



JOINT ELECTED OFFICIALS MEETING

City of Eugene ● City of Springfield ● Lane County

January 13, 2009
Noon to 1:30 pm

Springfield City Hall
Library Conference Room
225 5th Street, Springfield

12:00 - 1:30 pm

I. Metro Plan Revisions
Kent Howe, Lane County

Action Requested: Review Lane County Board of Commissioners' identified issues with the Eugene-Springfield Metro Plan and discuss possible Metro Plan amendments to remedy those issues.

SPRINGFIELD LIBRARY MEETING ROOM

The Library Meeting Room is located adjacent to the Library inside City Hall on the second floor.

If you enter City Hall at 5th and A, you will enter by the Library. Continue past the Library entrance. Turn right just past the Library and you will be looking at the Library Meeting Room.

If you enter from the East Entrance, go through the lobby. The Library Meeting Room is off to the left before you reach the Library.

PARKING AROUND SPRINGFIELD CITY HALL

There is free two hour parking beneath City Hall, next to the Museum at 6th and Main. There is also free two hour parking along Main St. and most streets surrounding City Hall.

Location is wheelchair accessible (WCA). American Sign Language (ASL) interpretation is available with 48 hours notice.

LCOG Main Office: 859 Willamette, Suite 500, Eugene, Oregon 97401
Phone: (541) 682-4283 • Fax: (541) 682-4099 • TTY: (541) 682-4567

Memo Date: December 22, 2008
Board Meeting Date: January 7, 2009



TO: LANE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

DEPARTMENT: Public Works Dept./Land Management Division

PRESENTED BY: Kent Howe, Planning Director

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: Work Session / Regarding January 13, 2009, Joint Elected Officials Discussion on Metro Plan Revisions Required to Address Issues Identified by the Lane County Board of Commissioners

Agenda Item Summary:

On January 13, 2009, the Board of Commissioners will participate in a meeting of the Joint Elected Officials (JEO). The purpose of the JEO meeting will be to review Board identified issues with the Eugene-Springfield Metro Plan and to discuss possible Metro Plan amendments to remedy those issues. This work session has been scheduled in preparation of the January 13th JEO Meeting.

Please find attached the proposed JEO agenda cover memo and associated documents.

Memo Date: December 19, 2008
JEO Meeting Date: January 13, 2009



TO: **JOINT ELECTED OFFICIALS OF THE EUGENE/
SPRINGFIELD METRO PLAN**

PRESENTED BY: Kent Howe, Planning Director
Lane County Land Management Division

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: Joint Elected Officials Discussion on Metro Plan
Revisions to Address Issues Identified by the Lane
County Board of Commissioners

I. PROPOSED MOTIONS:

No motion is necessary. This is a discussion item only.

II. ISSUE OR PROBLEM

This memorandum is a follow-up to the discussions of the Mayors and Chair of the Board on December 1st regarding possible Metro Plan amendments that could be considered and implemented to address concerns with the Metro Plan and the Urban Transition Agreements that have been identified by the Board of County Commissioners. These amendment concepts have been developed by County staff as an alternative to the termination of the metro-area Urban Transition Agreements.

Staff is seeking general direction and input from the Joint Elected Officials ("JEO") as we begin development of specific Metro Plan Amendment revisions and materials to address the first two of five Lane County issues, as discussed at the December 1st Mayors and Chair meeting. Staff will continue to coordinate with the cities the development and inclusion of specific text revision proposals into the Metro Plan amendment efforts currently underway, as appropriate.

III. DISCUSSION

A. BACKGROUND

The Eugene/Springfield Metro Area General Plan (the Metro Plan) serves as a joint management agreement between Lane County and the cities of Eugene and Springfield in matters of long-range planning and policy guidance. For several years, the Board of County Commissioners have recognized and attempted to address identified issues within the Metro Plan relating to:

1. Annexation policies;
2. The ambiguous and conflicting plan language related to urban services;
3. Perceived citizen disenfranchisement (stemming from the delegation of building and land use code administration to the cities within the UGB);

4. Jurisdictional autonomy, and
5. Dispute resolution policies.

These five issues have been under discussion by the Board for some time and at the December 1, 2008, meeting of the Mayors and Board Chair they were discussed in more detail. Attachment "A" to this memo is a copy of a background memo that was provided for the December 1st meeting. At that meeting it was determined that simultaneously addressing all of these issues could be too complex of an endeavor. The Mayors and Board Chair suggested staff start by bringing issues #2 and #4 to the January 2009, meeting of the JEO for consideration and direction. As envisioned by the Mayors and Board Chair, the remaining issues could be considered at a later time, once issues #2 and #4 had been resolved.

