overview and Discussion – Transportation System Planning (Division 12)

Bill Holmstrom, DLCD, provided an overview of the update for the transportation system planning rules. The updates for the rules are the following:

- Timing and Phasing
  - There is a new option for local governments to propose work program instead of deadlines in rule.

- Pedestrian and Bicycle
  - There are clearer requirements.
  - The rules are less about functional classification of street, and more about traffic level.
  - Bicycle planning is focused on a connected network of safe, low stress facilities, and for all ages and abilities.

- Authorization of Facilities that Increase Driving
  - The draft rule requires some facilities to be reviewed before adding to a plan.
The updates include more facilities are excluded from this review, it clarifies the review is planning level and uses existing data, and public engagement may be coordinated with other activities.

- **Land Use**
  - Draft rules 0330 & 0340 were updated with transportation system plan updates.
  - The rules have less prescriptive neighborhood land use requirements.
  - Land use assumptions and requirements for auto-related land uses were clarified.

- **Project lists**
  - The “illustrative” list is now called “unconstrained”.
  - The rules allow for prioritization of projects in tiers.
  - The financially constrained list must meet climate targets.
  - Existing bond funding may be a prioritization factor.
  - Development-funded projects may be used from unconstrained list.

- **Other changes**
  - Changes were made to support accessibility.
  - Some rules were moved and renumbered.
  - There were various other clarifications based on suggestions and questions.

Bill provided next steps for the draft rules. DLCD will continue to refine the draft rules ahead of and in response to legal review in February. DLCD is working on guidance and state technical support directly to communities and is working with ODOT to identify and deploy additional funding.

Sylvia, facilitator, opened the meeting for discussion and requested for RAC members to provide written comments via the Jamboard.

**Transportation System Planning Jamboard link:**
https://jamboard.google.com/d/1vJGCI14DFKNLGon2Z3E07b9x3uTBceyoTt8cYDH6l1o/viewer?f=0

**Questions and Comments:**

- A RAC member expressed appreciation for the incorporation of the “all ages and abilities” language for the bike and pedestrian infrastructure rules. They shared concern regarding inconsistent application of the integration of volume and speed.
- A RAC member sought clarity over the deadline for work programs and inquired if the issue has been resolved regarding transportation planning and project development as two separate distinct pieces to reflect the existing TPR.

**Response:** DLCD clarified that a local jurisdiction cannot start something five years from now, and the deadline in the draft rules is subject to change and negotiation. In the rules there are requirements on what local governments can propose and the rules give the Commission flexibility on what they can require on the work program. Regarding the issue raised, existing Rule 0050 should have included the transportation planning and project work as part of the rules that continue to apply statewide; it is now under Rule 0011 which applies everywhere. Rule 0050 will continue to apply inside and outside of Metropolitan areas.

- A member shared appreciation for the clarity of the tiers within the project list. They added concern that Rule 0180-2A is not legally defensible and believes the LCDC does not have the
authority to limit what is federally required Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). They added appreciation for the change in section 0180-2B that allows cities to require developers to build projects on the unconstrained project list as part of development and the revisions to the street and highway system planning; they suggested to tie in the half million dollars associated with that function to inflation.

**Response:** DLCD noted they will discuss the raised issue of Rule 180-2A with their legal counsel.

- A member asked staff to expand on the term “regional coordinated work plans” and inquired what they envision for the coordination.

**Response:** DLCD answered that the coordination is different for the Portland-Metro area. All other areas will have separate work plans but will work together. The Portland-Metro jurisdiction can submit a coordinated work program.

- Regarding work plan language under sections 3B-b and 3B-c, a member inquired if a city can determine the work they can accomplish according to the deadlines and rules, and request for extensions in other areas if more time is needed.

**Response:** DLCD noted they are attempting to provide local governments with flexibility.

- Regarding the work program, a member inquired if the local jurisdiction must submit its own work program in addition to a coordinated work program. They also sought clarity whether if all cities are still required to have regional TSPs within metropolitan planning organization (MPO) areas or counties.

**Response:** DLCD explained that a local jurisdiction would have to submit both its own and a coordinated work program. Cities outside the Portland-Metro area are not required to have regional TSPs, and the existing transportation planning rules requires a regional TSP for every county in the state.

- A member shared that additional work needs to be done on defining safety within the capacity increasing exceptions. They shared concern on the voter approved bonds date, especially considering some cities are currently undertaking public outreach for a potential bond measure to go to voters soon.
- Another member inquired if bond funded projects that are purely preservation of the existing transportation system but not building a new TSP would be okay to move forward in the coming years.

**Response:** DLCD explained that preservation, maintenance, and operational changes are outside the scope of TSP plan projects. The bond funding date was set in response to the concern of an existing bond that had already been approved for the City of Bend.


Kevin Young, DLCD, reviewed the impact statements. Kevin noted DLCD is required to publish impact statements on impacts that may occur based on the rule, and this particular effort is subject to three requirements (fiscal, housing impact, and racial equity). The requirements and findings summary for each impact statement are the following:
- **Fiscal**
  - DLCD is required to identify any persons the proposed rule could affect economically.
  - In determining economic impact, the agency shall project any significant economic effect of that action on businesses which shall include a cost of compliance effect on small businesses affected.
  - DLCD is not required to conduct original research in creating the impact statement.
- **Housing**
  - Requires an estimate of the effect of a proposed rule or ordinance on the cost of development of a 1,200 square foot detached single family dwelling on a 6,000 square foot parcel.
- **Racial equity**
  - This new requirement, established by HB 2993 (2021), requires agencies to include a “statement identifying how adoption of the rules will affect racial equity in the state”.

