

W. J. A.



Lane Council of Governments

99 East Broadway, Suite 400, Eugene, Oregon 97401-3111 (541) 682-4283 Fax: (541) 682-4099 TTY: (541) 682-4567

January 8, 2004

TO: Eugene and Springfield City Councils and Lane County Board of Commissioners

FROM: Metro Plan Periodic Review Staff Team

SUBJECT: February 10, 2004 Joint Elected Official Work Session and Public Hearing on Periodic Review of the *Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (Metro Plan)* and *Metro Plan* Amendments

A Joint Elected Official public hearing has been scheduled for February 10, 2004 in the Eugene Public Library Bascom Tykeson Rooms at 6:30 p.m. The public hearing is an opportunity for the public to provide testimony on proposed amendments to the *Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (Metro Plan)* text and Diagram related to Periodic Review of the Metro Plan.

This proposal is for the following three amendments to the *Metro Plan* text and Diagram which are attached as Exhibits to the adopting ordinance:

1. Metro Plan Housekeeping Revisions (Exhibit A)
2. Metro Plan Chapter III-C: Environmental Resources Element (Exhibit B)
3. A new Metro Plan Diagram that is based on the Regional Land Information Database (RLID) (Exhibit C)

These amendments are proposed to complete the metropolitan-wide portions of Periodic Review of the *Metro Plan*.

The Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County Planning Commissions all recommended the proposed *Metro Plan* text and Diagram amendments for adoption.

ACTION REQUESTED

Hold a joint work session to review, and a joint public hearing to consider public testimony on, the proposed amendments to the *Metro Plan* text and the proposed *Metro Plan* Diagram.

PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The three planning commissions conducted a public hearing on the text and diagram recommendations on June 3 and June 17, 2003. The commissions met individually in November, 2003, and recommended adoption of the proposed amendments. In response to oral and written testimony, the planning commissions recommended a number of changes to the proposal. In their formal actions, the three commissions slightly varied the language of two policies and one finding in Chapter III-C. The Lane County Planning Commission, the last commission to take action, recommended the language incorporated into Exhibit B and the Eugene and Springfield Planning Commissions subsequently concurred with this compromise language.

These changes and the planning commissions' discussions are found in the minutes of those proceedings and have been included in the public record for the joint elected official public hearing on the proposal available in the planning offices of Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County Land Management.

The attached versions of Exhibits A, B, and C contain additional edits based on legal review.

ELECTED OFFICIAL PROCESS

At 5:30 p.m. on the evening of the public hearing, the three elected official bodies will receive an initial briefing work session to become familiar with the proposed *Metro Plan* text and diagram amendments.

The comment period will end following the close of the public hearing. Subsequently, each jurisdiction will conduct individual work sessions to deliberate on the proposed amendments. The process for adoption of these types of changes to the Metro Plan requires that the three jurisdictions reach unanimous agreement on the proposed amendments. There is a dispute resolution process through the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) in the event of disagreement by the three jurisdictions.

Upon agreement of the proposed amendments, the changes are forwarded to the Director of the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Department for final ratification of completion of the Periodic Review work tasks.

PROPOSAL HIGHLIGHTS

This proposal is for the following three amendments to the *Metro Plan* text and Diagram which are attached as Exhibits to the adopting ordinance:

1. *Metro Plan* Housekeeping Revisions (Exhibit A)
2. New Metro Plan Chapter III-C: Environmental Resources Element (Exhibit B)
3. New Metro Plan Diagram (Exhibit C)

1. Metro Plan Housekeeping Revisions (Exhibit A)

These amendments “clean up” the *Metro Plan* by making the format and text internally consistent and clarifying and updating the text. Please refer to Exhibit A: *Proposed Metro Plan Housekeeping Revisions* for amendments in legislative format. Format changes are proposed for all chapters, text is clarified, and findings and policies are amended throughout the *Metro Plan* to clarify and reflect previously updated Plan Elements, such as Residential Land Use and Housing, Public Facilities and Services, and Transportation. Objectives are deleted to streamline the text and to clarify that they do not provide policy direction. The objectives have been erroneously interpreted by some members of the public and applicants as providing policy direction when they do not.

2. Metro Plan Chapter III-C: Environmental Resources Element (Exhibit B)

A new Environmental Resources Element is proposed to replace the existing Metro Plan Chapter III-C. Exhibit B: Proposed *Metro Plan* Chapter III-C Environmental Resources Element shows the proposed changes in legislative format. This Chapter addresses Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands), Goal 4 (Forest Lands), Goal 5 (Natural Resources), Goal 6 (Air, Water, and Land Resources Quality), and Goal 7 (Natural Disasters and Hazards). Following is a summary of the changes.

- Changes are proposed to *Metro Plan* Chapter III-C, Environmental Resources Element to: complete Statewide Planning Goal 5 requirements for riparian corridors, wetlands, and wildlife habitat outside the urban growth boundary (UGB); update the Element to reflect Goal 5 work underway for Eugene and Springfield; and delete or amend language to remove outdated or already accomplished items.
- Proposed amendments to the *Lane Code* Chapter 16 Riparian Protection Regulations modify the riparian setback requirements to comply with the Goal 5 Rule (OAR 660-023). Text changes in Chapter III-C refer to these protection measures in the *Lane Code*, which apply to the area outside the UGB and within the *Metro Plan* boundary. The *Lane Code* amendments are the subject of a separate staff report and February 10, 2004 public hearing before the Lane County Board of Commissioners.
- Text changes are proposed to comply with Statewide Planning Goal 3 (Agricultural Lands) and Goal 4 (Forest Lands) to make the *Metro Plan* consistent with recent changes to the *Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan* adopted by the Lane County Board of Commissioners. These changes apply to the area outside the urban growth boundary (UGB).

3. New Metro Plan Diagram (Exhibit C)

This proposal is to adopt a new Metro Plan Diagram that is based on the Regional Land Information Database (RLID), to adopt Metro Plan Diagram amendments for specific properties in Springfield, and to remove Urban Reserves (Exhibit C).

The following updates to the *Metro Plan* diagram are proposed for compliance with Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR), to make the *Metro Plan* Diagram consistent with locally-adopted refinement plans, to show re-designations that have been approved since 1982, and to make housekeeping changes for formal adoption of a revised *Metro Plan* Diagram that reflects, for the majority of parcels, RLID data.

- *Metro Plan* Diagram Housekeeping Changes

The current, adopted diagram was adopted in 1982 as a graphic. Often referred to as a “blob” diagram, the map allows for interpretation of Plan designation and urban growth boundary (UGB) lines based on an analysis of *Metro Plan* policy. Over time, updates to the diagram have been entered into RLID and all long-range planning studies are based on these data. No interpretation of the Plan designations and UGB for the entire RLID version of the diagram had been conducted and this version had not been adopted locally and acknowledged by LCDC. In order to make the RLID diagram the official comprehensive plan map, staff have worked since September, 2002 to make these interpretations.

The revised *Metro Plan* Diagram has been “matched” with the current adopted conceptual version of the diagram and adjusted to reflect the adopted map and existing development patterns. This will allow formal adoption of an RLID-based Plan Diagram to replace the currently-adopted graphic diagram.

The proposed *Metro Plan* Diagram will not be parcel-specific *in its entirety*. The *Metro Plan* Diagram continues to evolve into a parcel-specific map, but there remains the need to define some of the *boundaries* of Plan designation areas in urban areas on a site-specific basis. These boundaries or edges of Plan designation areas lend themselves to site-specific determination of Plan designation because they transition from one Plan designation to another and the case-by-case determination allows for both citizen input in these determinations and site-specific analysis not available at the broad, legislative level.

This proposal is for an updated, diagram that, together with *Metro Plan* policies and descriptive text, provides guidance to local governments in determining the Plan designation of specific parcels. The proposed diagram contains all updates that have been adopted since the *Metro Plan* Diagram was adopted in 1982 as well as updates to make the diagram consistent with adopted refinement plans in Eugene and, for a few specific areas, with existing zoning in Springfield. Other parcel-specific Plan designations apply to parcel-specific Plan designations within refinement plan

boundaries, parcels with an adopted Plan designation resulting from a citizen-initiated *Metro Plan* Diagram amendment process, and all lands in the area between the urban growth boundary (UGB) and the *Metro Plan* Boundary. In the event of a conflict between the Plan designation of a parcel as shown on the RLID-based *Metro Plan* Diagram and the Plan designation for that parcel determined through a formal adoption process, the Plan designation will be the designation that is determined through the formal adoption process.

As in the past, this Plan diagram will provide the cities with the flexibility to interpret the designation of specific properties that border one or more different plan designation category.

- *Metro Plan* Diagram Updates for Refinement Plan Consistency

Refinement plans are a detailed examination of the service needs and land use issues of a specific area, topic, or public facility. Refinement Plans, which are typically adopted by a single jurisdiction, include specific neighborhood plans, special area plans, or functional plans (such as *TransPlan*) that address a specific *Metro Plan* element or sub-element. In order for refinement plan designations to effectively modify the *Metro Plan*, they must be adopted through the *Metro Plan* amendment process, which has not been the case for many refinement plans.

Many refinement plans show designations not reflected in the *Metro Plan* Diagram. This is especially true in Eugene, where neighborhood plans and special area studies sometimes create new land use designations that better describe the intended future use of properties. While these Refinement Plan designations were generally consistent with the *Metro Plan* Diagram, they created many new land use designations that were never formally recognized in the *Metro Plan*. These periodic review amendments to the *Metro Plan* diagram accomplish that follow-up task and better reflect refinement plan designations as the official designations of the *Metro Plan*. One new *Metro Plan* diagram land use category was created, a “Mixed Use” designation without an underlying base designation.

