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INTRODUCTION

This report is intended to provide the citizens of the metropolitan area with information which will aid their understanding of the draft Metropolitan Area General Plan contents and the process which led to the publication of the draft. Throughout this report, the draft Metropolitan Area General Plan may be referred to as either "the draft Plan" or "the Plan"; in either case, the document is a draft, subject to change through the hearing and adoption process. References to more detailed information sources and to the offices where questions can be addressed are also contained in this report.

This report should be used in conjunction with the draft Metropolitan Area General Plan, L-COG, September 1979. This draft and questions about its contents or the update adoption process can be directed to any of these offices:

Lane Council of Governments
Public Service Bldg. 2nd Floor
125 Eighth Avenue East
Eugene, Oregon 97401
687-4283

Eugene Planning Dept.
City Hall
777 Pearl St.
Eugene, Oregon 97401
687-5481

Lane County Planning Division
Dept. Public Service Bldg. - Basement Level
125 Eighth Avenue East
Eugene, Oregon 97401
687-4186

Springfield Planning
126 North 4th St.
Springfield, OR 97477
726-3759

This report is not a summary of the Plan. A poster-sized summary, including the Plan diagram (a generalized land use map) and all the recommended policies, can be obtained from any of the four above offices. Copies of the complete draft Plan are also available at the above offices.

Special interest groups and community organizations can contact the city offices or county office to inquire about speakers to address the Plan. An introductory slide show is also available from the four offices for meetings where the Plan is discussed.

Citizens or groups interested in following the process of the Plan through adoption are urged to contact one of the four offices to obtain the most current schedule for public meetings where the Plan will be discussed.

Once the Plan is adopted, a full Technical Appendix document will be prepared.
II WHAT IS THE METROPOLITAN AREA GENERAL PLAN?

In 1972, the Eugene City Council, the Lane County Board of County Commissioners, and the Springfield City Council adopted the "Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area 1990 General Plan" or "1990 Plan." That Plan called for updates to occur over time to reflect changing community conditions and attitudes.

The draft Metropolitan Area General Plan is the update proposed to replace the existing 1990 Plan. Both Plans are long-range policy documents providing a broad, metropolitan-wide framework for consistent planning among governments within the metropolitan area. Chapter I of the draft explains in more detail the purposes and the role of the Plan and its relationship to the statewide planning goals and local plans (for example, neighborhood refinement plans and other community plans).

The second chapter deals with the fundamental principles of the Plan, including the concept of compact urban growth management with an urban growth boundary. The relationship between providing services to the vacant land as it is developed to meet population growth needs is addressed in this chapter: the Plan diagram, a generalized land use map, is also contained in Chapter II.

The third chapter includes eleven specific elements. Each of those elements is listed on the matrix (page 24). Each element is organized in the same format: an introduction, findings (based on research, analysis and observations taken primarily from the working papers listed on page 5), goals, objectives and recommended policies.

The fourth chapter deals with the processes for amending, updating or refining the Plan.

At the end of the draft Plan, a glossary is provided to explain some of the terms used in the Plan.

After undergoing citizen review and comment, the updated Metropolitan Area General Plan will be adopted, in amended form, by the elected officials of Eugene, Lane County and Springfield.
III WHO DEVELOPED THE PLAN?

A team of five professional planners from L-COG, the two cities and the county worked with a citizen committee, under the direction of a policy committee, to prepare the draft Plan. The team of planners was formed in November, 1977, and was housed in the L-COG offices. Other planners and staff from L-COG, the two cities, the county and other public agencies (e.g., Eugene Water and Electric Board, Springfield Utility Board, the school districts, the public works departments) assisted with various phases of the work program.

The citizen committee, Metropolitan Area Planning Advisory Committee (MAPAC), consists of twenty-one citizens with seven members each appointed by Eugene, Lane County, and Springfield elected officials. MAPAC appointments are ratified by the L-COG Board as are their operating bylaws.

The seven member policy committee, the Metropolitan Plan Policy Committee, (MPPC), was created to provide policy direction to preparation of the update. MPPC consists of one elected official and one planning commissioner each from Eugene, Lane County and Springfield, and one member from MAPAC who acts as a liaison between the policy committee and the citizen committee. After giving staff direction to print the draft Plan, MPPC voted to become inactive until the update is adopted--at which time the committee is scheduled to dissolve.

The Plan contains policies directing that an on-going metropolitan-wide citizen committee be retained after adoption.
IV THE UPDATE PROCESS

WORK PROGRAM
After public meetings and review by Eugene, Springfield and Lane County's elected bodies, a work program was adopted in late 1977. In accordance with the work program, the project was divided into four basic phases:

1. Preparation of Working Papers to update background data (listed at the end of this section);

2. Revision of the "1990 Plan" text including preparation of new elements on Housing, Economy, Energy, Historic Preservation, and Willamette River Greenway;

3. Revision of the Plan Diagram; and

4. Adoption.

As part of the work program the governing bodies also agreed upon the study area; the area within which information gathering was focused prior to developing the data base and draft Plan (see Map No. 1).

PUBLIC INPUT
The public had the opportunity to comment on a preliminary draft text (June, 1978) through 13 neighborhood meetings conducted by MAPAC. In conjunction with the work on the Plan diagram, three alternative plan diagrams were prepared in January, 1979. These alternatives were the subject of MAPAC's Community Forum at the Lane County Fairgrounds in February, 1979. This forum attracted about 1,165 citizens. Including special public meetings, regular committee meetings, and subcommittee meetings, MAPAC met on approximately 100 occasions where the update was discussed.

MAPAC AND MPPC RECOMMENDATIONS
MAPAC used public comments when making its June 13, 1979 recommendations on the draft text and Plan diagram to MPPC. On July 26, 1979, MPPC took its final action on MAPAC's recommended Plan.

CONSIDERATION BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS
In September 1979, a draft Metropolitan Area General Plan as recommended by MPPC was forwarded to the elected officials of Eugene, Springfield and Lane County. These bodies and their planning commissions are responsible for establishing their own citizen participation programs to allow for further comment on the draft. The planning commissions will conduct joint meetings and have formed a joint coordinating committee to assist in establishing schedules and seeking compromise solutions where needed.

Questions regarding dates for further meetings during the adoption phase of the work program can be directed to the planning department offices listed on page 1.
WORKING PAPERS

The following subjects were treated in the working papers prepared by the planning team and MAPAC under the direction of MPPC in late 1977 and the first half of 1978. While most of these documents are now out of print, complete reference sets are available for public review at each of the four planning offices listed on page 1.

1. Existing Land Use, Housing Characteristics and Historic Resources

2. Public Facilities
   a. Fire Protection
   b. Police Services
   c. Park & Recreation Facilities
   d. School Facilities
   e. Sanitary Sewer Service
   f. Storm Sewers
   g. Water Service
   h. Electrical Service
   i. Inventory of Natural Gas Service
   j. Transportation Facilities and Service

3. Natural Assets and Constraints
   a. Flood Hazards
   b. Soil Constraints for Development
   c. Agricultural Land
   d. Vegetation/Wildlife/Wildlife Habitat
   e. Sand and Gravel Resources
   f. Forest Lands
   g. Scenic Areas
   h. Water
   i. Air
   j. Willamette River Greenway
   k. Geologic Hazards
   l. Archeological Sites

4. Energy

5. Residential Land Use and Housing*

6. A Description of the Metro Area Economy*

7. Air Transportation

8. Residential, Commercial, Industrial and Public Facility Land Use Needs (Demand)

OTHER PRODUCTS


*Reprints available at L-COG ($1.00)
V THE DATA BASE AND BASIC METHODOLOGY

In this section, applicable information generated during the process is summarized in a format which lends understanding to the process of creating the draft Plan diagram. Many of the projections were prepared prior to developing the June, 1978 draft of the text--thus, the process described in this section also indicates how the intent of the text goals, objectives and polices were considered and balanced during preparation of the draft Plan diagram.

