

W. H. B.

AGENDA COVER MEMO

DATE: July 19, 2005
July 26, 2005 Board Meeting Date

TO: BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

FROM : KENT HOWE, PLANNING DIRECTOR
LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: The Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan/
History and Draft List of Issues in Need of Examination

I. MOTION:

No motion necessary. This is an information item only.

II. ISSUE OR PROBLEM

The Board has requested a work session on the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (Metro Plan).

III. DISCUSSION

A. BACKGROUND

This presentation provides a brief history of the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (Metro Plan), illustrates its values and demonstrates how the Metro Plan has served the metropolitan area land use planning partners. The information is intended to provide the Board with a factual basis on which to begin a high level discussion that may set the stage for future meetings with the other Metro Plan partners.

The cities are responsible for the planning and development of the lands within the City Limits. Each city shares responsibility with Lane County for developing the land use policy that governs the areas outside the City Limits. The area of overlapping jurisdiction is the "edge" or fringe area outside the City Limits and inside the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). The county delegated its administrative authority for processing planning and building permits to each of the two cities, respectively, within the UGB upon the adoption and signing of the Urban Transition Agreements (UTAs) in 1986-87. The UTAs limited Lane County's administrative responsibility for planning and building permit processing to the area outside the UGB. However, just as the cities are responsible for approving the urban development within their city limits, the County retains its role and responsibility in joint policy development for the "edge" or fringe area outside the City Limits, inside the UGB.

There are several questions that periodically arise during policy discussions and are likely to continue to do so in the future:

1. What is urban and what is rural?
2. Where is urban and rural growth going to occur?
3. Who is going to control urban growth?
4. What are urban level services?
5. Who is going to provide urban level services?
6. How does the community function as a region?
7. When the region has completed the state-driven Periodic Review, what local planning efforts and improvements should the region undertake?
8. How are government services going to be funded?

Please think about these questions as you consider the background information presented, below.

B. HISTORY

Cities and Counties are governmental and geographic entities that function as subdivisions of the State. They operate under the Constitution, Statutes, and other laws of Oregon. They are both "general purpose" governments empowered with broad authorities to provide services and finance them. Local "home rule" options grant them even greater local powers through their charters. There are also key differences between cities and counties; often in terms of history, function, politics, and outlook. Historically, cities were seats of government, religion, defense, and trade. They were compact places where people gathered for economic and social reasons. Counties act more like an arm of state government functioning at a more local level (courts, police, jails, tax collection, roads, deed and survey records, and election recorder).

Rural was rural - people made a living off the land. A trip to town was carefully planned, and sometimes an ordeal. A lot of land around cities was used for crops and livestock to meet the needs of city citizens (food and clothing), and hay to power horses and feed livestock. The automobile changed things. The depression and World War II delayed the impact of autos on our landscape. Post WWII saw a suburban explosion. This post war growth was responding to pent up demand in achieving the "American Dream": Live and work where you want; Have a car in every garage; Own your own home with a lawn. Eugene and Springfield provided urban services inside the city limits and special districts formed on the urban fringe.

By 1956, the Bureau of Municipal Research and Service published a series of reports on the major urban areas in Oregon, "Problems on the Eugene-Springfield Urban Fringe". This report addressed growing concerns about suburban sprawl, proliferation of special service districts, and the impacts that resulted from widening gaps in tax rates and service delivery levels. These concerns accelerated in the 1950's and 1960's as growth continued outside city limits in Bethel, River Road, Santa Clara, North Springfield, Thurston, and Douglas Gardens.

Problems of sprawl, leapfrog development, loss of farmland, rapid development during a period of economic recovery, construction of interstate freeways, unequal level of services, fragmentation of government, and unequal taxation were the fodder for our modern land use planning program.

C. CHRONOLOGY OF FORCES MOLDING THE CURRENT METRO PLAN POLICIES

1945 - Formation of Central Lane Planning Commission (CLPC).

c. 1947-48 - Eugene, Springfield and Lane County adopt first comprehensive zoning.

1959 - Development Plan for Eugene/Springfield area prepared by Howard Buford and the CLPC

1967 - The Eugene-Springfield Area Transportation Study (E-SATS) was prepared with major help from the Oregon Department of Transportation. It was totally devoted to the automobile mode of travel and included several controversial projects (like the Roosevelt Freeway). There was already some backlash to freeway construction in Eugene as I-105 dumped heavy traffic through the Washington/Jefferson neighborhood off the newly constructed freeway bridge. Prospects of the Roosevelt Freeway making things worse excited even more controversy.

1969 - Lane Boundary Commission formed (along with Salem and Portland metro areas).

1969 - Oregon enacts mandatory comprehensive land use planning requirements (Senate Bill 10).

1972 - Adoption of the 1990 General Plan (1990 Plan) for the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area with a forerunner of the urban growth boundary. The 1990 Plan process began in 1967 with an examination of alternative growth forms and analysis of the implications of sprawl. The Plan was general with goals and recommendations, but no policies. It was also broad in its aerial coverage, extending from Fern Ridge to east of Walterville and from just north of Creswell to just south of Junction City. The 1990 Plan relied on E-SATS for its transportation element and recommended an immediate update.