Primarily in the Eugene UGB, the diagram has been updated to make the Plan Diagram consistent with locally-adopted refinement plans. Owners of all the properties subject to this update were notified of the process.

- *Metro Plan* Diagram Amendments in Springfield and to Remove Urban Reserve Designations from the *Metro Plan* Diagram

The City of Springfield is proposing to amend the *Metro Plan* Diagram for several specific properties and these amendments are not considered “housekeeping.” In addition, *Metro Plan* Diagram amendments propose removing the designation of Urban Reserve where it is applied to specific

properties in existing urban reserve areas. The list of tax lots affected by these amendments is included in Exhibit C.

The existing underlying *Metro Plan* Diagram designation for urban reserves will not change. This change is required because, based on the information and conclusions in the *Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area Urban Reserve Analysis and Alternatives Report*, June 2001 (see record of Planning Commission proceedings), the existing Urban Reserves are not in compliance with OAR 660 Division 21. These amendments are proposed to complete the Urban Reserve Work Task in the Periodic Review Work Program. The *Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area Urban Reserve Analysis and Alternatives Report*, June 2001, was prepared during the first phase of this work task. The report evaluates existing and alternative urban reserve areas within the context of the OAR and concludes that, due to the construction of the administrative rule, the current and alternative areas do not meet the requirements of the rule.

METRO PLAN PERIODIC REVIEW

The proposed Metro Plan text and diagram amendments will bring the metropolitan area very close to completion of the 1995 Metro Plan Periodic Review Work Program. Once these amendments are adopted and the remaining work tasks in the Periodic Review work program are accomplished, the Eugene-Springfield area will have completed its Periodic Review requirements.

Periodic Review is the process used in Oregon to update long-range, comprehensive land use plans. State law requires that plans be current, consistent with new state laws and administrative rules, and responsive to changing local conditions. The Metro Plan Periodic Review process and work tasks are outlined in the *Periodic Review Work Program* which was adopted locally and approved by the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) on May 25, 1995 and revised in July 2002. Copies of the work program are on file in the planning offices of Eugene, Springfield, Lane County, and LCOG.

A Periodic Review work task is “complete” when it is adopted locally and acknowledged by DLCD. Of the 18 work tasks in the original Periodic Review work program, eight tasks have been completed since 1995:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Metro Plan Amendment Process | 5. Springfield Commercial Lands Study |
| 2. TransPlan Coordination | 6. Eugene Implementation Measures |
| 3. Eugene Minimum Density Standards | 7. Springfield Implementation Measures |
| 4. Metropolitan Residential Lands Study | 8. Metropolitan Public Facilities and Services Plan |

Two work tasks, Lane County Sand and Gravel Study and Willamette River Greenway Study, were removed from the Periodic Review work program by DLCD because changes in state law removed the requirement that the studies be conducted.

The proposed Metro Plan text and diagram amendments, when final, will complete, or partially complete, the following six Periodic Review work tasks:

1. Metropolitan Natural Resources Study: Metro Plan Chapter III-C will be submitted to DLCD for partial acknowledgement of completion of this work task. Full acknowledgement will be obtained when DLCD approves the Eugene and Springfield components of the study, now underway.
2. Lane County Agricultural Lands Study (*within the Metro Plan Boundary*): Metro Plan Chapter III-C will be submitted to DLCD for acknowledgement of completion of this work task.
3. Lane County Forest Lands Study (*within the Metro Plan Boundary*): Metro Plan Chapter III-C will be submitted to DLCD for acknowledgement of completion of this work task.
4. Metropolitan Urban Reserve Study: Metro Plan Housekeeping Revisions and Metro Plan Diagram will be submitted to DLCD for acknowledgement of completion of this work task.
5. Metro Plan Housekeeping Revisions. Metro Plan Housekeeping Revisions will be submitted to DLCD for acknowledgement of completion of this work task.
6. Revision and Reprint of the Metro Plan and the Metro Plan Diagram. Metro Plan Housekeeping Revisions, Metro Plan Chapter III-C, and Metro Plan Diagram will be submitted to DLCD for acknowledgement of completion of this work task.

It is anticipated that the remaining two work tasks, which will not require a joint adoption process, will be completed within the same timeframe as the above tasks:

1. Springfield Wetlands Protection Plan
2. Springfield Drinking Water Protection Plan

ATTACHMENTS:

Adopting Ordinance with Exhibit “A” (Metro Plan Housekeeping Revisions), Exhibit “B” (Metro Plan Chapter III-C), Exhibit “C” (Metro Plan Diagram), and Exhibit “D” (Findings).

FOR MORE INFORMATION:

For more information on the Metro Plan amendments, please contact one of the following staff.

Carol Heinkel, Lane Council of Governments Principal Planner (682-4107),
Periodic Review Coordinator
Kathi Wiederhold, Lane Council of Governments Senior Planner (682-4430),
Metropolitan Natural Resources Study Project Manager
Mark Metzger, Springfield Senior Planner (726-3775)
Kurt Yeiter, Eugene Principal Planner (682-8379)
Kent Howe, Planning Director (682-3734) and Stephanie Schulz, Planner (682-3958),
Lane County Land Management

BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LANE COUNTY, OREGON

ORDINANCE NO. PA 1197) IN THE MATTER OF AMENDING THE EUGENE-
) SPRINGFIELD METROPOLITAN AREA GENERAL PLAN
) (METRO PLAN) TO ADOPT AS PART OF PERIODIC
) REVIEW METRO PLAN HOUSEKEEPING REVISIONS; A
) NEW METRO PLAN CHAPTER III-C: ENVIRONMENTAL
) RESOURCES ELEMENT; A NEW METRO PLAN DIAGRAM;
) AND ADOPTING SAVINGS AND SEVERABILITY CLAUSES.

WHEREAS, Chapter IV of the Eugene–Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (Metro Plan) sets forth procedures for amendment of the Metro Plan, which for Lane County are implemented by the provisions of Lane Code 12.200 through 12.245; and

WHEREAS, the current Metro Plan, adopted in 1982 and subsequently amended, is in need of modification to reflect changes in State law and local conditions, as required by Periodic Review; and

WHEREAS, following a joint public hearing with the Eugene and Springfield Planning Commissions on June 3 and June 17, 2003, the Lane County Planning Commission recommended the draft Metro Plan Housekeeping Revisions, draft Metro Plan Chapter III-C, and the draft Metro Plan Diagram to the Lane County Board of Commissioners by action taken at a public meeting held by the Planning Commission on November 18, 2003; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners has conducted a public hearing and is now ready to take action based upon the above recommendations and the evidence and testimony already in the record as well as the evidence and testimony presented at the public hearing held in the matter of amending the Metro Plan.

NOW THEREFORE, the Board of County Commissioners of Lane County ordains as follows:

Section 1. The revisions in the *Metro Plan Housekeeping Revisions*, as set forth in Exhibit A attached and incorporated herein, are adopted as amendments to the *Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (Metro Plan)*.

Section 2. The *Environmental Resources Element* (Chapter III-C) of the *Metro Plan* is removed, superseded and replaced by a new *Environmental Resources Element* (Chapter III-C), as set forth in Exhibit B attached and incorporated herein, which is hereby adopted as an amendment to the *Metro Plan*.

Section 3. The *Metro Plan Diagram* is removed, superseded and replaced by the *Metro Plan Diagram*, as amended and set forth in Exhibit C attached and incorporated herein, which is hereby adopted as an amendment to the *Metro Plan*.

FURTHER, although not part of this Ordinance, the Board of County Commissioners adopts the Legislative Findings set forth in the attached Exhibit “D.”

The prior designations and provisions repealed by this Ordinance shall remain in full force and effect to authorize prosecution of persons in violation thereof prior to the effective date of this Ordinance.

If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or portion of this Ordinance is for any reason held invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such portion shall be deemed a sepa-

rate, distinct and independent provision and such holding shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions hereof.

ENACTED this _____ day of _____, 2004.

Chair, Lane County Board of Commissioners

Recording Secretary for this Meeting of the Board

APPROVED AS TO FORM

Date 1-14-2004 Lane County


OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL

Exhibit A

Metro Plan Housekeeping Revisions Draft January 8, 2004

Metro Plan Housekeeping Revisions

This document contains proposed housekeeping changes to the *Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (Metro Plan)* to comply, in part, with state-mandated Periodic Review requirements and to make the *Metro Plan* format and text internally consistent and user friendly, as follows:

- Format changes are proposed for all chapters;
- Objectives are eliminated to streamline and clarify the text;
- Text is amended for clarification and corrections, to remove outdated findings and policies, and to reflect updated, adopted *Metro Plan* elements, such as Residential Lands and Housing; Public Facilities and Services; and Transportation.

Added text is shown with a double underline; deleted text is ~~struck-out~~.

The Environmental Resources Element, *Metro Plan* Chapter III-C: Environmental Resources is not contained in this document, but will be inserted into and become part of the Metro Plan with the adoption of the new Metro Plan Chapter III (Exhibit B to the ordinance adopting these Metro Plan Housekeeping Revisions).

Please refer to the new Chapter III-C: Environmental Resources Element (Exhibit B) which addresses Statewide Planning Goal 3: Agricultural Lands, Goal 4: Forest Lands, and Goal 5: Natural Resources and also contains the housekeeping changes described above.

EUGENE-SPRINGFIELD METROPOLITAN AREA GENERAL PLAN

2004 ~~1987~~ Update

Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County

For information about the *Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (Metro Plan)*, contact the following planning agencies:

City of Eugene
Eugene Planning Division
99 West 10th Avenue, Suite 240
Eugene, Oregon 97401
1-541-682-5481

City of Springfield
Development Services Department
225 5th Street
Springfield, Oregon 97477
1-541-726-3759

Lane County
Land Management Division
125 East 8th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon 97401
1-541-682-4061

Lane Council of Governments
99 East Broadway, Suite 400
Eugene, Oregon 97401-3111
1-541-682-4283

For *Metro Plan Replacement Pages* that contain on-going updates to the *Metro Plan*, contact Lane Council of Governments or visit the web site at www.lcog.org/metro.