The process is divided into three major steps as described below. Each of these general steps is described in more detail in separate subsections.

STEP 1 - DEMAND
In this step, assumptions and projections of future population and employment growth are translated into land use needs.

STEP 2 - SUPPLY
This step involves inventories of existing land use, existing zoning, and existing 1990 Plan diagram designations in the study area. Particular attention is directed to the vacant land supply and the natural (e.g., slopes) and human factors (e.g., lot size) which affect the vacant land inventory.

STEP 3 - ALLOCATIONS
In this step, land use needs (demand) are matched to buildable vacant lands (supply) in a process leading to the draft Plan diagram. During the allocation process, the various Plan text goals are balanced to achieve a Plan diagram which reflects the identified needs of the metropolitan region.

A STEP 1 - DEMAND
In this step, population and employment projections are converted into general land use needs. The land use needs are expressed as an overall demand for residential, commercial and industrial land. Some of the basic projections are reviewed in this section. References are made to sources where more detailed data and methodology are available. A major assumption that growth will occur is inherent in the demand calculations.

1. Population Projections. Population projections indicated a 64 percent increase from a 1977 metropolitan population of 185,000 to a total of 293,700 by the year 2000. The following graph depicts the actual and projected population growth for the metropolitan region and compares the update projections with 1990 Plan population projections.
The projected increase results from a combination of natural increase (the difference in births over deaths) which constitutes about one-third of the total, and in-migration, which constitutes about two-thirds of the total.

**Detailed information regarding population projections can be obtained from the publication, Population, Households, and Employment, 1978, from L-COG ($1.00).**

---

**METROPOLITAN POPULATION PROJECTIONS**

---

- 1940: 34,400
- 1950: 77,200
- 1960: 109,800
- 1970: 148,300
- 1980: 168,700 (estimate)
- 1990: [193,100]
- 2000: [211,000]

---

**Legend:**
- Actual Population Increases
- Actual Population Figures
- 1990 Plan Projected Increase
- [100,000] 1990 Plan Population Projections
- Update Projected Increase
- (100,000) Update Population Projections

---

-7-
2. Translate Projected Population into a Demand for Households. The average size of households (average number of people living in a dwelling unit) is projected to decrease from 2.8 people in 1975 to 2.33 by 2000. This projected decrease is a result of several factors, including: more single parents (choice and increased divorce rate); people living longer; people delaying childbearing until later in the life cycle (especially as more women join the work force); more people deciding to have fewer children or to remain childless; and more single-person households (by choice).

The implications of the projected decrease in average household size are twofold: (1) more dwelling units will be needed to accommodate a fixed population and, when coupled with a population increase, a significant number of additional units will be necessary, and (2) the type of dwelling unit needed to serve the smaller households will be different from that demanded by a family with children.

More detailed information on the actual and projected decline of household size can be found in Population, Households and Employment, 1978, L-COG ($1.00) and the "Housing Working Paper," 1978, L-COG.

3. Dwelling Unit Projections by Structure Type. Based on household projections, on projections of the composition of the households (size, age, income, tenure [renters vs. owner]), and on trends in the metropolitan area, dwelling unit projections were prepared. These are summarized in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure Type</th>
<th>Existing d.u.'s (as of January 1, 1977)</th>
<th>Projected new d.u.'s for study area (1977-2000)</th>
<th>Total d.u.'s existing, new construction and % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single family</td>
<td>41,320 (63%)</td>
<td>26,800 (45%)</td>
<td>68,120 (54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>3,620 (6%)</td>
<td>3,650 (6%)</td>
<td>7,270 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>5,530 (9%)</td>
<td>5,560 (9%)</td>
<td>11,090 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple family</td>
<td>14,665 (22%)</td>
<td>23,975** (40%)</td>
<td>38,640** (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal:</td>
<td>65,135 (100%)</td>
<td>59,985 (100%)</td>
<td>125,120 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the UGB*</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>127,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*UGB = Urban Growth Boundary

**Includes 2,400 multiple-family units near downtown Eugene.
A shift from single-family construction toward more multiple-family units is projected, but, for new construction between 1977 and 2000, single-family units are still projected to outnumber multiple-family units. Recent trends in new dwelling unit construction in Eugene and Springfield support the projections related to multiple-family/single-family ratios.


4. Employment Projections. Total employment is projected to increase from about 89,700 in 1980 to about 146,600 by 2000. Detailed projections for major employment sectors (manufacturing, government, retail trade, etc.) by five-year increments, are contained in Population, Households and Employment, L-COG, 1978, ($1.00) and the "Economic Working Paper," L-COG, 1978 ($1.00).

5. Translation of the Projections into Land Use Needs.

a. Employment. The methodology for determining commercial and industrial land use needs involves four steps: (1) determine the current employment for each major employment sector, (2) determine the amount of land currently in use for each of the employment sectors, (3) calculate the existing number of employees per acre for each sector, (4) apply the ratios to the employment projections. The following demand (1977-2000) for additional commercial and industrial land results from this methodology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industry</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light-medium Industry</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Dwelling Units. The methodology for converting dwelling unit projections into demand for additional residential land (1977-2000) involves three steps: (1) determine the percent of each projected structure type (refer to Table 1) assumed to be built within each of the three residential Plan designations (low, medium and high density), (2) determine the average density for each structure type assumed to be constructed within each of the three residential Plan designations, and (3) calculate the demand acres for each of the three designations.

The results from the application of the above three steps are summarized in Table 2.
### TABLE 2
- METROPOLITAN AREA -


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure Type</th>
<th>Low Density</th>
<th>Medium Density</th>
<th>High Density</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single family</td>
<td>5,596</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple family</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>8,295</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>9,394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The major determination in the methodology is the density assumed for each structure type. The following table compares the update assumptions with 1976 density by structure type within the various residential plan diagram categories.

### TABLE 3
- METROPOLITAN AREA -

Draft Gross Density Assumptions
Comparison with Existing Gross Densities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure Type</th>
<th>Plan Residential Designation</th>
<th>1976 Existing Density</th>
<th>Assumed Density for New Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single family</td>
<td>low density</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single family</td>
<td>medium density</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>low density</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>low density</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>medium density</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple family</td>
<td>low density</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple family</td>
<td>medium density</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple family</td>
<td>high density</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The major shift indicated in Table 3 is the assumption for single-family units in low density areas. Recent trends in single-family subdivisions (1977 through early 1979) indicate lot sizes which would result in densities of at least 4.2 units per acre in Eugene and at least 4.4 units per acre in Springfield. The assumed density of 4.55 family units per gross acre (Table 3) for new construction implies an average lot size of approximately 6,700 square feet.