1973 - Senate Bill 100 passed, LCDC formed and Statewide Planning Goals became the thrust of the Oregon land use program - rural resource protection with exceptions and a defined urban growth boundary around each city to concentrate urban uses and services.

1975 - Eugene (within city limits) was acknowledged by LCDC using the regional 1990 Plan.

1978 - The regional transportation element (T-2000) of the 1990 Plan was adopted. It was the first multi-modal transportation plan for the region (roads, auto, bus, bikes and pedestrian). It took innovative juggling of the goal-oriented alternative mode assumptions among the three governments to get it adopted. It did away with the

Roosevelt Freeway, called for widening of 6th and 7th Streets and recommended an extension of a limited access arterial to connect with W. 11th west of Beltline.

Mid 1970's - Lane County adopted rural zoning county-wide by watershed through the Subarea Comprehensive Land Use Plans.

1982 - The Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (complete with UGB) was adopted by the governing bodies of each jurisdiction. Key issues were the amount of industrial land within the UGB, protection around the airport, who would control growth, and River Road-Santa Clara. The portions of the Metro Plan inside the UGB and cities were acknowledged.

1984-85 - Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan (1984) and the rural portions of the Metro Plan (1985) were acknowledged.

1986 - Curry County Goal 14 litigation and ongoing LCDC efforts result in the 1994 Unincorporated Communities Rule, 2000 Rural Residential Rule and 2003 amendments for Industrial Lands defining rural levels of development consistent with the Statewide Planning Program.

1985-87 - Urban Transition. Remember that whoever controls infrastructure (key elements are roads, water and wastewater treatment) controls growth. Planning and zoning makes a difference because it allows service providers to plan the location of infrastructure. To a large extent, Lane County decides to get out of the administrative side of urban development approvals inside the UGB.

1987 - Completion of first Metro Plan Periodic Review.

The 1990's saw the formation of watershed councils and regional planning efforts, such as the Portland Metro 2040, Willamette Livability Forum ("Choices for the Future, the Willamette Valley", 1999), Willamette Valley Futures and the Region 2050 effort in Lane County. We are currently seeing a re-emergence of concepts from the late 1960's – watershed and regional planning.

D. INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION

The late 1970's and early 1980's was an era of unprecedented intergovernmental cooperation. The T-2000 Plan was adopted, the Metro Plan was adopted with the formation of the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) for policy direction and dispute resolution, and the Wastewater Plan was adopted - leading to formation of the MWMC, regionalization of wastewater treatment, and passage of a local bond to fund the local 25% share of the converted plant and major lines necessary to convey Springfield wastewater to the new regional plant.

Following those early successes and the deep recession of the late 70's and early 80's, an intergovernmental review of urban service delivery was undertaken. The review was motivated by Commissioner Peter DeFazio. Commissioner John Ball chaired the study that led to intergovernmental agreements including the transfer of roads to cities and development of county road fund sharing formulas, the transfer of county administration of planning and building permitting to cities, and the transfer of urban county parks to Eugene and Springfield (for Willamalane).

E. CURRENT REALITIES

The second Periodic Review of the Metro Plan is all but complete and the metropolitan area is dealing with the prospects of the region's population doubling during the next 50 years. If the area doesn't want to replicate what many view as mistakes in other highly developed areas, densities must increase, redevelopment must occur while livability is maintained and there must be an orderly and efficient provision for the necessary public services.

Currently, intergovernmental cooperation is needed as hospitals expand and relocate to address the growing health needs of the region. Schools are consolidating, rebuilding and relocating to meet the changing demographics. Transportation facilities are being designed for the future transportation needs. Destination recreational facilities are being expanded while new ones are being planned. The Metro Plan partners struggle to find ways to finance the many increasing demands placed on government as the region grows.

As cities grow, they inherit the fringe from the county - and a new fringe is formed - and with cars, the fringe influence expands further outward. The land division and settlement patterns greatly influence future growth, infrastructure, and density issues. Small rural communities struggle to survive. Technology is constantly changing and presenting a new wave of issues for the future in terms of shopping, entertaining, working, and commuting.

F. ADVANTAGES OF THE METRO PLAN

The Metro Plan has a number of advantages and various bits of logic attached:

1. It was the cornerstone of LCDC acknowledgment - greater certainty and local control was returned to the region.
2. It treated the urban area as a region - common waters, airshed, transportation links, transit system, scenic assets, and recognized common interests in the housing market, jobs, commuting for workers, shopping opportunities, social interactions, cooperative government services, and higher education.
3. It contained general goals and objectives - and policies that covered gaps in local master planning.
4. It allowed each jurisdiction to develop more detailed goals and policies (Like Eugene's Community Goals and Springfield's 'Project Listen' and Springfield Tomorrow). It allowed

each City and Lane County to construct their individual zoning and ordinances (within the general goals and policies of the Metro Plan).