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
Preface.....	i
I. Introduction.....	I-1
Background.....	I-1
Purpose.....	I-1
<i>Metro Plan</i> Contents.....	I-2
Use of the <i>Metro Plan</i>	I-3
Relationship to Other Plans, Policies, and Reports.....	I-5
General Assumptions and Findings.....	I-7
II. Fundamental Principles and Growth Management Policy Framework.....	II-A-1
A. Fundamental Principles.....	II-A-1
B. Metropolitan Goals.....	II-B-1
C. Growth Management Goals, Findings, and Policies.....	II-C-1
D. Jurisdictional Responsibility.....	II-D-1
E. Urban and Urbanizable Land.....	II-E-1
F. River Road and Santa Clara Goals, Findings, and Policies.....	II-F-1
G. <i>Metro Plan</i> Diagram.....	II-G-1
III. Specific Elements.....	III-A-1
A. Residential Land Use and Housing Element.....	III-A-1
B. Economic Element.....	III-B-1
C. Environmental Resources Element.....	See Separate Document
D. Willamette River Greenway, River Corridors, and Waterways Element.....	III-D-1
E. Environmental Design Element.....	III-E-1
F. Transportation Element.....	III-F-1
G. Public Facilities and Services Element.....	III-G-1
H. Parks and Recreation Facilities Element.....	III-H-1
I. Historic Preservation Element.....	III-I-1
J. Energy Element.....	III-J-1
K. Citizen Involvement Element.....	III-K-1
IV. <i>Metro Plan</i> Review, Amendment, and Refinement.....	IV-1
V. Glossary.....	V-1

Preface

Adoption History

In 1980, Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County adopted updated versions of the *Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (Metro Plan)*. The *Metro Plan* replaced the *Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area 1990 General Plan (1990 Plan)*, which was adopted in 1972.

The Eugene City Council and the Springfield City Council adopted identical versions of the *Metro Plan* in 1980:

Eugene City Council, Ordinance No. 18686, July 28, 1980
Springfield City Council, Ordinance No. 4555, August 4, 1980

The Lane County Board of Commissioners adopted a different version of the *Metro Plan* in 1980:

Original adoption, Ordinance No. 9-80, adopted August 27, 1980
Amended adoption, Ordinance No. 9-80-A, adopted October 14, 1980

The two versions of the *Metro Plan* and supporting documents were forwarded to the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) with a request for acknowledgment of compliance with the 15 applicable statewide planning goals. In reports dated June 25-26, 1981, and September 24-25, 1981, and adopted by LCDC on August 6 (amended version of June 25-26 report) and September 24, 1981, respectively, LCDC outlined the requirements necessary to bring the August 1980 versions of the *Metro Plan* into conformance with state standards.

From September 1980 to February 1982, Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County cooperated, with coordination and technical assistance from the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), to amend the August 1980 versions of the *Metro Plan*. The three general purpose governments used the Elected Officials Coordinating Committee (two elected representatives each as voting members and one ex-officio Planning Commission member from each government) to work out informal compromises and provide policy direction to staff.

In response to LCDC's requirements, 10 working papers were prepared and draft *Metro Plan* amendments were released for public review.

After a joint public hearing by the Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County Planning Commissions on November 17, 1981, and joint public hearings by the Eugene City Council, Springfield City Council, and Lane County Board of Commissioners on December 15, 1981, and January 12, 1982 (Goal 5), the three governing bodies informally agreed to the amendments in this document.

Following the January 12, 1982, joint meeting, each governing body adopted the mutually agreed upon amendments contained in this document:

Lane County, Ordinance No. 856, adopted February 3, 1982
City of Eugene, Ordinance No. 18927, adopted February 8, 1982
City of Springfield, Ordinance No. 5024, adopted March 1, 1982

In February 1982, the City of Eugene began work on the *Willow Creek Special Area Study* (Study). The Study resulted in proposed amendments to the *Metro Plan* Diagram. These ~~Willow Creek diagram~~ amendments, as approved by Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County, and the ~~Lane Council of Governments~~, are incorporated into this document. Based on the adoption of these amendments, the three governments have had a common version of the *Metro Plan*.

After completing other LCDC required work specific to each jurisdiction, the amended *Metro Plan* and supporting documents were resubmitted to LCDC with a second request for acknowledgment with the 15 applicable goals. After conducting a hearing in Salem on August 19, 1982, the LCDC granted acknowledgment for the portion of the *Metro Plan* within the urban growth boundary. ~~LCDC's acknowledgment included the 1982 Amendments to the *Metro Metropolitan Plan* and the Willow Creek *Metro Metropolitan Plan* amendments.~~

Although the *Metro Plan* was acknowledged by LCDC in August, the rural portions of the *Metro Plan* were segmented and continued in order to correct deficiencies under Goals 2, 4, 5, and 15. The appropriate corrections were made and on September 13, 1985, LCDC acknowledged the rural portion of the *Metro Plan*.

Metro Plan Updates

The *1990 Plan* stated that a review should be conducted between major five-year ~~plan~~ updates by the Metropolitan Area Planning Advisory Committee (MAPAC), planning commissions, and governing bodies. In September 1984, a work program for a two and one-half year mid-period review for the *Metro Plan* was adopted by the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC). In accordance with the Post Acknowledgment plan review procedures of ORS 197.610-650, proposed amendments to the *Metro Plan* were transmitted to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) on October 21, 1985. DLCD presented the metropolitan area with a Post Acknowledgment Review Report on the proposed amendments on December 9, 1985. Governing bodies of Lane County, Springfield, and Eugene took final unanimous action on the proposed amendments to the *Metro Plan* on June 11, May 5, and April 23, 1986, respectively. The amendments are contained in this document:

Lane County, Ordinance No. 709
City of Eugene, Ordinance No. 19382
City of Springfield, Ordinance No. 5329

Periodic Review

Pursuant to ORS 197.610-650, local governments are required to update their comprehensive plans and land use regulations through the Periodic Review process in order to bring plans into compliance with new state law and administrative rules and to ensure that the plans address changing local conditions. ~~the LCDC periodically reviews each local government's comprehensive plan and land use regulations.~~ The DLCD initiated the first Periodic Review of the *Metro Plan* and land use regulations on June 28, 1985. A series of Metro Plan amendments were adopted by all three governing bodies as part of the periodic review process and are reflected in this document. The second Periodic Review process was initiated in May 1995. This *Metro Plan* is also subject to citizen- and government-initiated amendments which are incorporated into the document via *Metro Plan* replacement pages. This *Metro Plan* and replacement pages are available at LCOG and www.lcog.org.

Chapter I

Introduction

Background

The 2003 *Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (Metro Plan)* is the third ~~first~~ update of the *1990 Plan*. The *1990 Plan*, adopted in 1972, provided that a major update of the comprehensive plan General Plan should be initiated every five years. This reflects the fact that comprehensive plans a general plan must be adaptable to the changing needs and circumstances of the community if they it is are to retain their its validity and usefulness.

Therefore, this *Metro Plan* is not an entirely new product, but rather has evolved from and reflects needed changes to the original 1990 Plan.

The *Metro Plan* was acknowledged by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) in 1982 for the area inside the urban growth boundary (UGB). The remaining area was acknowledged in September 1985. The Metro Plan was updated in 1987 and in 2004 through periodic review.

Purpose

The *Metro Plan* is the official long-range comprehensive general plan (public policy document) of metropolitan Lane County and the cities of Eugene and Springfield. Its policies and land use designations apply only within the area under the jurisdiction of the *Metro Plan as described in Chapter II-D. the Plan Boundary (see Metro Plan Diagram map in Chapter II).* The *Metro Plan* sets forth general planning policies and land use allocations and serves as the basis for the coordinated development of programs concerning the use and conservation of physical resources, furtherance of assets, and development or redevelopment of the metropolitan area.

The *Metro Plan* is intended to designate a sufficient amount of urbanizable land to accommodate the need for further urban expansion, taking into account the growth policy of the area to accommodate a population of 286,000~~293,700~~ within the UGB by the year 2015.¹ The *Metro Plan* also identifies the major public facilities required to meet the land use needs designated within the UGB.

More specifically, the *Metro Plan* provides the overall framework for the following planning functions. The *Metro Plan*:

1. The population projection range for the Residential Land Use and Housing Element in Chapter III-A is 291,700 to 311,100. The expected population for the year 2015 is 301,400. This projection is for the Metropolitan Study Area, a census tract area much larger than the UGB. The projection was used as the basis for deriving the population figure of 286,000 for the UGB for the year 2015 for the residential lands analysis performed in the 1999 Residential Lands and Housing Study.

1. Guides all governments and agencies in the metropolitan area in developing and implementing their own activities which relate to the public planning process.
2. Establishes the policy basis for a general, coordinated, long-range approach among affected agencies for the provision of the facilities and services needed in the metropolitan area.
3. Makes planning information available to assist citizens to better understand the basis for public and private planning decisions and encourages their participation in the planning process.
4. Provides the public with general guidelines for individual planning decisions. Reference to supplemental planning documents of a more localized scope, including neighborhood refinement plans, is advisable when applying the *Metro Plan* to specific parcels of land or individual tax lots.
5. Assists citizens in measuring the progress of the community and its officials in achieving the *Metro Plan*'s goals and objectives.
6. Provides continuity in the planning process over an extended period of time.
7. Establishes a means for consistent and coordinated planning decisions by all public agencies and across jurisdictional lines.
8. Serves as a general planning framework to be augmented, as needed, by more detailed planning programs to meet the specific needs of the various local governments.
9. Provides a basis for public decisions for specific issues when it is determined that the *Metro Plan*, without refinement, contains a sufficient level of information and policy direction.
10. Recognizes the social and economic effects of physical planning policies and decisions.
11. Identifies the major transportation, wastewater, stormwater, and water projects needed to serve a future UGB population of 286,000~~301,400~~.