The major factor affecting the higher density focus for new construction (an overall density of about six units per acre for all structure types) is the projected continuation of the
shift toward more multiple-family construction over the planning period. It is likely that attainment of that level will occur over a period of time as depicted in the graph below. During the early portion of the planning period, average densities for new construction may be below the plan density level and average densities in the latter parts of the planning period may be higher than that level. In any event, monitoring of the Plan and new development will allow local governments to assess progress in meeting six units per acre density overall.

**B STEP 2 - SUPPLY**

This step involves the inventory of the existing land uses with particular attention to vacant private land. All allocations for the update focus on the previously agreed-upon study area (the study area boundary is illustrated on Map No. 1). The following two tables summarize the land supply data, as of January 1977, for the area within the draft urban growth boundary. The urban growth boundary is defined in the glossary of the Plan.

Map No. 1 at the end of this report depicts the existing land uses in Table 4.
## TABLE 4

Existing Land Use (as of January 1977)
Within the Draft Urban Growth Boundary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>% of Subtotal*</th>
<th>% of Total*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>(12,728)</td>
<td>10,920</td>
<td>(27.2)</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single family</td>
<td></td>
<td>549</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mobile home</td>
<td></td>
<td>568</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duplex</td>
<td></td>
<td>638</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple family</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (group quarters)</td>
<td>(2,990)</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>(6.4)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation, communication, utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>(3,119)</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retail trade</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commercial services</td>
<td></td>
<td>826</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>(2,087)</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>(4.5)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td>535</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads and parking</td>
<td>(6,858)</td>
<td>6,858</td>
<td>(14.6)</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>(698)</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant, Agriculture</td>
<td>(18,358)</td>
<td>10,302</td>
<td>(39.2)</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,653</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td>871</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td>532</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>(46,864)</td>
<td>46,864**</td>
<td>(100.1)</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages may not add correctly due to rounding.

**This 46,864 figure is the sum of all the land use parcels whose centers fall within the urban growth boundary. That sum compares closely with the actual area within the urban growth boundary (46,743 acres) which is derived from a more accurate boundary description.
Not all of the 16,955 private vacant and agricultural acres (about 36 percent of the total area) were assumed to be available for development. Modification and closer analysis of the vacant land supply within the draft urban growth boundary included consideration of (1) the effect of natural physical factors upon the supply, (2) to what extent recent land use changes affected the supply and (3) other factors affecting the buildable lands inventory. The results of that analysis are summarized in Table 5. (Some of the physical considerations are depicted on Map No. 3 at the end of this report.)

| TABLE 5 |
| Buildable Lands Inventory |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refinement Factors</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total private vacant and agricultural lands</td>
<td>+16,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical prohibitions to development</td>
<td>-1,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small lots (less than 0.13 acres 5,800 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>- 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments to existing land use classifications (for example, recent park acquisitions, re-definition of log pond acres as industrial use)</td>
<td>- 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas outside the urban growth boundary (46,864 - 46,743 = 121)</td>
<td>- 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous - not assigned to an analysis zone</td>
<td>- 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildable lands</td>
<td>-14,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal:</td>
<td>-16,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference:</td>
<td>+ 177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining 177 acres are unaccounted for in the methodology, but can be largely attributed to rounding of fractions of acres during the allocation process. This 177-acre total represents less than one-half percent (0.38%) of the total 46,743 acres within the urban growth boundary.

Before allocation of new land uses was made, the area considered was further analyzed on the basis of: ability to provide urban facilities and services (especially sanitary sewers, water, electricity and transportation—those services most directly linked to land use decisions); solar exposure (north versus south slopes); housing costs (slopes versus flatlands); ability to fit into a phasing program; physical factors (slopes, sand and gravel deposits, floodway, wetlands, significant vegetation and wildlife areas); proximity to airport noise, obstruction, and safety zones; agricultural productivity rating (including considerations of compatibility of farming with nearby adjacent urban uses); and possible effects on satellite communities.
The result of this evaluation was identification of broad areas which were preliminarily removed from consideration for allocation of urban uses. From this process, a tentative, partial urban growth boundary was defined. This tentative boundary (shown on Map No. 2) did not circle the entire area; it was used to identify constraints to logical or possible urban expansion prior to matching the projected demands to the vacant land supply. Comparison of the draft urban growth boundary and various physical factors shown on Maps 3 and 4 will also provide understanding for the rationale behind location of the U.G.B.

C STEP 3 – ALLOCATIONS
This step involved matching demand to the available land supply within the study area while balancing applicable local and statewide goals. A more detailed discussion of the methodology is contained in the "Plan Diagram Update Alternatives Technical Report," Chapter III, Methodology, L-COG, January, 1979. Some of the major assumptions were as follows:

1. Compact urban growth can be better accomplished at densities higher than currently exist.

2. With the exception of downtown Eugene, the majority of new uses will be located on vacant land through in-filling and expansion onto urbanizable lands.

3. Metropolitan land use demand (residential, commercial, industrial) will be met within the urban growth boundary.

4. In new residential areas, an average of 30 percent of new land use allocations will be in public and semi-public uses (e.g., roads and streets, neighborhood parks and schools, neighborhood commercial enterprises, and utilities and other public facilities).

5. The Plan will reflect the developed urban situation at a residential "saturation point" for a metropolitan population of 293,700. However, future updates will occur far in advance of reaching the "saturation point." Furthermore, phasing of development will occur between adoption of this Plan and the next update, thus ensuring an adequate available land supply to meet metropolitan land use needs.

6. The allocation process will include a realistic attempt to match demand with vacant land in order to avoid miscalculating and unnecessarily constraining the availability of land for future development and to also avoid grossly overestimating land use needs.

7. Land uses will be distributed to allow Eugene and Springfield to share the burden of providing services to new urban development and to share in the revenue derived from new construction (see Table 7).
The following is a brief outline of the allocation process:

1. Existing land use (January 1, 1977) in generalized map form was the basic framework within which new uses were allocated (see Map 1).

2. Recent (1977-1979) subdivision activity and major land use changes were manually accounted for on the map of vacant land (refer to the buildable lands inventory on page 13).

3. The effect of prohibitions and limitations on the vacant land supply was accounted for, using overlays (see Map 3).

4. A tentative partial urban growth boundary was transferred to the allocation map (see Map 2).

5. Allocations were made to the remaining buildable lands until the demand was met. Future land uses were allocated in the following order:
   a. Heavy industrial
   b. Large-scale special light manufacturing
   c. Light-medium industrial, commercial, high density residential, medium density residential
   d. Low density residential.

6. Once projected demand was accounted for, the proposed urban growth boundary was drawn. (See Section VI for more detail.)

7. Uses outside the urban growth boundary were designated.

Allocation of land uses was made to general areas in the following priority order:

1. In-fill all vacant parcels within the existing cities

2. In-fill all vacant parcels within the unincorporated islands surrounded by Eugene and Springfield

3. In-fill vacant parcels within the developed portions of unincorporated areas (e.g., River Road, Santa Clara, North Springfield, Douglas Gardens)

4. Saturate outlying areas which appear most appropriate for urban development (analysis zones 015, 016, 018, 019, 029 and portions of 027, 002, 014, 028, 030 and 031--see Map No. 2 for analysis zone numbers.)
5. Continue to expand outwardly to other analysis zones until the demand is met. (That expansion included all or portions of zones 010, 011, 013, 023 and 036.) During this last phase, additional areas considered included all or portions of certain zones (005, 009, 012, 013, 014, 021, 028, 030 and 031).