This memo provides an overview of issues #2 and #4 and describes possible Metro Plan amendment approaches to address each.

Issue #2: Metro Plan Description of Urban Services

Problem Statement: Within the Metro Plan a number of different and inconsistent terms are used when referring to various services provided by the local governments and other agencies. More important and problematic for Lane County is that the terms used in the plan do not specifically refer to, define or recognize those key functions and services that the county provides which are used extensively by urban residents. These key county-provided urban services include: Sheriff and corrections services, criminal prosecution (DA) services, parole and probation services, elections, regional transportation facilities and services, mental health services, public health services, workforce assistance services, animal services and regional park facilities and services.

Failure to recognize the county as a provider of these key urban services within the metropolitan area and the Metro Plan is fundamentally unfair and potentially detrimental to the county's long term ability to maintain them. This is because funding one or more of these services may, at some point, require the establishment of a special taxing district or some other innovative approach to keep those services viable. Under current policies and operational practices of the Metro Plan, the creation of special taxing districts for these services or including them within existing districts would likely not be feasible or could be precluded because public services are not defined and the scope of defined key urban services includes some services cities do not provide. The definitions and Metro Plan policies also may affect or exclude consideration of other services not provided by cities in ways unrelated to land use planning.

Proposed Solution: Address deficiencies of the Metro Plan dealing with public and urban services. Revisions may include modifications/clarifications to the text of the fundamental principles; clarifying modifications to goal language and findings and/or modification or clarification of the definition of key urban services and public services within the Metro Plan Glossary. These revisions would clarify

the cities' and county's roles as providers of various key urban services within the Metro Plan area.

Currently, the Metro Plan refers to general services, public services, urban services and key urban services at both the minimal and full range level, but only the latter term is defined with descriptions of various services.

The minimum level of key urban services are defined as: wastewater service, stormwater service, transportation, solid waste management, water service, fire and emergency medical services, police protection, citywide parks and recreation programs, electric service, land use controls, communication facilities, and public schools on a district-wide basis (in other words, not necessarily within walking distance of all students served).

The full range of key urban services adds urban public transit, natural gas, street lighting, libraries, local parks, local recreation facilities and services, and health services.

A logical interpretation of these definitions might assume that county provided services, such as Sheriff and correctional services, would fall within the scope of "police protection" or, that county mental health and public health services would be included within "health services". Unfortunately, these distinctions are not clearly specified within the Metro Plan and, as discussed above, this lack of clarity can be problematic when faced with exploring options for financing those and other services.

Modifying existing fundamental principle or goal and policy language within the Metro Plan to provide this needed clarity may cause far reaching and unintended problems with the cities' land use and annexation review criteria and processes. This potential issue was discussed at the December 15th meeting of the Metro Planning Directors. During that meeting staff from the three jurisdictions discussed the possibility of simply adding a definition within the Metro Plan Glossary to articulate the key county-provided urban services. While this option would provide some recognition of the county's role as an urban service provider and would not run the risk of impacting existing city land use and annexation review criteria, it is unlikely that this approach would go far enough to fully recognize and incorporate the county's urban service provider role within the Metro Plan and maintain financing flexibility to support those services similar to what exists in all other parts of Lane County.

Lane County staff is recommending that a more comprehensive analysis continue to be conducted to determine which specific components of the Metro Plan would require revision to acknowledge the county's role as a key urban service provider and to determine what possible externalities those revisions would have on existing city processes. Additionally, staff is recommending that any future Metro Plan revisions to address this issue be coordinated with city staff as they develop the bundle of proposed amendments associated with HB3337. These amendments could be brought before the Board and the City

Councils in the near future to keep you apprised of the proposals as they work through the amendment process.