***Metro Plan* Contents**

As indicated in the Purpose section, the *Metro Plan* provides the overall policy framework for planning in this community. The five chapters of the *General Plan* are include: Introduction; Fundamental Principles; *Metro Plan* Elements; ~~and~~ *Metro Plan* Review, Amendments, and Refinements, ~~and Jurisdictional Responsibility~~; and The *Plan* Glossary. is in Chapter V.

Fundamental Principles

Chapter II sets forth the basic concepts of the *Metro Plan*, including geographical growth management and a UGB. ~~compact urban service area~~. It is intended to tie the specific elements in Chapter III together into a comprehensive public policy document.

Components of Chapter II, the Fundamental Principles, are: Metropolitan Goals; Growth Management Goals, Findings, and Policies; Eugene and Springfield Jurisdictional Responsibility; Urban and Urbanizable Land; River Road and Santa Clara Goals, Findings, and Policies; and the *Metro Plan* Diagram.

Metro Plan Elements

Chapter III is composed of specific elements, including ~~within each~~ an introductory text, applicable goals from Chapter II, and findings, ~~objectives~~, and policies.² The specific elements are: Residential Land Use and Housing; ~~Economy~~ Economic; Environmental Resources; Willamette River Greenway, River Corridors, and Waterways; Environmental Design; Transportation; Public Facilities and Services; Parks and Recreation Facilities; Historic Preservation; Energy; and Citizen Involvement.

Metro Plan Review, Amendments, and Refinements

Chapter IV of the *Metro Plan* establishes the procedures for ensuring that the *Metro Plan* retains its applicability to changing circumstances in the community. It includes procedures and time schedules for reviewing and updating the *Metro Plan*, provides procedures for amending it and resolving conflicts, and recognizes that refinement will be necessary where conflicts exist.

Glossary

Chapter V, the Glossary, includes terms used in the *Metro Plan* that might otherwise be unclear or misinterpreted.

Appendices

The following information is available at Lane Council of Governments (LCOG):

- Appendix A Public Facility Plan Project Lists and Maps for Water, Stormwater, Wastewater, Electricity, and Transportation [These lists and maps are located in Chapter II of the 2001 *Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area Public Facilities and Services Plan* and 2001 *Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area Transportation Plan (TransPlan)*]
- Appendix B List of Refinement and Functional Plans and Map of Refinement Plan Boundaries
- Appendix C List of Exceptions and Maps of Site-Specific Exception Area Boundaries

² Through updates to the *Metro Plan*, the objectives and policies are being combined. Eventually, each element will contain only findings and policies.

Appendix D Auxiliary Maps showing the following:

- Fire station locations
- Urban growth boundary
- Greenway boundary
- Schools
- Parks

Use of the *Metro Plan*

The *Metro Plan* is a policy document intended to provide the three jurisdictions and other agencies and districts with a coordinated guide for change over a long period of time. The major components of this policy document are: the written text, which includes goals, findings, and policies; the *Metro Plan* Diagram; and other supporting materials. These terms are defined below:

- A goal is a broad statement of philosophy that describes the hopes of the people of the community for the future of the community. A goal may never be completely attainable, but is used as a point to strive for.

- A finding is a factual statement resulting from investigation, analysis, or observation.

- An assumption is a position, projection, or conclusion considered to be reasonable. Assumptions differ from findings in that they are not known facts.

- ~~A goal is a broad statement of philosophy that describes the hopes of the people of the community for the future of the community. A goal may never be completely attainable, but is used as a point to strive for.~~

~~An objective is an attainable target that the community attempts to reach in striving to meet a goal. An objective may also be considered as an intermediate point that will help fulfill the overall goal.~~

- A policy is a statement adopted as part of the *Metro Plan* to provide a consistent course of action, moving the community towards attainment of its goals.

- The *Metro Plan* Diagram is a graphic depiction of: (a) the broad allocation of projected land use needs in the metropolitan area; and (b) goals, objectives, and policies embodied in the text of the *Metro Plan*. Some of the information shown on the *Metro Plan* Diagram depicts includes land use designation categories, the metropolitan urban growth boundary, the *Metro Plan* Plan Boundary (Plan Boundary), and major transportation corridors.

The revised goals, objectives, and policies contained in this *Metro Plan* are not presented in any particular order of importance. The respective jurisdictions recognize that there are apparent conflicts and inconsistencies between and among some goals, objectives, and policies. When making decisions based on the *Metro Plan*, not all of the goals, objectives, and policies can be

met to the same degree in every instance. Use of the *Metro Plan* requires a balancing of its various components on a case-by-case basis, as well as a selection of those goals, objectives, and policies most pertinent to the issue at hand.

The policies which follow in the *Metro Plan* vary in their scope and implications. Some call for immediate action; others call for lengthy study aimed at developing more specific policies later on; and still others suggest or take the form of policy statements. The common theme of all the policies is acceptance of them as suitable approaches toward problem-solving and goal realization. Other valid approaches may exist and may at any time be included in ~~put into~~ the *Metro Plan* through plan amendment procedures. Adoption of the *Metro Plan* does not necessarily commit the jurisdictions to immediately carry out each policy to the letter, but does put them on record as having recognized the validity of the policies and the decisions or actions they imply. The jurisdictions can then begin to carry out the policies to the best of their ability, given sufficient time and resources.

In addition, it is important to recognize that the written text of the *Metro Plan* takes precedence over the *Metro Plan* Diagram where apparent conflicts or inconsistencies exist. The *Metro Plan* Diagram is a generalized map which is intended to graphically reflect the broad goals, objectives, and policies. As such, it cannot be used independently from or take precedence over the written portion of the *Metro Plan*.

The degree to which the *Metro Plan* provides sufficient detail to meet the needs of each jurisdiction will have to be determined by the respective jurisdictions; and where conflicts exist among the *Metro Plan*, refinement plans, and existing zoning, each jurisdiction will have to establish its own schedule for bringing the zoning and refinement plans into conformance with the *Metro Plan*.

It is recognized that the needs, priorities, and resources vary with each jurisdiction and that the methods and timing used to implement the *Metro Plan* will also vary.

Relationship to Other Plans, and Policies, and Reports

~~Where~~ ~~The~~ *Metro Plan* is the basic guiding land use policy document, and but it is not the only such document. As indicated in the Purpose section, above, the *Metro Plan* is a framework plan, and it is important that it be supplemented by more detailed refinement plans, programs, and policies. Due to budget limits and other responsibilities, all such plans, programs, and policies cannot be pursued simultaneously. Normally, however, those of a metropolitan-wide scale should receive priority status.

Refinements to the *Metro Plan* can include: (a) city-wide comprehensive policy documents, such as the 1984 Eugene Community Goals and Policies; (b) functional plans and policies addressing single subjects throughout the area, such as the 2001 *Eugene-Springfield Public Facilities and Services Plan (Public Facilities and Services Plan)* and 2001 *TransPlan* ~~water, sewer, or transportation plans~~; and (c) neighborhood plans or special area studies that address those issues that are unique to a specific geographical area. In all cases, the *Metro Plan* is the guiding document, and refinement plans and policies must be consistent with the *Metro Plan*.

Should inconsistencies occur, the *Metro Plan* is the prevailing policy document. The process for reviewing and adopting refinement plans is outlined in Chapter IV.

The diagram below indicates the relationship of the *Metro Plan* to refinement plans and policies.

delete graphic

Relationship to Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan

The Plan Boundary shown on the *Metro Plan* Diagram in Chapter II is boundaries of the ~~Metropolitan Area General Plan~~ are adjacent to the boundaries of the *Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan* that surround the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area. There is no overlap between the boundaries of the *Metro Plan* and that of the *Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan*. Lane Code Chapter 16 is applied in the area between the UGB and the Plan Boundary to implement the *Metro Plan*.

Adjustments to boundaries may occur in the future so that areas previously a part of one plan are covered under another plan. These adjustments may occur using the *Metro Plan* review and amendment procedures described in Chapter IV.

Relationship to Statewide Planning Goals

As required by state law, the *Metro Plan* has been developed in accordance with the statewide planning goals adopted by the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC), and published in April 1977, as amended through June 1997. These goals provide the standards and set the framework for the planning programs of all governmental agencies and bodies in the metropolitan area. The *Metro Plan* addresses each of the LCDC goals (as well as local goals) and contains objectives and policies that aimed at compliance comply with the LCDC goals.

Relationship to the Technical Supplement and, Working Papers, and Public Facilities Plan

The *Metro Plan* ~~is~~ was based on a work programs approved by the Metropolitan Plan Policy Committee (MPC) and by the governing bodies of Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County after review and hearings by the respective planning commissions (and MAPAC for the 1982 *Metro Plan*). Based on these is work programs, an inventories, reviews, and analyses of a number of *Metro Plan* relevant elements are were conducted. These included population projections, land use and housing (supply and demand), public facilities and services, utilities, and natural assets and constraints.

~~From this inventory, review, and analysis, A set of working papers³ was ere-developed for the 1982 *Metro Plan* that which describes the relevant issues and factors concerning each subject, and from these analyses, findings were drawn. These findings, in turn, formed an important~~

³ The working papers are on file for public use in the Springfield, Lane County, and Eugene planning offices, and at the Lane Council of Governments LCOG.

share of the basis for the goals, objectives, and policies in this plan. In addition, several new or expanded elements were developed from working papers, partly to comply with LCDC Goals.