5. It continued the basis for the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) and regular coordination meetings of the Metro Planning Directors.
6. It established stability that made it possible for progress in servicing River Road and Santa Clara with needed sewers, bringing fire protection to Douglas Gardens and parts of South Springfield, and developing plans for Glenwood.
7. It set the stage for the urban transition study - and the decision of the County to concentrate its planning administration on rural Lane County and to get out of the more intensive administrative urban planning and building permit business (the County did not directly provide water or sewers - two major growth-controlling urban services).
8. It allowed for private development that has been successful in creating housing and economic development during the past 23 years and that has made the Eugene/Springfield Metro area the second largest economic engine in Oregon.

The Metro Plan is viewed in its original form as a general plan within which the individual governments could control more local, refined planning to suit their unique situations, attitudes, and politics.

The Metro Plan has been viewed at times as a source of pride and accomplishment because it expressed our community's direction and met the statewide framework, and it reflected our cooperative approach. It embodied the spirit of a community unlike most others, where we found more in common and worked out our differences through thoughtful negotiations. The Metro Plan also allowed the partners to be different. The Metro Plan reflected a spirit as much as a substance about colors or lines on a map, or a specific policy.

The Metro Plan was successful in setting the stage for many public and private developments in this area over the past 23 years. The regional wastewater plant, an improved airport, a transit system and conservation of agricultural and forest land. The Metro Plan also facilitated the Gateway Mall, fire service by Willakenzie in South Springfield, precluded a new city in Santa Clara, and led to development of new higher tech industrial parks that had been the center of controversy in the late 1970's. It took us into a new century.

G. CURRENT CHALLENGES

When the Metro Plan was first adopted the population within the UGB was approximately 184,000 (1977). During the last 30 years, the population within the Metro UGB has grown approximately 45,000 to 232,000. Twenty-five years from now, the adopted projection for the Metro UGB population is 314,000, an increase of 82,000 by the year 2030.

As the Metro Plan partners finish Periodic Review, we are relieved from a state-mandated process. Local control is placed back in the hands of the Metro Plan partners and we have the opportunity for the first time in a decade to develop a Metro Plan Work Program that is locally driven and meets the desires of the Metro Plan partners. Eugene, Springfield and

Lane County are interconnected by geographic, social, economic, and political ties through a 50 year evolution of land use planning and policy development. The challenge is planning for future generations in a meaningful way and providing for stable government services within the financial constraints of the 21st Century in the aftermath of Measures 5, 47, and 50.

Staff will use your discussion as guidance in developing the Long Range Planning Work Program and staff involvement in coordinating Metro planning efforts. A starting point for discussion could be the general questions previously posed and the list of issues that follow:

Draft List of Issues in Need of Examination

1. Plan Architecture/Structure – 1 Metro Plan or Separate Plans?
2. Urbanizable Land (inside UGB, outside City Limits) Administration
 - a. Who does planning and building permits?
 - b. Representation of citizens inside UGB, outside City Limits.
3. Statutory Coordination Role - LCOG or Lane County?
4. Fundamental Principles.
 - a. Compact Urban Growth.
 - b. With Measures 5, 47/50 are cities logical providers of urban services?
5. Metro Plan area outside UGB.
6. Metro Plan/refinement plan amendment procedures.
7. Regional impacts – County/other City roles inside City Limits
8. Inventory Development (Responsibility and Methodology).
 - a. Residential, Commercial and Industrial land.
 - b. Goal 5 Natural Resources.
9. Role of MPC – Policy Development and Dispute Resolution.
10. Effects of Ballot Measure 37.

OREGON PLANNING HISTORY – HIGHLIGHTS

Pre-World War II:

1895 first special service district law enacted (rural agricultural development district).

1906 Oregon cities gain home rule authority.

1915 water district enabling legislation enacted.

1918 City of Portland adopts Oregon's first zoning.

1919 City zoning enabling legislation enacted.

1935 fire district enabling legislation enacted.

1930-1945 Depression and World War II.

Post World War II:

1947 first county planning enabling legislation.

1958 Oregon counties home rule enabling legislation.

1969 Senate Bill 10 enacted (first comprehensive planning legislation).

1973 Senate Bill 100 enacted and Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) formed.

1974-76 LCDC adopts statewide planning goals.

c. 1986 all 276 local comprehensive plans in Oregon “acknowledged” by LCDC.

1990 Ballot Measure 5 passes, property tax capped at \$15/\$1000 of assessed value excluding bonds: \$10 for general government and \$5 for schools.

1996 Ballot Measure 47 passes.

1997 As a result of legislative action and voter approval Ballot Measure 50 supersedes Ballot Measure 47. This measure rolled assessed values back by 17% and capped growth at 3% annually.

2000 Ballot Measure 7 passes and requires compensation for restrictive land use regulations. (Measure found invalid by the courts).

2004 Ballot Measure 37 passes and requires compensation or “waiver” of restrictive land use regulations for valid claims.

2005 Most local plans are now 15-20 years old. (We are still in an adolescent stage).