Issue# 4: Jurisdictional Autonomy/Metro Plan Boundary Adjustment

Problem Statement: Over the years there have been infrequent but highly publicized instances when the cities have held a deciding vote in land use proceedings involving private property within another governing body's primary jurisdiction. This continues to be possible because Ch. IV, Policy 7 of the Metro Plan requires that any proposed amendments to the Metro Plan for property outside of a city must be jointly approved by the County and the partner city (or cities) or otherwise, the amendment shall be referred to the MPC for conflict resolution. The current bylaws and operation of the MPC has made resolution unlikely if one of the jurisdictions does not desire resolution. This has meant that each of the cities possess and have exercised an ability to override the authority and will of the County Commissioners and the adjoining City Council on proceedings which involve property located entirely outside of their own city limits or the UGB.

Proposed Solution: There are two possible remedies to this problem. The first entails modifying the current consensus-driven conflict resolution bylaws of the MPC. The second, involves limiting the applicability of the Metro Plan by modifying the plan boundary so that it is coterminous with the Eugene Springfield Urban Growth Boundary and modifying key policy language within the Metro Plan that speak to the applicability of the plan beyond the UGB. These revisions could be implemented and concurrently adopted along with other upcoming HB3337 related amendments.

Attachment "B" to this memo is a possible conceptual illustration of the proposed adjusted Metro Plan Boundary.

IV. ACTION

The information presented in this memo was provided at the direction of the Mayor's and Chair of the Board for discussion purposes only. Therefore, no action is requested at this time.

V. FOLLOW-UP

Staff will provide additional information or clarifications at the request of the Joint Elected Officials and continue to work on all five issues with progress reports at subsequent JEO meetings.

VI. ATTACHMENTS:

A. November 12th BCC work Session Agenda Cover Memo regarding alternative options to UTA termination

B. Concept illustration of the proposed adjusted Metro Plan Boundary

AGENDA COVER MEMO

DATE: October 27, 2008
November 12, 2008 Board Meeting Date

TO: BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

FROM: KENT HOWE, PLANNING DIRECTOR
LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: Urban Transition Agreements and the Eugene-Springfield Metro Plan Alternative Considerations

I. MOTION:

No motion necessary. This is an information item only.

II. ISSUE OR PROBLEM

Follow-up to Board's October 22nd discussion on alternatives to the Eugene-Springfield Metro Plan issues and Urban Transition Agreement concerns. Provide staff direction on specific alternative approaches to pursue.

III. DISCUSSION

A. BACKGROUND

The Board has articulated five issues related to using the Eugene/Springfield Metro Plan as the urban area joint management agreement and to the Eugene/Springfield Urban Transition Agreements :

- Because significant development triggers annexation, the Board has constituents that are upset over annexation policies.
- Citizens feel disenfranchised, because their elected officials have delegated land use and building code administrative authority to the cities.
- The fundamental policies of the *Metro Plan* that describe the cities as the logical provider of urban services.
- Jurisdictional autonomy -- goes back as far as Blue Water Boats, but more recently the Public Safety District and Delta S&G expansion and consideration of having the Metro Plan coterminous with the UGB.
- Dispute Resolution that does not work with the way MPC operates.

The Board is a partner in the *Eugene/Springfield Metro Plan* and there are several plan amendment opportunities coming to you in the near future. These are opportunities to refine your vision of the *Metro Plan* and include your considerations in the discussion.

- The cities will be coming to you for co-adoption of amendments that will be necessary to implement HB 3337; and

- The co-adoption of the amendments for the transportation system plans, the RTSP and TransPlan.

The Board will have opportunities at these junctures to guide the *Metro Plan* with your vision of :

1. Board hearing process for citizens in the UTA to be heard when they disagree with administration of the Metro Plan within the UGB;
2. Amendments to the *Metro Plan* description of urban services;
3. Rural Reserves so that important agricultural land can be protected from urbanization;
4. An adjusted Plan Boundary to provide jurisdictional autonomy for properties outside the Urban Growth Boundary;
5. An opportunity to develop a dispute resolution process that does not allow one jurisdiction to hold veto power over the other partners.