The 1978 *Technical Supplement*, a product of the working papers and the various reports prepared during preparation of the first update of the *Metro Plan* diagram, is available under separate cover. It was written for use by those who wish more information on the technical aspects of the *Metro Plan* and its preparation. It can also be of assistance for in-depth analysis of metropolitan planning issues.

The working papers and *Technical Supplement* have been amended through updates of individual elements in Chapter III. ~~may be amended in conjunction with a Plan amendment (refer to Chapter IV).~~ During a major five-year updates, working papers and the *Technical Supplement* are reviewed and updated as part of a comprehensive work program. Applicable working papers and the *Technical Supplement* are referenced by ordinance when subsequent *Metro Plan* amendments are adopted. As new information is obtained, draft working papers may be prepared in advance of proposed amendments to integrate the new information into the *Metro Plan* data base. A current list of working papers ~~is~~ will be maintained by the Lane Council of Governments LCOG.

~~The Public Facilities Plan also serves as a background information document supporting the Metropolitan Plan. The only portions of the Public Facilities Plan which establish public policy are incorporated in Metropolitan Plan policy and in Appendix A.~~

General Assumptions and Findings and Assumptions

~~Unlike findings associated with a single specific element or section of the Plan, t~~The following general findings and assumptions and findings relate to the entire *Metro Plan*. They are listed included in the Introduction because of their general application.

General Assumptions

1. A population of ~~286,000~~293,700 is expected to reside within the metropolitan UGB area by the year 201500. This is a ~~29~~59 percent increase from the estimated 2000~~1977~~ census population of ~~222,500~~184,300. Since this *Metro Plan* is designed to accommodate the expected population rather than remain static until 201500, it can be adjusted periodically as changes in population trends are detected.
2. Based on recent trends, the rate of population growth and the rate of in-migration are projected to decrease.
3. In addition to population growth, increasing household formation rates (i.e., decreasing average household size) will increase the demand for housing.
4. In addition to population growth, increasing labor force participation rates will increase the resident labor force, thereby increasing the demand for employment opportunities.

5. The metropolitan area will experience continuing growth of the local economy.
6. Based on projections of recent population and economic trends, there will be sufficient land within the urban growth boundary, depicted on the *Metro Plan* Diagram in Chapter II, to ensure reasonable choices in the market place for urban needs to serve a metropolitan UGB area population of 286,000~~293,700~~, provided periodic updates of the *Metro Plan* are conducted and the area designated for urbanization on the *Metro Plan* Diagram is updated to assure that the supply remains responsive to demand.
7. Public policies controlling the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area's growth pattern will continue to be effective. For example, compact urban growth will continue to enhance the opportunity to preserve important natural assets, such as rural open space and agricultural land.
8. Additional urban development will take place within incorporated cities.

General Findings

- ~~1.~~ The average annual growth rate in the metropolitan area decreased from 3.1 percent in the 1960s to 2.6 percent between 1970 and 1975. This is the lowest it has been since 1930.
- ~~2.1.~~ Orderly metropolitan growth cannot be accomplished without coordination of public investments. Such coordination can be enhanced through use of the *Public Facilities and Services Plan* and scheduling of priorities.
- ~~3.2.~~ When urban growth is allowed to occur without consideration for the physical characteristics of the land, it creates problems that are then difficult to solve.
- ~~4.3.~~ The development and implementation of planning policies have social and economic impacts.
- ~~5.4.~~ Financial and taxing inequities are generated when urban development is allowed to occur in unincorporated areas on the periphery of Springfield and Eugene because many residents of such developments are at least partially dependent on streets, parks, and other non-direct fee facilities and services provided by those cities and financed from their revenues.

Chapter II

Fundamental Principles and Growth Management Policy Framework

This chapter contains Fundamental Principles that reflect the overall themes of the *Metro Plan*. The chapter also contains: *Metropolitan Goals*; *Growth Management Goals, Findings, and Policies*; *Eugene and Springfield Jurisdictional Responsibility*; *Urban and Urbanizable Land*; *River Road and Santa Clara Goals, Findings and Policies*; and *Metro Plan Diagram*.

A. Fundamental Principles

There are seven principles ~~themes~~ that are ~~basic~~ or fundamental to the entire *Metro Plan*. They are implicitly included in the various individual *Metro Plan* components. These Fundamental Principles are:

1. The *Metro Plan* is a long-range policy document providing the framework within which more detailed refinement plans are prepared. This concept is discussed in more detail in ~~Section E~~ of the Introduction (Chapter I).
2. To be meaningful, the *Metro Plan* requires cooperation by all general purpose, special district, and special function agencies in the community. This reflects its comprehensive nature encompassing physical land use, social, and economic implications for the metropolitan area. Examples where cooperation is essential include planning and implementation of a transportation system, development of a metropolitan-wide energy plan, metropolitan-wide analysis and resolution of certain housing issues, and planning for areas outside the urban growth boundary (UGB) and within the Plan Boundary.
3. The *Metro Plan* and most of its elements are oriented to and require that urban development occur in a compact configuration within the metropolitan UGB ~~a prescribed urban service area~~. Elaboration of this principle is treated in the other sSections B, C, D and E of this chapter, and in the Public Facilities and Services Element in Chapter III.
4. Comprehensive plans identify and establish the plan-zoning consistency concept and recognize the importance of timing concerning implementation techniques. Implementation techniques, including zoning, shall generally be consistent with the precepts established in the *Metro Plan*, which is the broad policy document for the metropolitan area. The consistency test shall continuously be applied to implementation measures and public actions taken to rectify inconsistencies when the general direction provided by the *Metro Plan* is modified. A variety of potential solutions to consistency problems exist, including modification to the *Metro Plan* or alteration to the implementation techniques themselves.
5. The zoning process shall be monitored and adjusted to meet current urban land use demands through the planning period for all land use categories.

6. The *Metro Plan* is based on the premise that Eugene and Springfield, the two existing cities, are the logical providers of services accommodating urban levels of development within the UGB.
7. The *Metro Plan* was developed to meet the supporting facilities and services necessary to serve a population of 286,000~~293,700~~ within the UGB by the year 2015. ~~That population level may be reached before or after the year 2000, depending upon the rate of growth. The *Plan* is based on the needs of a future population level and not a specific year.~~

B. Metropolitan Goals

~~While the following Metropolitan Goals are listed under the topic heading applicable section in this chapter or in each the first section of this chapter are also stated in connection with of the individual *Metro Plan* elements Chapter III (*Metro Plan* Elements) and Chapter IV (*Metro Plan* Review, Amendments, and Refinements), they are central to the entire *Plan*, so they are included here as well as in the order they appear in the *Plan*.~~

Growth Management and the Urban Service Area

1. Use urban, urbanizable, and rural lands efficiently.
2. Encourage orderly and efficient conversion of land from rural to urban uses in response to urban needs, taking into account metropolitan and statewide goals.
3. Protect rural lands best suited for non-urban uses from incompatible urban encroachment.

Residential Land Use and Housing

1. Provide viable residential communities so all residents can choose sound, affordable housing that meets individual needs.

~~Economy~~ Economic

1. Broaden, improve, and diversify the metropolitan economy while maintaining or enhancing the environment.

Environmental Resources

1. Protect valuable natural resources and encourage their wise management and proper use and reuse, reflecting their special natural assets.
2. Maintain a variety of open spaces within and on the fringe of the developing area.
3. Protect life and property from the effects of natural hazards.
4. Provide a healthy and attractive environment, including clean air and clean water, for the metropolitan population.

Willamette River Greenway, River Corridors, and Waterways

1. Protect, conserve, and enhance the natural, scenic, environmental, and economic qualities of river and waterway corridors.

Environmental Design

- | 1. Secure a safe, clean, and comfortable environment which is satisfying to the mind and senses.
- | 2. Encourage the development of the natural, social, and economic environment in a manner that is harmonious with our natural setting and maintains and enhances our quality of life.
- | 3. Create and preserve desirable and distinctive qualities in local and neighborhood areas.

Transportation

- | 1. Provide an integrated transportation and land use system that supports choices in modes of travel and development patterns that will reduce reliance on the automobile and enhance livability, economic opportunity, and the quality of life.
- | 2. Enhance the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area's quality of life and economic opportunity by providing a transportation system that is:
 - Balanced,
 - Accessible,
 - Efficient,
 - Safe,
 - Interconnected,
 - Environmentally responsible,
 - Supportive of responsible and sustainable development,
 - Responsive to community needs and neighborhood impacts, and
 - Economically viable and financially stable.

Public Facilities and Services

- | 1. Provide and maintain public facilities and services in an efficient and environmentally responsible manner.
- | 2. Provide public facilities and services in a manner that encourages orderly and sequential growth.

Parks and Recreation Facilities

- | 1. Provide a variety of parks and recreation facilities to serve the diverse needs of the community's citizens.

Historic Preservation

- | 1. Preserve and restore reminders of our origin and historic development as links between past, present, and future generations.

Energy

- | 1. Maximize the conservation and efficient utilization of all types of energy.
- | 2. Develop environmentally acceptable energy resource alternatives.

Citizen Involvement

- | 1. Continue to develop, maintain, and refine programs and procedures that maximize the opportunity for meaningful, ongoing citizen involvement in the community's planning and planning implementation processes consistent with mandatory statewide planning standards.

| ***Metro Plan* Review, Amendments, and Refinements**

- | 1. Ensure that the *Metro Plan* is responsive to the changing conditions, needs, and attitudes of the community ~~and is fully integrated with surrounding subarea plans.~~

C. Growth Management Goals, Findings, and Policies

To effectively control the potential for urban sprawl and scattered urbanization, compact growth and the urban growth boundary (UGB) ~~service area~~ concepts are, and will remain, the primary growth management techniques for directing geographic patterns of urbanization in the community. In general, this means the filling in of vacant and underutilized lands, as well as redevelopment inside the UGB.