The criteria used for allocating the various broad land use categories are noted in the following section. A more detailed treatment of the allocation criteria is contained in Chapter III, "Methodology," in the Plan Diagram Update Alternatives Technical Report, L-COG, January, 1979.

Allocation Criteria for Major Land Uses

1. Heavy Industry
   a. Allocate uses when vacant land is zoned M-3 and owned or adjacent to an existing heavy industrial use to meet Plan goals which promote expansion of existing businesses. Areas no more than twice the size of the existing site were so designated.

2. Large-Scale Special Light Manufacturing
   a. Large scale; in excess of 50 acres
   b. Five or fewer ownerships
   c. Good access to transportation facilities, especially highways
   d. Buffered from detracting surrounding urban uses
   e. Campus-like atmosphere.
   f. A number of sites were allocated within the urban growth boundary, since anticipated industries in this category would add to the diversification of the local economy.

   (It was not assumed that all six of the sites would be utilized for this particular use during the planning period.)

3. Light-Medium Industry*
   a. Transportation access, (rail and/or highway); and
   b. Existing adjacent land uses; existing zoning; and existing 1990 Plan designation.

* An over-allocation of light-medium uses was made where a pre-commitment to industrial use already existed and proper transportation criteria were met.

4. Commercial
   a. It was assumed that 15 percent (110 acres) of the commercial demand would be met in neighborhood commercial establishments within residential designations in response to Plan goals related to economy, energy, transportation and environmental design.
b. Criteria used in allocating the remaining 640 acres of commercial land use needs:

i Allocate to existing commercial developments considering existing zoning and existing Plan designation

ii Allocate to new commercial centers of five acres or greater (areas designated community commercial on the diagram), considering:

(a) Transportation access
(b) Nodal concepts, including easy access to identified transit stations and possible new transit stations
(c) Proximity to concentrations of housing
(d) Emphasis on allocating within the cities in order to provide locational choice for commercial development early in the planning period

(Note: 600 of the 640 acres of demand were allocated within the urban growth boundary)

5. Residential, High Density (over 20 units per gross acre)

a. Proximity to downtown Eugene and Springfield; allocate as close to those centers as possible, then allocate outwardly, considering:

i Impact on adjacent land uses

ii Access to street network and transit system (existing and planned transit stations and major routes)

iii Proximity to places of employment and shopping, both existing and future

iv Whenever possible, high density should not be located on the outer fringes of the developed area

v Since little vacant land exists in areas most logical for high density development, it was assumed that 2,400 multiple-family units would be constructed within a one-mile radius of downtown Eugene through in-filling and some redevelopment.

6. Residential, Medium Density (over 10 through 20 units per gross acre)

a. Proximity to downtown Eugene and Springfield; allocate as close to those centers as possible, then allocate outwardly, considering:

i Impact on adjacent land uses
ii. Access to street network and transit system (existing and planned transit stations and major routes)

iii. Proximity to places of employment and shopping, both existing and future.

iv. Whenever possible, medium density uses should not be located on the outer fringes of the developing area.

v. Because many prime locations for medium density are already developed, and because medium density designations provide opportunities for meeting Plan energy and transportation goals, many of the identified potential sites which met the above criteria were designated for medium density residential use, resulting in an over-allocation of this category. (Some of these areas will serve the demands beyond the year 2000.)

7. Residential, Low Density (through 10 units per gross acre)

For low density, demand was allocated on the basis of actual dwelling units rather than gross acres so that allocations to existing vacant small lots (in-fill) could be accounted for. Allocations to hillside areas of 20-45 percent slope were made at an assumed density of 3.5 dwelling units per acre.

Allocations to small lots and hillside areas resulted in a reduction in density when compared to the demand assumptions. The methodology reflects a realistic matching of demand and supply.

The results of the allocation process are summarized in Tables 6 and 7. The acreage allocations in Table 6 can be compared with commercial and industrial demand by referring to page 9 and residential demand by referring to Table 2 on page 10.
TABLE 6
Recommended Plan Diagram Allocations
Metropolitan Totals by Land Use Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>New Acres Allocated</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Gross Density</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Non-residential)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy industry</td>
<td>309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light-medium industry</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special light mfg.</td>
<td>752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>600*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td>3,135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Residential)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density</td>
<td>9,386</td>
<td>43,669</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density</td>
<td>1,505</td>
<td>16,343</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>11,099</td>
<td>65,112**</td>
<td>5.87** overall average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* An additional 110 acres of commercial use is assumed to occur in neighborhood-level development within residentially designated areas.

** Assuming also 2,400 multiple-family units within one mile of downtown Eugene through in-filling and redevelopment, there are Plan diagram designations to accommodate 67,512 new units and an overall average of new construction over the planning period of 6.06 units per gross acre.

For a better understanding of the implications of the allocations without analysis on a small geographic area basis, the following table of distribution by jurisdictions is provided. No attempt was made to influence decisions regarding the River Road/Santa Clara or Glenwood areas in presenting this data. The current percentage split in population between incorporated Eugene (about 105,000) and Springfield (about 42,000) is about 70 to 30.
TABLE 7
New Allocations (Acres, Dwelling Units, Densities)
By Major Jurisdictions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Eugene (%)</th>
<th>River Rd/SC (%)</th>
<th>Springfield (%)</th>
<th>Glenwood (%)</th>
<th>Metro (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>173 (56)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>136 (44)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>309 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light/Medium Indus.</td>
<td>1,021 (69)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>408 (28)</td>
<td>45 (03)</td>
<td>1,474 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special/Light Mfg.</td>
<td>375 (50)</td>
<td>67 (09)</td>
<td>310 (41)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>752 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>329 (55)</td>
<td>39 (07)</td>
<td>232 (38)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS:</td>
<td>1,898 (61)</td>
<td>106 (03)</td>
<td>1,086 (35)</td>
<td>45 (01)</td>
<td>3,135 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residential

| (Acres)      |            |                 |                 |              |           |
| High Density | 131 (63)   | 0               | 77 (37)         | 0            | 208 (100) |
| Medium Density | 989 (66)  | 151 (10)        | 365 (24)        | 0            | 1,505 (100) |
| Low Density  | 5,512 (59) | 972 (10)        | 2,864 (31)      | 38 (00)      | 9,386 (100) |
| TOTALS:      | 6,632 (60) | 1,123 (10)      | 3,306 (30)      | 38 (00)      | 11,099 (100) |

(Dwelling Units)

| High Density | 3,275 (63) | 0               | 1,925 (37)      | 0            | 5,200 (100) |
| Medium Density | 10,739 (66) | 1,640 (10)     | 3,964 (24)      | 0            | 16,343 (100) |
| Low Density  | 24,642 (56) | 5,001 (12)     | 13,730 (32)     | 196 (00)     | 43,569 (100) |
| TOTALS:      | *38,658 (60) | 6,541 (10)     | 19,619 (30)     | 196 (00)     | 65,112 (100) |

(Density)

| High Density | 25.0        | 25.0            | 25.0            | 0            | 25.0       |
| Medium Density | 10.86      | 10.86           | 10.86           | 0            | 10.86      |
| Low Density  | 4.47        | 5.15            | 4.79            | 5.16         | 4.64       |
| AVERAGE:     | 5.75        | 5.19            | 5.93            | 5.16         | 5.87       |

* Does not include 2,400 multiple-family units allocated within one mile of downtown Eugene through in-filling and redevelopment.