This memo addresses each of the opportunities listed above for your consideration and seeks direction from the Board for staff to further develop your vision.

1. Board Hearing Process

Significant development triggers annexation and citizens get upset over annexation policies that are city's jurisdiction. The Board could establish a hearing process so that the citizens can be heard by their elected officials and not feel disenfranchised in the city decisions on annexation. The Board and Council could develop a referral process that provided consideration of the Board's position on the annexation to the Council.

This action could be implemented with process and/or code amendments. One way would be to develop a review process in Land Management at the level of a Land Use Compatibility Statement (LUCS) form and fee (currently \$138.00 for a simple LUCS, \$690.00 if a complex LUCS). This form will be designed for a project applicant that has been denied a development permit to present their case to the Board of Commissioners for consideration of a solution in a public hearing process. The Board's decision would be forwarded to the city for consideration. Annexation Metro Plan policies are in Attachment 1.

The Board could also provide a waiver process for a property owner wanting to develop in the UGB with amendments to LC Chapter 10. LC10 applies to all UGB's in the county, including the Metro Plan UGB. The example below is being proposed for the Florence UGB under co-adoption of their Realization 2020 Comp Plan.

10.122-31 Land Uses.

(1) For land within the Florence UGB that is within the North Florence Dunal Aquifer boundary, as designated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in September, 1987, no land uses that require an expansion or installation of a new septic system will be allowed, unless the applicant provides proof that an

exception has been made as evidenced by final written action of the Florence City Council. Replacement of a failing septic system for existing uses is allowed if consistent with state law.

Direct staff to further refine administrative processes and possible Metro Plan amendments for consideration and your Metro partners.

2. Metro Plan Description of Urban Services

A variety of public services are provided by Lane County and special service districts to unincorporated portions of the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area. The Metro Plan uses a number of terms inconsistently when referring to services provided by the local governments. (Attachment 1)

The Metro Plan refers to general services, public services, urban services and key urban services both minimal and full range.

The minimum level of key urban services are defined as: wastewater service, stormwater service, transportation, solid waste management, water service, fire and emergency medical services, **police protection**, citywide parks and recreation programs, electric service, land use controls, communication facilities, and public schools on a district-wide basis (in other words, not necessarily within walking distance of all students served).

The full range of key urban services adds urban public transit, natural gas, street lighting, libraries, local parks, local recreation facilities and services, and **health services**.

Other key urban services that could be added to the list of full range key urban services would be public safety and regional services such as transportation, mental health, district attorney, animal services and medical/hospital.

Many public services are currently provided almost exclusively by Lane County agencies: the Sheriff, District Attorney, Youth Services and Health and Human Services operate within all city limits and provide many services cities do not currently provide.

The fact that the cities do not generally provide all of the contemplated public safety services is evidence that these services are not an element of an urban level of development; rather they are basic, on-going county services provided regardless of development level. Most of the contemplated services are very different than the "police protection" described in the Metro Plan definition of "key urban facilities and services."

The *Metro Plan* policies compel delivery of truly urban development services by cities (water, sewer, stormwater, etc.) but are unclear how police and health services address growth management concerns. Language could be provided to clarify that police and health services provided by the County do not weaken the position of Eugene and Springfield relative to the other growth management policies or their ability to annex land or control the proliferation of other growth-inducing or related special districts.

Amending the *Metro Plan* text to clarify the different types of urban services provided and distinguishing which are related to growth management (such as water, sewer and transportation) and which are not is a critical first step in the comprehensive process of addressing the fundamental policy of the *Metro Plan* that states cities are the logical provider of urban services.

Direct staff to further refine proposed Metro Plan amendments for your consideration and discussion with your Metro partners.

3. Rural Reserves

Current state statutes and administrative rules do not explicitly provide for the establishment of rural reserves outside of the Portland Metro area. However, provisions for Rural Reserves could be developed locally within the framework of the Eugene-Springfield Metro Plan (or any acknowledged comprehensive plan) so that important aesthetic, agricultural, and environmentally sensitive lands in proximity to the Metro Area can be protected from future urbanization.