Outward expansion of the ~~projected urban service area, as defined in the Glossary~~ UGB, will occur only when it is proven necessary according to the policies set forth in this *Metro Plan*, particularly in this element.

Goals

1. Use urban, urbanizable, and rural lands efficiently.
2. Encourage orderly and efficient conversion of land from rural to urban uses in response to urban needs, taking into account metropolitan and statewide goals.
3. Protect rural lands best suited for non-urban uses from incompatible urban encroachment.

Findings and Policies

Findings

1. Many metropolitan areas within the United States that have not implemented geographic growth management techniques suffer from scattered or leapfrog urban growth that leaves vacant and underutilized land in its path and encourages isolated residential developments far from metropolitan centers. Until adoption of the *1990 Plan's* urban service area concept, portions of this metropolitan area were characterized by these phenomena.
2. Beneficial results of compact urban growth include:
 - a. Use of most vacant leftover parcels where utilities assessed to abutting property owners are already in place.
 - b. Protection of productive forest lands, agricultural lands, and open space from premature urban development.
 - c. More efficient use of limited fuel energy resources and greater use of bicycle and pedestrian facilities due to less miles of streets and less auto dependence than otherwise would be required.

- d. Decreased acreage of leapfrogged vacant land, thus resulting in more efficient and less costly provision and use of utilities, roads, and public services such as fire protection.
 - e. Greater urban public transit efficiency by providing a higher level of service for a given investment in transit equipment and the like.
- 3. The disadvantages of a too-compact UGB can be a disproportionately greater increase in the value of vacant land within the Eugene-Springfield area, which would contribute to higher housing prices. Factors other than size and location of the UGB and city limits affect land and housing costs. These include site characteristics, interest rates, state and federal tax laws, existing public service availability, and future public facility costs.
 - 4. Periodic evaluation of land use needs compared to land supply provides a basis for orderly and non-excessive conversion of rural land to urbanizable land and provides a basis for public action to adjust the supply upward in response to the rate of consumption.
 - 5. Prior to the late 1960s, Eugene and Springfield had no growth management policy and, therefore, growth patterns were generally dictated by natural physical characteristics.
 - 6. Mandatory statewide planning goals adopted by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) require that all communities in the state establish UGBs to identify and separate urbanizable land from rural land.
 - 7. Between 1970 and 1983, Springfield's population increased about 4 percent and Eugene's about 2.5 percent a year, but unincorporated portions of the metropolitan area experienced a population decline. About 17 percent of the total increase in the population was related to annexations. This indicates that growth is occurring in cities, which is consistent with the compact urban growth ~~urban service area~~ concept, and limitations on urban scatteration into unincorporated areas, as first embodied in the *1990 Plan*.
 - 8. In addition to Finding 7 above, evidence that the UGB ~~service area~~ is an effective growth management tool includes the following:
 - a. Consistent reduction over time of vacant land within the UGB.
 - b. Reduction of vacant residential zoned land in Springfield and Eugene.
 - c. Greater value of vacant land within Springfield and Eugene than similar land outside incorporated areas but within the UGB ~~projected urban service area~~.
 - d. Increase since 1970 of the proportionate share of residential building permits issued within city limits.

9. Reduction in the use of zoning provisions and regulatory processes that favor single-family detached dwellings on standard size parcels would increase the opportunity to realize higher net residential densities than are presently occurring, particularly in newly developing areas.
10. A variety of public services are provided by Lane County and special service districts to unincorporated portions of the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area.
11. In 1986, the Cities of Eugene and Springfield entered into Urban Transition Agreements with Lane County which transferred from the County to the Cities administration for building and land use within the urbanizable portion of the UGB.

Goals

- ~~1. Use urban, urbanizable, and rural lands efficiently.~~
- ~~2. Encourage orderly and efficient conversion of land from rural to urban uses in response to urban needs, taking into account metropolitan and statewide goals.~~
- ~~3. Protect rural lands best suited for nonurban uses from incompatible urban encroachment.~~

Objectives

- ~~1. Continue to minimize urban scatteration and sprawl by encouraging compact growth and sequential development.~~
- ~~2. Insure that land supply is kept in proper relationship to land use needs.~~
- ~~3. Conserve those lands needed to efficiently accommodate expected urban growth.~~
- ~~4. Protect rural land and open space from premature urbanization.~~
- ~~5. When necessary to meet urban needs, utilize the least productive agricultural lands for needed expansion.~~
- ~~6. Encourage new and maintain existing rural land uses where productive or beneficial outside the urban growth boundary.~~
- ~~7. Shape and plan for a compact urban growth form to provide for growth while preserving the special character of the metropolitan area.~~
- ~~8. Encourage development of suitable vacant, underdeveloped, and redevelopable land where services are available, thus capitalizing on public expenditures already made for these services.~~

~~9. Protect life and property from natural hazards and natural disasters.~~

~~10. Allow smaller outlying communities the opportunity to plan for their own futures without being engulfed by unlimited outward expansion of the metropolitan area.~~

~~11. Identify methods of establishing an urban transition program which will eventually reduce service delivery inefficiencies by providing for the provision of key urban services only by cities.~~

Policies

1. The UGB and sequential development shall continue to be implemented as an essential means to achieve compact urban growth. The provision of all urban services shall be concentrated inside the UGB.
2. The UGB shall lie along the outside edge of existing and planned rights-of-way that form a portion of the UGB so that the full right-of-way is within the UGB.
3. Control of location, timing, and financing of the major public investments that directly influence the growth form of the metropolitan area shall be planned and coordinated on a metropolitan-wide basis.
4. Lane County shall discourage urban development in urbanizable and rural areas and encourage compact development of outlying communities.
5. To maintain the existing physical autonomy of the smaller outlying communities, urban development on agricultural and rural lands beyond the projected service boundary UGB shall be restricted and based on at least the following criteria:
 - a. Preservation and conservation of natural resources.
 - b. Conformity with the policies and provisions of the *Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan* that borders the metropolitan area.
 - c. Conformance with applicable mandatory statewide planning goals.
6. Outlying communities close to Springfield and Eugene shall be encouraged to develop plans and programs in support of compact urban development.
7. Conversion of rural and rural agricultural land to urbanizable land through *Metro Plan* amendments expanding the projected service area UGB shall be consistent with mandatory statewide planning goal.
8. Land within the UGB may be converted from urbanizable to urban only through annexation to a city when it is found that:

- a. A minimum level of key urban facilities and services can be provided to the area in an orderly and efficient manner.
 - b. There will be a logical area and time within which to deliver urban services and facilities. Conversion of urbanizable land to urban shall also be consistent with the *Metro Plan*.
9. A full range of key urban facilities and services shall be provided to urban areas according to demonstrated need and budgetary priorities.
10. Annexation to a city through normal processes shall continue to be the highest priority.
11. The tax differential concept, as provided for in ORS 222.111 (2), shall be one mechanism that ~~which~~ can be employed in urban transition areas.
12. When the following criteria are met, either Springfield or Eugene may annex land which is not contiguous to its boundaries.
 - a. The area to be annexed will be provided an urban service(s) which is (are) desired immediately by residents/property owners.
 - b. The area to be annexed can be serviced (with minimum level of key urban facilities and services as directed in the *Metro Plan*) in a timely and cost-efficient manner and is a logical extension of the city's service delivery system.
 - b. The annexation proposal is accompanied by support within the area proposed for annexation from the owners of at least half the land area in the affected territory.
13. Police, fire and emergency medical services may be provided through extraterritorial extension w~~With a signed annexation agreement or initiation of a transition plan, and upon concurrence by the serving jurisdiction, extraterritorial extension of services for specific life safety services shall be granted.~~
14. Both Eugene and Springfield shall examine potential assessment deferral programs for low-income households.
15. Creation of new special service districts or zones of benefit within the jurisdictional Plan Boundary ~~boundaries~~ of the *Metro Plan* shall be considered only when all of the following criteria are satisfied:
 - a. There is no other method of delivering public services which are required to mitigate against extreme health hazard or public safety conditions.
 - b. The three metropolitan area general purpose governments concur with the proposal to form the service district or zone of benefit.

- c. The district or zone of benefit is an interim service delivery method, and there are legal assurances, such as annexation agreements, to ensure that annexation to the appropriate city occurs within the planning period.
 - d. The servicing city is not capable of providing the full range of urban facilities and services in the short term, although it is recognized that urban facilities and services will be provided by a city consistent with adopted public facilities plans and capital improvement programs.
 - e. The district or zone of benefit will contract with the appropriate city for interim service delivery until ~~annexation~~ annexed to the appropriate city.
16. Ultimately, land within the UGB shall be annexed to a city and provided with the required minimum level of urban facilities and services. While the time frame for annexation may vary, annexation should occur as land transitions from urbanizable to urban.
 17. Eugene and Springfield and their respective utility branches, Eugene Water & Electric Board (EWEB) and Springfield Utility Board (SUB), shall be the water and electrical service providers within the UGB.
 18. As annexations to cities occur over time, existing special service districts within the UGB shall be dissolved. The cities should consider developing intergovernmental agreements, which address transition issues raised by annexation, with affected special service districts.
 19. The realignment (possible consolidation or merger) of fringe special service districts shall be examined to:
 - a. Promote urban service transition to cities within the UGB.
 - b. Provide continued and comprehensive rural level services to property and people outside the UGB.
 - c. Provide more efficient service delivery and more efficient governmental structure for serving the immediate urban fringe.
 20. Annexation of territory to existing service districts within the UGB shall occur only when the following criteria are met:
 - a. Immediate annexation to a city is not possible because the required ~~public~~ minimum level of key urban facilities and services cannot be provided in a timely manner (within five years, as outlined in an adopted capital improvements program).