The allocations between Eugene and Springfield do not unduly favor either jurisdiction in any category of major land use. Densities in Springfield within low density designations are slightly higher than in Eugene, due largely to the greater number of vacant hillside parcels in Eugene (thus, a lower density allocated).
FINDINGS

The following findings are a result of the allocation process:

1. The vacant land supply in and near (within one mile of) downtown Eugene and Springfield, to which new commercial or residential uses can be allocated, is extremely limited.

2. During the redevelopment necessary to accommodate the additional 2,400 dwelling units allocated to downtown Eugene, care will have to be taken to avoid possible conflicts in existing surrounding residential neighborhoods.

3. The vacant land supply in and near (within one-half mile) of most transit stations identified in the Transportation Plan is limited.

4. With the exception of West 11th Avenue in Eugene and Main Street in Springfield, limited opportunities exist for increasing residential densities on vacant land along major transit routes identified in the Transportation Plan.

5. Opportunities for locating high density residential uses are limited when all the criteria for locating high density development are compared with the vacant land supply.

6. The number of possible sites for locating large-scale special light manufacturing developments within the metropolitan area are limited, but not all six sites will necessarily be converted to industrial use by 2000.

7. From a metropolitan-wide perspective, the most efficient areas of future expansion (when cost of extending many public services and natural constraints are taken into account) are to the west and southwest of the City of Eugene.

8. Expansion to the west and southwest of the City of Eugene will require a commitment to provide better transportation access between those areas and other metropolitan locations, including downtown Eugene. For example, the 6th-7th Freeway Extension outlined in the Transportation Plan within the Eugene east-west corridor will be needed, along with other improvements to serve the land uses allocated for the planning period.
VI  LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION (LCDC) 
STATEWIDE GOALS AND THE URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY

The preparation of a comprehensive plan requires a balancing of complex, competing, and sometimes contradictory points of view. Preparation of the draft Metropolitan Area General Plan was no exception to this balancing requirement.

The various LCDC-adopted statewide goals or standards (Adopted April 1977) must be considered during preparation of comprehensive plans by cities and counties. The Metropolitan Area General Plan is not a complete comprehensive plan; it is a general policy framework plan, and, as such, provides the metropolitan-wide planning direction within which Eugene, Springfield and Lane County finish their comprehensive planning programs and products.

During preparation of the draft Plan, the LCDC Goals were considered. Readers of the draft Plan will notice a similarity in organization of Chapter III, "Specific Elements," and the LCDC goals. The findings, goals, objectives and recommended policies of the draft Plan reflect not only statewide concerns, but, perhaps more importantly, local values and emphasis within the context of the statewide goals. The diagram, in turn, reflects a balancing of the goals, objectives and recommended policies of the draft Plan.

In this chapter, a brief description of how each of the applicable LCDC goals was addressed is presented. Particular attention is directed to LCDC Goal 14, "Urbanization," and the seven criteria which must be considered when establishing an urban growth boundary. Readers interested in one particular goal can use the matrix to find the appropriate section(s) of the draft Plan which addresses, either directly or indirectly, a particular goal. The matrix also includes some of the background documents and other plans which were used in preparing the Plan and are directly referenced in the text of the Plan. Some of the relationships among the various Plan topics can be envisioned by studying the matrix. LCDC Goals 1 and 2 are not listed on the matrix, since they are more process oriented than the other 13 applicable goals.

Goal 1, Citizen Involvement

Preparation of the draft Metropolitan Area General Plan has involved citizens in all phases of the work program. L-COG's Metropolitan Area Planning Advisory Committee (MAPAC) is a 21-member citizen committee which was given the responsibility for obtaining metropolitan-wide citizen input into the Plan. In addition to their regular public meetings where MAPAC discussed background material and draft Plan elements, MAPAC conducted public meetings to solicit public involvement in the work program (April, 1977), the draft text (August-October, 1978) and the three Plan diagram alternatives (February, 1979). MAPAC also maintains a mailing list of approximately 1,000 people and groups who have expressed interest in the Plan.
# LCDC Goal Matrix

## Draft Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCDC Goals</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Forest</th>
<th>Natural Resources</th>
<th>Air, Water</th>
<th>Hazards</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th>Energy</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Urbanization</th>
<th>Greenway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Introduction

II. Fundamental Principles
   - B. Growth Management
   - C. Plan Diagram

III. Specific Elements
   - A. Residential/Housing
   - B. Economy
   - C. Environmental Res.
   - D. Willamette Greenway
   - E. Environmental Design
   - F. Transportation
   - G. Public Utilities & Facilities
   - H. Parks & Recreation
   - I. Historic Preservation
   - J. Energy
   - K. Citizen Involvement

IV. Plan Review, Amendment, Refinement

## Working Papers

1. Existing land use, housing, historic resources
2. Public Facilities
3. Natural Assets & Constraints
4. Energy
5. Residential Land Use & Housing
6. Economy
7. Air Transportation
8. Land Use Needs

## Other Documents

1. Three Alternatives Technical Report
2. T-2000
3. Mahlon Sweet Master Plan
4. Metro Bikeway Master Plan
During the adoption phase, Eugene, Lane County and Springfield are responsible for their own individual citizen participation programs. Interested citizens should contact the local planning offices listed on page 1 for current information on the adoption process.

**Goal 2, Land Use Planning**

The Metropolitan Area General Plan is but one segment of the comprehensive planning program for Eugene, Springfield and the metropolitan portion of Lane County. It is a general policy framework plan setting broad direction for land use planning in the metropolitan area through a cooperative planning effort involving those three governments, with assistance from the Lane Council of Governments. Development of refinement plans (e.g., neighborhood plans), functional plans (e.g., a metropolitan transportation plan), and other community plans (e.g., city goals and studies) occurs within the broad context of the adopted Metropolitan Area General Plan.

Important features of the draft Metropolitan Area General Plan include the recommended policies and the draft Plan diagram, complete with a proposed urban growth boundary.

In preparing the buildable lands inventory, particular attention was directed to Goals 3-7. During preparation of the urban growth boundary, particular attention was directed to Goal 3. The most important thing to remember is preparation of the Plan involved a balancing of the goals.

**Goal 3, Agricultural Lands**

Preparation of the Plan involved consideration of agricultural lands, including inventories of resources (see Map No. 4), preparation of policies addressing agricultural issues, and designation of land uses indicating agricultural, urban, and other rural uses. For a better understanding of how the draft diagram affects agricultural lands, refer to criteria 6 and 7 in the section addressing Goal 14, "Urbanization." Refer to the matrix for sections of the Plan and other documents providing further understanding of agricultural resources and issues.

**Goal 4, Forest Lands**

Preparation of the Plan involved inventorying of forest lands and vegetation resources, developing recommended policies regarding forest lands and resources, and designating forest lands on the diagram. Forest lands are not designated within the urban growth boundary where the need to accommodate urban uses in a compact manner is of primary importance, especially where the orderly and economic provision of public facilities is possible.