Establishing a process and criteria for the selection and designation of rural reserves in the context of the Metro Plan will necessitate a number of amendments to the plan. The following minimum amendments should be pursued:

- Modify Chapter II, Section A -Fundamental Principle #3 to make reference for the need for compact urban growth to occur in a manner that does not preclude the establishment of rural reserves.
- Modify Chapter II, Section B - Growth Management Goal #3 to include reference to preservation of designated rural reserves and insert similar references in the Environmental Resources goals also within Chapter II, Section B
- Insert appropriate finding and policies in support of a rural reserves within Chapter II, Section C
- Create a rural reserves land-use designation and description under Chapter II Section G.
- Modify the Metro Plan map legend within Chapter II section G to account for future a diagrammatic representation of rural reserves
- Insert appropriate findings and policies in support of a rural reserves within Chapter III, Section C- Environmental Resources Element and include similar language in other related elements (i.e. D-Willamette River Greenway, River Corridors and Waterways Element and H - Parks and Recreation Facilities Element)
- Add a functional definition of rural reserves into the plan glossary contained in Chapter V

If the Board is interested in implementing these changes staff should be directed to begin crafting specific Metro Plan amendment materials and policy language. In addition to this approach, the Board could also direct the Intergovernmental Relations Officer to pursue a legislative change that would enable reserves to be established statewide.

4. Adjusted Metro Plan Boundary

The Board has expressed frustration about the ability of the cities to override county decisions on land use issues outside of the urban growth area but within the Metro Plan Boundary. These problems stem from Ch. IV, Policy 7 of the Metro Plan, which require that any proposed amendments to the Metro Plan be jointly approved by the County and the partner city or otherwise, the amendment shall be referred to the MPC for conflict resolution.

There are two possible remedies to this problem. The first entails modifying the current consensus-driven conflict resolution bylaws of the MPC, as discussed in item 5, below. A second and more certain solution could involve limiting the applicability of the Metro Plan by modifying the plan boundary so that it is coterminous with the Eugene Springfield Urban Growth Boundary (UGB).

The county could pursue this action through any of the following strategies:

- A. Direct staff to initiate Type I Metro Plan amendment (per Ch. IV, Policy 3. a) to modify the Metro Area General Plan Diagram and boundary description contained II-G-1 of the plan.
- B. Work closely with the cities of Eugene and Springfield on future UGB-related Metro Plan amendments compelled by HB3337. This coordination could be conducted in such a way as to strongly encourage the cities to concurrently adopt a Metro Plan boundary and description that is coterminous with the exterior boundaries of the newly bifurcated UGBs.
- C. Direct staff to explore the feasibility of initiating a limited periodic review work program in partnership with the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) as provided for in OAR 660-025-0035(1) to address Metro related issues, including boundary adjustment. County initiation of this type of periodic review appears justified by state law. Specifically, ORS 197.628 (3)(c).
- D. Finally, and in conjunction with any of the above mentioned strategies that the county chooses to pursue, the Board should simultaneously direct the county Intergovernmental Relations Officer to craft and lobby for a legislative adjustment to Metro Plan boundary in a fashion similar to Springfield's promotion of HB 3337. This approach should be aggressively pursued as a "fall-back" strategy regardless of apparent traction gained on any of the above mentioned fronts.

Direct staff to further refine proposed Metro Plan amendments for your consideration and discussion with your Metro partners.

5. Dispute Resolution Process

A dispute resolution process could be designed that does not allow one jurisdiction to hold veto power over the other partners. Amendment of Chapter IV, Policy 7 would be

required, as well as amendments to implementing development codes, specifically for the county, Lane Code 12.235(5), conflict resolution process.

The Board could direct staff to initiate amendments to substitute the majority process used by the Public Safety Coordinating Council. Other methods of dispute resolution could be proposed, as the Board directs.

B. Summary

These proposals can be further refined to move the Board's agenda forward on:

- Annexation Policies
- Protecting important farmland from urbanization
- Developing an effective dispute resolution process
- Provide jurisdictional autonomy

.....
IV. ATTACHMENTS:

1. Excerpts of relevant Metro Plan Findings, Objectives, Policies and Glossary

Attachment 1.