- b. Except for areas that have no fire protection, affected property owners have signed consent to annex agreements with the applicable city ~~which meet the “triple majority” requirements of the~~ consistent with Oregon annexation law.

Such annexations shall be considered as interim service delivery solutions until ultimate annexation to a city occurs.

- 21. When unincorporated territory within the UGB is provided with any new urban service, that service shall be provided by the following method (in priority order).
 - a. Annexation to a city;
 - b. Contractual annexation agreements with a city;
 - c. Annexation to an existing district (under conditions described previously in Policy ~~#1920~~); or
 - d. Creation of a new service district (under conditions described previously in Policy ~~#1415~~).
- 22. Cities shall not extend water or ~~sanitary sewer~~ wastewater service outside city limits to serve a residence or business without first obtaining a valid “triple majority” annexation petition, a consent to annex agreement, or when a health hazard annexation is required.
- 23. Regulatory and fiscal incentives that direct the geographic allocation of growth and density according to adopted plans and policies shall be examined and, when practical, adopted.
- 24. To accomplish the Fundamental Principle of compact urban growth addressed in the text and on the *Metro Plan* Diagram, overall metropolitan-wide density of new residential construction, but not necessarily each project, shall average approximately six dwelling units per gross acre over the planning period.
- 25. When conducting metropolitan planning studies, particularly the *Public Facilities and Services Plan* and ~~Alternative Growth Areas Study~~, consider the orderly provision and financing of public services and the overall impact on population and geographical growth in the metropolitan area. Where appropriate, future planning studies should include specific analysis of the growth impacts suggested by that particular study for the metropolitan area.
- 26. Based upon direction provided in Policies ~~34, 78, and 2324~~ of this section, any development taking place in an urbanizable area ~~or in rural residential designations in an urban reserve area~~ shall be designed to the development standards of the city which would be responsible for eventually providing a minimum level of key urban services to the area. Unless the following conditions are met, the minimum lot size for campus industrial designated areas shall be 50 acres and the minimum lot size for all other

designations shall be 10 acres. ~~Any lot under ten acres in size but larger than five acres to be created in this area on undeveloped or underdeveloped land will require the adjacent city and Lane County to agree that this lot size would be appropriate for the area utilizing the following standards.~~ Creation of new parcels in the urbanizable area will comply with the following standards:

- a. The approval of a conceptual plan for ultimate development at urban densities in accord with applicable plans and policies.
- b. Proposed land uses and densities conform to applicable plans and policies.
- c. The owner of the property has signed an agreement with the adjacent city which provides:
 - (1) The owner and his or her successors in interest are obligated to support annexation proceedings should the city, at its option, initiate annexation.
 - (2) The owner and his or her successors in interest agree not to challenge any annexation of the subject property.
 - (3) The owner and his or her successors in interest will acquire city approval for any subsequent new use, change of use, or substantial intensification of use of the property. The city will not withhold appropriate approval of the use arbitrarily if it is in compliance with applicable plans, policies, and standards, as interpreted by the city, as well as the conceptual plan approved under subsection a above.

27. ~~Any lot under five acres in size to be created in the area described in policy 25 above an~~ urbanizable area will require city-county agreement utilizing the following additional standards:

- a. The property will be owned by a governmental agency or public utility.
- b. A majority of parcels located within 100 feet of the property are smaller than five acres.
- c. No more than three parcels are being created, ~~unless otherwise agreed.~~

28. The siting of all residences on urbanizable lots served by on-site sewage disposal systems shall be reviewed by Lane County to ensure the efficient future conversion of these lots to urban densities according to *Metro Plan* assumptions and minimum density requirements.

29. The approval of on-site sewage disposal systems for rural and urbanizable area uses and developments shall be the responsibility of Lane County, subject to: (a) applicable state law; (b) the criteria for the creation of new lots in Policies 26, ~~and~~ 27 above; (c) the

requirement for the siting of residences in Policy 28 above; (d) requirements of Policy 30; and (e) the requirements for special heavy industrial designated areas.

30. In order to encourage economic diversification, on-site sewage disposal systems shall be allowed for industrial development and for commercial development allowed within Campus Industrial designated areas in conjunction with annexation to a city, when extension of the public sewers wastewater system is ~~are~~ imminent or ~~are~~ is identified as part of an approved capital improvement program.
31. Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County shall continue to involve affected local governments and other urban service providers in development of future, applicable *Metro Plan* revisions, including amendments and updates.
32. ~~The Mohawk Valley, LCC Basin, and urban reserve areas were identified in the *Metro Plan* as alternatives for UGB expansion. The Awbrey Meadowview area has been identified as another alternate growth area. Prior to initiation of the next major *Metropolitan Plan* update, an intergovernmental growth study, jointly funded by all three metropolitan area governments, shall be completed. This study will include a comparative analysis of public costs and policy implications of balanced growth into each of these alternative areas.~~
33. If expansion of the UGB is contemplated, all other options should be considered and eliminated before consideration of expanding the UGB in the area west of Highway 99 and north of Royal Avenue.

Note: For other related policy discussion, see the Public Facilities and Services Element in Chapter, III-G.

D. Eugene and Springfield Jurisdictional Responsibility

The division of responsibility for metropolitan planning between the two cities is the Interstate 5 Highway. Lane County jurisdiction is between the urban growth boundary (UGB) and *Metro Plan* Plan Boundary (Plan Boundary); and the county has joint responsibility with Eugene between the city limits and UGB west of the Interstate 5 Highway and with Springfield between the city limits and UGB east of the Interstate 5 Highway. However, State law (1981) provides a mechanism for creation of a new city in the River Road and Santa Clara area. Refer to Metro Plan Chapter IV and intergovernmental agreements to resolve specific issues of jurisdiction.

E. Urban and Urbanizable Land

This section addresses the need to allow for the orderly and economic extension of public services, the need to provide an orderly conversion of urbanizable to urban land, and the need to provide flexibility for market forces to operate in order to maintain affordable housing choices. For the definitions of urban and urbanizable lands, as well as rural lands and the urban growth boundary (UGB) as used in this section, refer to the *Metro Plan Glossary*.

The undeveloped (urbanizable) area within the UGB, separating urban and urbanizable land from rural land, has been carefully calculated to include an adequate supply to meet demand for a projected population of ~~286,000~~293,700 through the end of the planning period (201500).⁴ With the addition of the urban reserve areas, approximately 25,000 to 30,000 additional people can be accommodated beyond the projected population for the year 2000. However, unless the community consciously decides to limit future expansions of the UGB, one of several ways to accommodate growth, that boundary will be expanded in future plan updates so that before 201500 it will include more urbanizable area reflecting future population and employment needs than that now depicted on the *Metro Plan Diagram*. Accordingly, periodic updates of land use needs and revision of the UGB to reflect extensions of the planning period will ensure that adequate surplus urbanizable land is always available.

The key to addressing the needs stated at the beginning of this section is not so much the establishment of an UGB, but maintaining an adequate and reasonable supply of available undeveloped land at any point in time. The “adequate” and “reasonable” tests are the key to the related phasing and surplus land issues.

In order to maintain an “adequate” supply of available surplus land to allow development to occur, annexation must take place in advance of demand in order to allow for the provision of public capital improvements, such as sewer/wastewater trunk lines, arterial streets, and water trunk lines. Most capital improvement programs are “middle-range” type plans geared three to six years into the future. The time between annexation and the point of finished construction usually involves several steps:

1. The actual annexation and rezoning of the land (with accompanying public hearing processes, including Lane County Local Government Boundary Commission approval.
2. Filing and approval of a subdivision or planned unit development (with accompanying public hearing processes).
3. Extension of public capital improvements (in accordance with programming and funding availability).
4. Construction of the private development (including local extension of streets, sidewalks, sewers/wastewater, water, and electricity, and construction of dwelling units or businesses).

⁴ The population projection range for the Residential Land Use and Housing Element in Chapter III A is 291,700 to 311,100. The expected population for the year 2015 is 301,400.

The time period between initiating annexation and sale of a home or opening of a business varies but can easily take from two to six years.

Large-scale and timely annexations of undeveloped and underdeveloped areas should be encouraged to enhance the opportunity for compact urban growth, an efficient land use pattern, and a well-planned supporting arterial street system.

The approach, as expressed in the following graphic, is to allow the cities to develop annexation programs which will ensure a six- to ten-year surplus of land. Such a range will allow the maintenance of an adequate surplus of land at any point in time. The six- to ten-year surplus is suggested as a reasonable range which will not only allow for the conversion of urbanizable to urban land through annexation but will allow the cities the opportunity and flexibility to plan for and provide urban facilities and services on a large scale. The six-year minimum will allow the cities and other providers of urban services to develop coordinated capital improvement programs in accordance with the *Metro Plan* adopted general plan. Such coordinated capital improvement programs can and should be closely related to implementation of annexation plans.

~~Insert graphic~~

The *Metro Plan* will be updated before undeveloped surplus urban lands are exhausted.

The six- to ten-year low density residential land surplus should be based on the amount of development over the previous six to ten years. For other land use categories, annexation programs should be based on past trends, *Metro Plan* assumptions, and *Metro Plan* Goals, particularly those goals dealing with promotion of economic development and diversity. Improved monitoring techniques made possible by the ~~geographic data system~~ Regional Land Information Database of Lane County (RLID) formerly referred to as the Geographic Information System (GIS) should allow such monitoring to occur. The monitoring information should be provided on a jurisdictional basis and on the metropolitan level.

Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County shall cooperatively monitor and periodically report on development trends and land supply for all categories of residential, commercial, and industrial land. This system shall include consideration of proper zoning, coordinated capital improvements programming, annexation, and other factors necessary to maintain availability of sufficient land to ensure that the supply is responsive to demand in keeping with the Fundamental Principles of the *Metro Plan*.

In summary, the cities should continually monitor the conversion of urbanizable land to urban and pursue active annexation programs based on local policies and applicable provisions of this *Metro Plan* including, for example:

1. Orderly economic provision of public facilities and services (maintenance and development of capital improvement programs).
2. Availability of sufficient land to ensure a supply responsive to demand.

3. Compact urban growth, ~~including development within the current urban service area before conversion of urbanizable lands to urban.~~
4. Cooperation with other utilities and providers of urban services to ensure coordination with their respective capital improvement programs.

F. River Road and Santa Clara Goals, Findings, and Policies

The River Road and Santa Clara portions of the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area are important components of the metropolitan community. Both River Road and Santa Clara have:

- Unique and distinctive neighborhood identities
- Experienced considerable private investment in the past years
- Experienced considerable public investments; e.g., transmission facilities by the Eugene Water & Electric Board (EWEB) and educational facilities by public school systems
- A sound housing stock

In Santa Clara, relatively large parcels of vacant land exist which, with adequate urban services, can be developed at increased densities; in River Road, relatively large developed lots exist which could be further developed by their owners.

The future of both the River Road and Santa Clara areas will play a critical role in the growth of the metropolitan area. For some years, officials of Lane County and Eugene have cooperatively discussed methods of delivering services to these neighborhoods.

These discussions have continually focused on two sides of a single, critical issue:

How can the short-range costs and benefits to the residents and other service providers be balanced against, and what are the long-range costs and benefits to the residents and the entire metropolitan area of logical growth and increased densities?

Inflation has drastically increased the need to balance these two potentially divergent objectives. The effects of continued inflation can be mitigated by identifying and implementing a solution to the servicing issue. ~~(For instance, since 1976, the average construction cost for sewer lines has risen by approximately 90 percent.)~~

A unique set of circumstances has occurred which lends direction to resolution of the service delivery questions for both River Road and Santa Clara.

1. As part of the acknowledgement process for the *Metro Plan*, the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) has directed that a servicing plan be developed for both River Road and Santa Clara and that Eugene provide those services.
2. Discussions between Eugene officials and state and county representatives of the River Road and Santa Clara area have led to reconsideration of Eugene's policy to provide services to these neighborhoods only after annexation to the City of Eugene of both areas has occurred.
3. Preliminary review of Eugene's comprehensive capital improvement program suggested a full range of services could not be provided immediately even if the areas were annexed at one time.

Based on these three conditions, a situation evolved which led to a set of findings, objectives, and policies for inclusion in the *Metro Plan* and ultimately will lead to delivery of urban services to the River Road and Santa Clara areas in cooperation with the residents of these neighborhoods. That situation is as follows.

The City of Eugene constructed and owns the main ~~sanitary-sewage~~wastewater system that serves the River Road and Santa Clara neighborhoods. Eugene has altered its policies pertaining to the service delivery to both River Road and Santa Clara to allow incremental annexation. Annexation must, however, be consistent with state law and other applicable local policies (e.g., the ability of the city to deliver key urban facilities and services in a timely manner). Eugene will pursue annexation only in accordance with applicable state laws and will not use these mechanisms to circumvent the process. In every case, Eugene will make every reasonable attempt to provide for annexation only on a voluntary basis and in accord with previous individual property annexation agreements. The City, in conjunction with Lane County and the citizens of both River Road and Santa Clara, developed a *River Road-Santa Clara Urban Facilities Plan* which is responsive to the basic service infrastructure which is either in place or contemplated for these areas. An integral part of the implementation phase of the *River Road-Santa Clara Urban Facilities Plan* is a financing mechanism which takes into account the financial abilities of residents/property owners and the City of Eugene to pay for service delivery in that area.

The following findings, ~~objectives~~, and policies reflect the situation that evolved:

Findings and Policies

Findings

1. Land supply in the River Road and Santa Clara areas is of metropolitan-wide significance.
2. In order to achieve urban densities, urban services, including public-~~sanitary~~sewerswastewater service, must be provided.
3. For a long period of time, officials of Lane County and Eugene have made great efforts to resolve the service delivery problems for both River Road and Santa Clara.
4. The history and pattern of development in River Road- and Santa Clara have resulted in the creation of two unique metropolitan neighborhoods.
5. The most cost-effective method of service delivery is through annexation.
6. An urban facilities plan is the best method of providing a framework for capital improvements programming in the River Road and Santa Clara areas.

7. Because of the substantial public investments already made in both neighborhoods, it is most cost-efficient to achieve urban densities in River Road and Santa Clara prior to accommodating new development needs in totally undeveloped areas.
8. The 1970 CH2M Hill *Sewerage System Study, River Road-Santa Clara* publication demonstrates the feasibility of providing ~~sanitary sewers~~wastewater service to the River Road- and Santa Clara area in a manner consistent with the *Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Waste Treatment Alternatives Report (208 Facilities Plan)* and the *Metro Plan*.
9. The CH2M Hill publication defined study boundaries and made population projections which are different than those contained in the *Metro Plan*; modifications to these factors is occurring as part of the required system design work prior to construction.
10. The detailed design work which will occur as part of development of the system will allow discussion of various system concepts with the residents and property owners of the River Road and Santa Clara areas.
11. The *River Road-Santa Clara Urban Facilities Plan* has been completed.
12. Based on the *River Road/Santa Clara Groundwater Study, Final Technical Report, February, 1980* by Sweet, Edwards, and Associates, Inc., the Oregon Environmental Quality Commission (EQC) found on April 18, 1980, that:
 - a. The River Road-Santa Clara shallow aquifer is generally contaminated with fecal coliform organisms in excess of drinking water and body contact standards.
 - b. Existing nitrate-nitrogen concentrations within the area exceed the planning target on the average.
 - c. About 73 percent of the nitrate-nitrogen pollutants (and, by analogy, a similar share of the fecal coliform contaminations) result from septic tank effluent. Septic tank pollutants can migrate rapidly to the groundwater from drainfields via macropore travel.
13. The EQC concluded that a public health hazard exists based on fecal coliform data for people using the aquifer for domestic (drinking) or irrigation and that a health hazard similarly exists in several areas based on nitrate-nitrogen levels.
14. To remedy the groundwater pollution problem, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) awarded Eugene a grant to build a ~~sewer~~wastewater system to replace the individual septic systems in use throughout River Road and Santa Clara according to a prescribed time frame.

15. Efforts toward incremental and voluntary annexation of River Road and Santa Clara properties to Eugene and connection to the sewer wastewater system according to the Environmental Protection Agency EPA's time frame have not been successful.

Objectives

- ~~1. Ensure the availability of land in River Road and Santa Clara for urban levels of development.~~
- ~~2. Capitalize on existing public expectations by providing further public services which will allow the River Road and Santa Clara areas to achieve urban densities.~~
- ~~3. Deliver a full range of urban services to the River Road and Santa Clara areas through annexation.~~
- ~~4. Consider the unique situation of the residents of River Road and Santa Clara by providing financing mechanisms which will take into account the financial ability of the residents to pay for service delivery and the City of Eugene's ability to provide these services.~~
- ~~5. Guide capital improvements in the River Road and Santa Clara areas through the *River Road-Santa Clara Urban Facilities plan* developed cooperatively by Lane County, the City of Eugene, and the residents and property owners of the two areas.~~
- ~~6. Eliminate groundwater pollution from individual septic tank disposal systems in River Road and Santa Clara.~~

Policies

1. Eugene shall develop methods of financing improvements in the River Road and Santa Clara areas which are responsive to the unique situation of residents and property owners, as well as the City of Eugene.
2. Eugene will plan, design, construct, and maintain ownership of the entire sanitary sewer wastewater system that services the River Road and Santa Clara areas. This will involve extraterritorial extension which will be supported by Lane County before the Lane County Local Government Boundary Commission and all other applicable bodies.
3. Annexation of the River Road and Santa Clara areas will occur only through strict application of state laws and local policies (e.g., ability to extend key urban facilities and services in a timely manner). In each case, Eugene will make every reasonable attempt to provide for annexation only on a voluntary basis and according to prior individual property annexation agreements.
4. The City of Eugene shall provide urban services to the River Road and Santa Clara neighborhoods upon annexation. In the meantime, to reduce the groundwater pollution problem, Eugene will extend sewers wastewater service to developed properties.

5. Using the CH2M Hill report as a foundation, efforts to prepare more detailed engineering studies which will provide the basis for a capital improvement program to sewer the River Road-and Santa Clara areas in a manner consistent with the above policy direction shall proceed.
6. No particular section of the *Metro Plan* shall be interpreted as prohibiting the process of incorporation of a new city in River Road- and Santa Clara in accordance with ORS 199 and 221. This means that:
 - a. As a comprehensive planning document, no particular section of the *Metro Plan* shall be used in isolation to evaluate different courses of action.
 - b. The phrase “process of incorporation” refers to the specific steps of incorporation outlined in ~~Oregon Revised Statutes~~ORS 199 and 221.
 - c. This policy does not negate the requirement of public ~~sanitary-sewerswastewater~~service as a minimum level of key urban facilities and services. Any institutional solution to providing urban services in the River Road- and Santa Clara areas must provide public ~~sanitary-sewerswastewater~~service to address LCDC requirements and to protect public health and safety in resolving groundwater pollution problems. Public ~~sanitary-sewerswastewater~~service ~~are~~is also required to achieve higher than septic tank level of urban residential densities and to utilize efficiently valuable metropolitan-scale buildable land.