**Goal 5, Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Natural Resources**

As indicated in the matrix, several Plan elements address subjects in Goal 5. Several areas in the diagram are designated open space in response to the inventories of metropolitan resources, including fish and wildlife areas. Areas of known sand and gravel resources are located outside the urban growth boundary to protect them from urban development (see Map No. 3). Natural resources are also addressed in Goal 3, Agriculture, and Goal 4, Forest Lands.
Goal 6, Air, Water and Land Resources

This goal has particular applicability to air and water quality; many land resources are specifically addressed in Goals 3, 4 and 5. As indicated in the matrix, four Plan elements directly or indirectly address air and water resources. Separate planning programs are directed toward maintaining and improving air quality and water quality and quantity in the metropolitan area, and those programs are referenced in the Plan. As also indicated in the matrix, the "Natural Assets" and "Public Facilities" working papers and several other planning documents address air and water resources in the metropolitan area.

Goal 7, Areas Subject to Natural Disasters and Hazards

The most up-to-date information on flooding potential within the metropolitan area was inventoried. Soil constraints for development were considered as one of the factors in determining density limitations on hillside areas with moderate slopes. Steep slopes (greater than 45%) were treated as prohibitions to development in compiling inventories of available vacant lands. No metropolitan scale data on potential geological hazards exists. The "Natural Assets and Constraints" working paper, L-COG, April, 1978, should be referred to for information on floodway hazards, soil constraints for development, soil erosion potential and geologic hazards. The Environmental Resources element contains recommended policies addressing hazard potential. In many (not all) instances, the known floodway fringe boundary was used as the line delineating the urban growth boundary. In some cases, urban uses were allocated to the floodway fringe (not the floodway) where public service availability and proximity to other urban development make such development logical. Policies directed toward protecting development planned within the floodway fringe are contained in the Environmental Resources element. The floodway fringe and slope areas are shown on Map No. 3.

Goal 8, Recreational Needs

In addition to the open spaces designated in response to Goal 5, the Parks and Recreation Facilities and Willamette Greenway elements and the "Park and Recreation Facilities" section of the Public Facilities working paper address metropolitan recreation needs. The need for a more detailed metropolitan parks and recreation plan is pointed out in the "Parks" element of the Plan. Auxiliary Map No. 2 in the Plan indicates existing neighborhood and community parks in the metropolitan area. The allocation of new residential uses contains a factor accounting for new, small governmental uses such as neighborhood parks.

Goal 9, Economy of the State

In preparing the Plan, employment projections by broad employment sectors were made and the projections were translated into demand figures for commercial and industrial lands. The diagram reflects the allocations of new commercial and industrial uses and responds to several policies.
in the draft text by (1) allowing for expansion of existing businesses, and (2) identifying adequate commercial and industrial sites which meet the locational requirements for the various land use categories of commercial and industrial uses being planned for. In some cases, allocations above the demand figures were made to: (1) accommodate market forces, (2) provide choice for firms desiring to locate in the metropolitan area, (3) allow for expansion of existing firms, (4) protect the available vacant lands most suitable for industrial development--even beyond the year 2000, and (5) reflect precommitments to commercial and industrial uses. The description of the land uses shown on the map are contained in Section II-C of the Plan. All commercial and industrial descriptions should be referred to in order to gain an understanding of land use implications for the metropolitan economy.

**Goal 10, Housing**

The Plan responds to the housing goal by providing for a variety of housing types, density levels and locations within the metropolitan region. The dwelling unit projections, density assumptions and locational criteria for medium and high density designations were carefully calculated to balance goals such as energy and transportation and to place related land uses in proximity to one another (e.g., residential and commercial uses) in a configuration that complements the overall goal of compact urban use and adopted metropolitan policies promoting non-automobile methods of transportation (e.g., transit, bicycles, pedestrian). The Residential Land Use and Housing element of the Plan also addresses the special housing needs of particular segments of the metropolitan population (e.g., elderly and low income).

The projections and translation of projections into demand for land include considerations of different dwelling unit structure types. However, one of the most common misconceptions about the diagram is that the three residential density designations are related to particular dwelling types (single-family, duplex, or multiple-family). The low density designation indicates a density range of up to ten dwelling units per gross acre. Structures may be single-family detached, duplexes, mobile homes, tripleplexes, planned unit developments, or other multiple-family type dwelling units.

Another misconception about the Plan is that multiple-family structures represent apartments or rental units. While multiple-family structures can, in some cases, be rental units, more and more multiple-family units are being constructed and sold for owner occupancy.

A common concern regarding the Plan is that the average density level of six dwelling units per acre for new construction will convert the metropolitan area into a high density city of concrete, asphalt and shadows. This is not the case. The densities are slight increases above development trends of the past few years. Some public policy decisions will be necessary to achieve the density prescribed, but that level is a realistic
one which will not drastically reduce the "liveability" of the urban area. Increasing densities provides an opportunity to achieve more efficiency with the limited amount of land available and to reduce the rate of urban expansion onto resource lands surrounding the metropolitan area. The discussion of density on pages 10 and 11 should be reviewed to obtain an understanding of the implications of the density level called for in the Plan.

Goal 11, Public Facilities and Services

Future urban growth is critically linked to the ability to plan and provide for new and improved public services and facilities. Coordination between the public and private sectors is vital. Furthermore, the Plan addresses the need to develop capital improvement programs as part of the phasing and surplus lands proposal contained in Chapter II.

The minimum level of key urban services (those services required for urban level development) is also defined in Chapter II. During preparation of the Plan, it was recognized that providers of public facilities and services may not all agree on the direction of growth within the metropolitan area. Some agencies are affected differently and in varying degrees by new development in a particular geographic region. For example, city sewers and fire protection may be available in an area, and water and electricity provided by a public utility may also be available, but schools, parks and a needed street widening may not. Cooperation and coordination among public service providers are necessary in developing and implementing the Plan.

The two cities play an important role in future development since they are the logical units of government best suited for providing a wide range of urban services.

Goal 12, Transportation

Since adoption in June, 1978, the Eugene-Springfield Area 2000 Transportation Plan (T-2000) has served as the transportation plan for the metropolitan area. This plan includes policy statements and facilities for future automobile and transit improvements. The plan also addresses bicycle, pedestrian and paratransit (defined in the Plan glossary) needs. The T-2000 plan is a multi-modal plan for surface transportation in the metropolitan area. Those interested in learning more about how T-2000 addresses Goal 12 should refer to Section F of the Eugene-Springfield Area 2000 Transportation Plan Technical Report, L-COG, January, 1978, where each of the nine points in Goal 12 is addressed. Once the Plan is adopted, the Transportation Plan will be assessed to determine the implications of the new land use distribution upon transportation systems.

As indicated in the matrix, two other adopted plans help guide transportation improvements in the metropolitan area, the Metropolitan Bikeway Master Plan and the Mahlon Sweet Field Master Plan. Both of those plans are referenced in the draft Plan and both are currently being considered for update.
Careful planning for lands surrounding the airport (see Map No. 3) and the relationship between transportation and land use were major considerations affecting preparation of the draft Plan. Existing and future facilities and services were integrated into the allocation process leading to the land use diagram.

Goal 13, Energy Conservation

By considering transportation criteria during the allocation of urban uses (particularly commercial, industrial and residential), an energy-efficient land use configuration has been reflected in the diagram. Policies related to on-site energy conservation and to developing a coordinated metropolitan energy conservation plan are set forth in the Energy element. (See also discussion under Goal 14, criteria 5.)