**Questions and Comments:**

- On the equity statement, a member noted the RAC has discussed possible equity impacts from lack of home ownership opportunities in CFAs and the preclusion of single-family units. They shared a resource, a 2019 report addressing barriers for home ownership, and encouraged DLCD staff to review the report and add analysis from that report into the equity statement.
- A RAC member noted concern that the unit of measurement for housing in a CFA is a single-family home, which is not the housing being considered within CFAs. Regarding block length, it’s multi-family housing that will bear the costs of this rule and the member urged DLCD to consider this issue.
- A member shared that institutional voices have dominated the dialogue of the RAC process, and although people not traditionally at the table were invited, their voices were not centered equitably. The member requested for transparent language integrated into racial equity impact statement.

**Response:** DLCD responded that they invited a range of voices to the table and are deeply appreciative of those voices. They clarified that the racial equity impact statement is a new requirement and DLCD staff are still working on the statement. Following the RAC process, there will be further opportunities to debrief on the process, and DLCD is seeking information on how they can have a better or different process in the future. These opportunities include interviews with RAC members identifying as experienced in equitable outcomes, a RAC-focused equity reflection forum, and a survey for local governments seeking their input on what they require or need to implement the rules.

- On the racial equity statement, a member observed from RAC comments an inclination to bypass community engagement efforts and shared how the statement notes that community engagement efforts will extend planning periods, increase costs significantly, and the notion of community engagement fatigue. The member emphasized there has been no mention of fatigue in other processes, and therefore shared concern that local jurisdictions may try to avoid community engagement. The member suggested for DLCD to remove the sentence on page 18.

---

of the racial equity impact statement regarding negatively impacting underserved populations by delaying transportation investment or reducing available investment amounts.

- RAC members representing local jurisdictions shared perspectives that it’s not so much local jurisdictions do not want to engage communities, but rather it’s recognition that more time is involved; they noted the aggressive timeline may negatively impact their ability to conduct thorough engagement. A RAC member emphasized they have been seeking timeline extensions considering they are being asked to deliver a faster planning process than before and to conduct more robust community engagement with limited resources and less time.

Thank You, Next steps and Wrap Up

Kirstin Greene, DLCD, provided next steps and reflections. She shared that RAC members have been involved in both a difficult and historic process and invited each member to the first public hearing to be recognized for their work in helping develop the rules. Kirstin asked members to differentiate their comments between the rule development process and rule implementation as DLCD wants to learn from the RAC process and how to fund implementation correctly. Kirstin reiterated there are upcoming opportunities to discuss the budget bill process and opportunities to discuss input, feedback, and further rule refinement. The important touch points in the "budget build" process are: 1) Interviews with community-based organization participants on a) how the process went and b) what is needed to operationalize the equity objectives; 2) RAC-based open forum focused on equity and what is needed to implement; 3) survey of local governments on what resources are needed to implement the rules for racial equity. DLCD is hoping members can provide comments before January 31st as DLCD will be turning those comments around for legal review in February. She concluded her remarks by providing gratitude to the RAC. Sylvia, facilitator, opened the meeting for RAC members to provide any final remarks or reflections.

Comments:

- A member shared appreciation for the way the process has been facilitated and for the more inclusive nature of the process, including more voices that have not been on rulemaking committees before.
- Another member acknowledged the challenge and difficulty of operating under the COVID-19 pandemic. They shared that throughout the RAC process it has been difficult to distinguish voices via the survey feedback and breakout room discussions. They suggested ensuring more voices are heard in future processes, especially considering the world of virtual engagement.
- A RAC member noted appreciation for DLCD’s intent on bringing diversity to the RAC process table. They suggested for a future process that involves two corresponding RACs; one based on technical specifications and another for community input and need. This approach can potentially get at the issues regarding housing and transportation and addressing true accessibility.
- A RAC member observed the work being done is foundational in allowing other organizations who participate in the social determinants of health to make a thriving community that enables access to food, healthcare, and education. The member reflected their wish that the group had done more in developing the rules, especially regarding participation from the equity representatives.
• A member provided a thank you to all the members and staff for their work. They shared a final concern of the lack of analysis regarding the realities of development and likely market around the housing pieces of the rule.

LCDC Commissioner Stuart Warren offered closing remarks and thanked the RAC members, volunteers, and DLCD/KW staff for their involvement throughout the process. Commissioner Warren shared appreciation for all the input of the members and acknowledged the heavy lift and journey the process has taken. He noted that he has learned immensely from the RAC process and guidance. He also provided appreciation for the RAC member’s honesty and reflection of inequities throughout the process. DLCD/LCDC will learn from the process and seek areas of improvement, including how to better engage the public in a meaningful way. Commissioner Warren reminded the RAC to complete the final survey and to reach out to him or other DLCD/LCDC staff with questions or comments. The final Commission meeting is scheduled for May 19-20, 2022. Commissioner Warren concluded his remarks with a final thank you and shared excitement for the implementation phase of the rules.

Meeting adjourned approximately at 1:00pm P.T.