Goal 14, Urbanization

This goal requires orderly and efficient transition from rural to urbanizable land and establishment of an urban growth boundary (sometimes referred to in this paper as ugb). The goal stipulates seven criteria which must be considered when the ugb is established or changed. The goal also contains criteria to be considered when converting urbanizable land to urban land. The terms urban, rural, urbanizable, and urban growth boundary all have specific meaning according to the LCDC goals. They are all defined in the glossary at the end of the draft Plan.

The seven criteria to be considered when establishing an urban growth boundary are addressed below. Chapter V, "The Data Base and Basic Methodology," of this report provides some of the explanation of how the proposed urban growth boundary was developed; where appropriate, reference will be made to earlier sections in that chapter. A detailed, site-specific urban growth boundary map is on file at the L-COG offices for public review.

(1) "Demonstrated need to accommodate long-range urban population growth requirements consistent with LCDC goals;"

(2) "Need for housing, employment opportunities, and livability;"

These two criteria are closely related and are addressed as one point.

As indicated in Chapter V, the population projections were translated into a demand for housing and into employment projections. The housing demand was translated into dwelling unit projections. The dwelling unit and employment projections were translated into land use demands for residential, commercial and industrial uses. The allocation process matched the land use demand to the available (buildable) land supply until the demand was met.
Prior to making those allocations, the land supply had been refined to remove hazard lands and sensitive lands from the supply (see Map No. 3). These lands total about 1,500 acres within the urban growth boundary or 9 percent of the private vacant land supply. In some instances, areas where combinations of hazards and assets existed (for example, within the floodway fringe where Class I and II productive agricultural soils overlie sand and gravel deposits, and rich aquifer recharge areas and river sloughs harbor valuable wetlands and open spaces) physical factors provided the definition of the boundary location.

A wide variety of living situations has been provided throughout the metropolitan area, and the various density ranges and the mix of structure types offer diverse living opportunities.

Some overallocation of industrial uses was made to encourage diversification of the local economy, to provide employment opportunities, and to assure site and location requirements unique to that sector of the economy (see also discussion under Goal 14, criteria 5).

The allocation process attempted, within the constraints of existing land uses and the vacant land supply, to designate uses in a manner maximizing opportunities for using transit and minimizing dependence on automobile use and average trip lengths.

All of these factors have an impact on the liveability of the metropolitan region. By adopting a Plan which calls for continuing increases in urban residential densities, the community can consciously move toward a relatively more compact urban growth form and further reduce urban growth pressures on rural lands.

The draft Plan text further supports housing, economic and liveability concerns in the Residential Land Use and Housing, the Economic, the Environmental Resources and the Environmental Design elements in Chapter III.

(3) "Orderly and economic provision for public facilities and services";

The minimum level of key urban facilities and services are those required when converting urbanizable land to urban through annexation to a city. Those services are listed on page II-8-4 of the Plan. In addition to the minimum-level services, a full range of key urban facilities and services should be provided to urban areas. These are listed on pages II-8-4 and -5 of the Plan. This distinction among services emphasizes the relative importance of certain services in urban areas.
In developing the urban growth boundary and allocating land uses, certain of the minimum level of key urban facilities and services were given more attention than others because of their relationship to land use distribution. These are sanitary sewers, water, electricity, airport, and surface transportation (streets and highways). Even though they are not one of the minimum-level services, transit service and facilities were also given strong consideration due to implications for energy and reducing traffic congestion. Most of these services involve large capital investments and are fixed. When considering these services, adopted plans (e.g., Mahlon Sweet Field Master Plan, T-2000) were referred to.

Other services considered to a lesser degree were schools, parks, police, and fire. While these services may also require capital expenditures, they can, in some instances, adapt and shift to changing situations by altering services.

Natural drainage basins and the ability to provide services to an area were considered. Not only was the ability to serve particular geographic areas considered, but the order in which they could be serviced was also considered. In some cases, provision of one public service to an area was easier than provision of another service. In these cases trade-offs were necessary and strongest consideration was given to water, sanitary sewers, and transportation facilities due to the strong land use relationship to those services.

The concept of urban reserve has been introduced as a means of identifying those additional areas outside the urban growth boundary where urban growth might logically take place beyond the year 2000. The designation of urban reserve is based upon consideration of physical factors and the ability to provide urban services in the long term. There is no commitment to actual urbanization in the urban reserve areas. Such a commitment would require study and a decision during subsequent Plan updates.

(4) "Maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area";

The decision to plan for higher residential densities within the urban growth boundary and the allocation process both support efficient use of land within the urban growth boundary. Attempts to allocate residential, commercial and industrial-transportation access (both existing and planned streets and trial uses in arrangement, using locational factors such as transit facilities and services), proximity of job and living situations, and in concentrating uses in nodal configurations (nuclei of more intense uses) all attest to the consideration of an energy-efficient land use pattern.
The section related to phasing and surplus land ties demand with the ability to provide services. When boundaries (e.g., city limits) are expanded within the ugb to allow for conversion of urbanizable lands to urban lands, the minimum level of key urban services must be available or imminent. This requirement promotes in-filling and orderly, logical, sequential conversion of undeveloped urbanizable land within the ugb.

(5) "Environmental, energy, economic and social consequences;"

Environmental concerns were directly addressed in the text in the Environmental Resources; the Willamette River Greenway; River Corridors and Waterways; the Environment Design; and the Parks and Recreation Facilities elements. During preparation of the Plan diagram, environmental concerns were accounted for in developing the vacant land inventory. Refinement of the vacant land supply involved consideration of wetlands, significant vegetation and wildlife areas, and steep slopes. (Refer to Map No. 5, "Plan Diagram Update Alternatives Technical Report," L-COG, January, 1979, and the "Natural Assets and Constraints Working Paper," L-COG, April, 1978.) Environmental factors were considered in developing the urban growth boundary (see Map 3). The "Comparison of Selected Metropolitan Boundaries" map in the draft Plan and the accompanying urban growth boundary description keyed to the map indicate locations where environmental or natural physical factors were actual criteria used in establishing the ugb.

Energy concerns were addressed primarily through the land use allocations. In making the allocations, the relationship between jobs and residences was considered. Higher density in general, and higher densities near downtowns, near transit stations (existing and planned), and along planned bus rapid transit routes and major arterial streets are examples of the consideration energy was given during the allocation process. Unfortunately, many of the hillside areas to the south of Eugene and Springfield which can be most economically served with water and sanitary sewers are on north-facing slopes reducing solar access potential.

Energy concerns were also addressed in the Transportation and Energy elements in Chapter III of the Plan.

Economic concerns were addressed in the Economic element in Chapter III of the Plan. The allocations of commercial and industrial lands to meet employment demands will help ensure that locational choices exist for new firms desiring to locate within the metropolitan region. Many of the allocations of commercial and industrial lands were made to allow
for expansion of existing businesses. An overall allocation of industrial lands was made so that (1) lands most suitable for industrial development are preserved for those uses (in some cases even beyond the year 2000), (2) adequate supply is available to the types of firms which can add to the continued diversification of the metropolitan economy and (3) areas already characterized by industrial uses can continue to develop in that way.

While there is not a social element in the Plan, social concerns are woven throughout many of the goals and policies of the Plan. Development of the elements on Environmental Resources and Environmental Design, Parks and Recreation, Historic Preservation, Transportation, Energy, Housing, Economy, and Citizen Involvement included consideration of social ramifications. One of the most frequently mentioned social concerns expressed is related to density. Some people perceive the density goal in the Plan will result in a living environment similar to that of large, eastern cities. While the Plan calls for higher densities, and more multiple-family units, the majority of homes will still be single-family. The average density for new construction of six dwelling units per acre, when combined with the existing overall density of 3.6 units per acre, will result in an average overall density of 4.5 to 5.0 units per acre. The Plan does not assume construction of many multi-story skyscraper living units to meet housing demand. Many of the new multiple-family units will be constructed in cluster developments or planned developments where condominiums or apartments can be carefully integrated into the natural and urban landscape.

(6) "Retention of agricultural land as defined, with Class I being highest priority for retention and Class VI the lowest priority;"

(7) "Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural activities."

These two criteria are closely related and are addressed as one point. The inventory of agricultural soils is contained in the 'Natural Assets and Constraints Working Paper', L-COG, April, 1978, (also see Map No. 4). One of the findings of that study was:

Almost all of the study area is covered by areas recommended for prohibition or limitation of development or by agricultural soils (page 11).

One of the assumptions of that study was:

Trade-offs between natural assets and constraints and other community goals such as housing costs and the costs of providing public services will occur during later phases of the Metropolitan Plan Update Process (page 12).
As indicated previously, location of the tentative urban growth boundary (refer to Map No. 2) took into consideration the relative value of broad areas of agricultural use or potential.

In general, the best agricultural lands in the metropolitan area are located within the floodway fringe where rich alluvial deposits exist. The hillsides are generally Class V-VIII soils. In terms of providing orderly and economic public services and housing opportunities, trade-offs with Class I-IV soils were necessary.

Areas within the floodway fringe in north Springfield, North Thurston, south of Jasper Road, East Santa Clara, North Gateway, Armitage Road, and in North Willakenzie were not included within the proposed urban growth boundary. These areas represent the majority of the most productive agricultural lands in the metropolitan region. The East Thurston area and the North Willakenzie area between Eugene’s city limits and the floodway fringe are two largely undeveloped areas containing Class I and II agricultural soils which are included within the proposed ugb. Both areas are relatively easy to serve with public facilities and provide good opportunities for providing a variety of housing types at relatively low cost. The major areas of urban expansion for Eugene are to the west of Terry Street and to the southwest where predominantly Class III and IV soils occur. The major area of expansion for Springfield is to the southeast along Jasper Road where predominantly Class III and IV soils exist.

One additional agricultural area, East Gateway near Deadman Ferry and Baldy View roads, was included within the proposed urban growth boundary due to potential compatability problems. This isolated pocket of agricultural use is adjacent to areas planned for intensive urban uses by 2000.

The urban growth boundary delineates a "sharp" boundary between urban or urbanizable and the rural lands. Compatability problems on the urban fringe are inevitable in some instances where urban and agricultural uses abut one another. Wherever possible, natural features (e.g., river terraces, sloughs) were used to delinate the urban growth boundary as a means of providing a physical buffer between urban and agricultural uses. Recommended policies in the Plan support agricultural uses on urbanizable lands and vacant urban lands as interim uses until development takes place. Such interim uses are most likely to occur on the fringe of the developing area and may also serve as a buffer between urban and designated agricultural uses on "rural" lands. The requirements for phasing growth in a sequential manner, thereby reducing leap-frogging, should also help reduce potential conflicts by minimizing the interface between urban and agricultural uses.
In addition to the seven criteria which must be considered when establishing or changing an urban growth boundary, Goal 14 sets forth four criteria which must be considered when urbanizable land is converted to urban uses.

"The conversion of urbanizable land to urban uses shall be based on consideration of:

(1) Orderly, economic provision for public facilities and services;

(2) Availability of sufficient land for the various uses to insure choices in the market place;

(3) LCDC goals; and

(4) Encouragement of development within urban areas before conversion of urbanizable areas."

The section of the Plan dealing with "Phasing and Surplus Land", pages II-C-13 through -16 addresses points 1, 2 and 4, above. Consideration of the LCDC goals was addressed in a comprehensive fashion when establishing the proposed urban growth boundary as part of the Plan preparation and need not be addressed again when urbanizable land is converted to urban land (e.g., urbanizable land is annexed to a city).

Goal 15, Willamette River Greenway

The Willamette River Greenway is the subject of individual planning processes by Eugene, Springfield and Lane County within the metropolitan area. The draft Plan includes a specific element reflecting the decisions resulting from those processes and elaborates on some of the concepts of the Greenway as they might be applied to other important metropolitan waterways. The greenway is depicted on Auxiliary Map No. 2 in the draft Plan.

Goals 16-19

These goals address coastal concerns and are not applicable to the metropolitan area.
VII CONCLUSIONS

Within the framework of the statewide goals and expressed local concerns, many factors must be considered when developing a general plan. While there is some danger in oversimplification of the complexities of the Plan, several basic points deserve review.

The draft Metropolitan General Area Plan is an update of the adopted 1990 Plan. The existing land use pattern which serves the needs of the current population of about 185,000 is an important factor influencing future land use patterns. For that and other reasons, many similarities exist between the 1990 Plan and the draft General Plan.

The 1990 Plan introduced the concept of a compact urban growth form and a "projected urban service area" for the metropolitan region. The urban growth boundary now required by the statewide goals is essentially the same concept. While the 1990 Plan is based on population and employment projections for 1990 and the draft update is based on projections for the year 2000, the criteria used for developing the 1990 Plan projected urban service area boundary and the draft Plan proposed urban growth boundary are similar. For this reason, differences between the two boundaries largely reflect differences in the respective projections rather than differences in the criteria used for determining a logical boundary (the 1990 Plan "boundary" encompasses about 43,250 acres. The proposed urban growth boundary encompasses about 46,750 acres).

Some new elements have been introduced in the draft Plan (Energy, Willamette River Greenway, and Historic Preservation). The "residential" and "industrial" land use chapters of the 1990 Plan have been expanded in the update to address broader concerns such as low income housing and maximum employment.

Some of the land use designations have also been changed. The opportunity areas used in the 1990 Plan have been eliminated. The single category of industrial land in the 1990 Plan has been divided into three categories in the draft Plan; heavy industry, light-medium industry, and special large-scale light manufacturing. No changes were made in the description of the three residential designations or their respective density levels.

Two new concepts introduced in the update are "urban reserve" (see pages II-C-6 and 7 of the Plan) and "phasing and surplus land" (see pages II-C-13 through 16 of the Plan). A glossary has been added to aid general understanding of planning terms used in the draft Plan.
One of the major differences between the 1990 Plan and the update is the level of sophistication in the data available. For planners and decision-makers, the geographic data system (a computer generated map modeling system) provides detailed up-to-date information on the land supply and existing development. This system and its map plotting capabilities were used extensively throughout the process and are keys to future planning and monitoring of the adopted updated Plan.

The 1990 Plan was well thought out and has served the metropolitan region well since 1972. The draft Plan is not a radical departure from the 1990 Plan. It is an update of the 1990 Plan with certain refinements and specific attention to the statewide goals.

Preparation of the update has involved citizens in all phases of its preparation. The process of identifying and debating issues regarding planning in this metropolitan region will continue. Solutions to differing points of view will result in compromises which are healthy for the current and future populations of Oregon's second largest metropolitan area.
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