Growth Management Goals, Findings, and Policies

Goals

1. Use urban, urbanizable, and rural lands efficiently.
2. Encourage orderly and efficient conversion of land from rural to urban uses in response to urban needs, taking into account metropolitan and statewide goals.

Findings and Policies

Findings

10. A variety of public services are provided by Lane County and special service districts to unincorporated portions of the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area.
11. In 1986, the Cities of Eugene and Springfield entered into Urban Transition Agreements with Lane County which transferred from the County to the Cities administration for building and land use within the urbanizable portion of the UGB.

Objectives

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

Policies

1. The UGB and sequential development shall continue to be implemented as an essential means to achieve compact urban growth. The provision of all urban services shall be concentrated inside the UGB.
3. Control of location, timing, and financing of the major public investments that directly influence the growth form of the metropolitan area shall be planned and coordinated on a metropolitan-wide basis.
8. Land within the UGB may be converted from urbanizable to urban only through annexation to the city when it is found that:
 - a. A minimum level of key urban facilities and services can be provided to the area in an orderly and efficient manner.
 - b. There will be a logical area and time within which to deliver urban services and facilities. Conversion of urbanizable land to urban shall also be consistent with the *Metro Plan*.
9. A full range of key urban facilities and services shall be provided to urban areas according to demonstrated need and budgetary priorities.

12. When the following criteria are met, either Springfield or Eugene may annex land which is not contiguous to its boundaries.
 - a. The area to be annexed will be provided an urban service(s) which is (are) desired immediately by residents/property owners.
 - b. The area to be annexed can be serviced (with minimum level of **key urban facilities and services** as directed in the *Metro Plan*) in a timely and cost-efficient manner and is a logical extension of the city's service delivery system.
 - c. The annexation proposal is accompanied by support within the area proposed for annexation from the owners of at least half the land area in the affected territory.

13. **Police, fire and emergency medical services** may be provided through extraterritorial extension with a signed annexation agreement or initiation of a transition plan and upon concurrence by the serving jurisdiction.

15. Creation of new special service districts or zones of benefit within the Plan Boundary of the *Metro Plan* shall be considered only when all of the following criteria are satisfied:
 - a. There is no other method of delivering public services which are required to mitigate against extreme health hazard or public safety conditions.
 - b. The three metropolitan area general purpose governments concur with the proposal to form the service district or zone of benefit.
 - c. The district or zone of benefit is an interim service delivery method, and there are legal assurances, such as annexation agreements, to ensure that annexation to the appropriate city occurs within the planning period.
 - d. The servicing city is not capable of providing the full range of **urban facilities and services** in the short term, although it is recognized that **urban facilities and services** will be provided by a city consistent with adopted public facilities plans and capital improvement programs.
 - e. The district or zone of benefit will contract with the appropriate city for interim service delivery until annexed to the appropriate city.

16. Ultimately, land within the UGB shall be annexed to a city and provided with the required minimum level of **urban facilities and services**. While the time frame for annexation may vary, annexation should occur as land transitions from urbanizable to urban.

18. As annexations to cities occur over time, existing special service districts within the UGB shall be dissolved. The cities should consider developing intergovernmental agreements, which address transition issues raised by annexation, with affected special service districts.

19. The realignment (possible consolidation or merger) of fringe special service districts shall be examined to:
 - a. **Promote urban service transition to cities within the UGB.**
 - b. Provide continued and comprehensive rural level services to property and people outside the UGB.

c. Provide more efficient service delivery and more efficient governmental structure for serving the immediate urban fringe.

20. Annexation of territory to existing service districts within the UGB shall occur only when the following criteria are met:

- a. Immediate annexation to a city is not possible because the required minimum level of **key urban facilities and services** cannot be provided in a timely manner (within five years, as outlined in an adopted capital improvements program);
- b. Except for areas that have no fire protection, affected property owners have signed consent to annex agreements with the applicable city consistent with Oregon annexation law. Such annexations shall be considered as interim service delivery solutions until ultimate annexation to a city occurs.

21. When unincorporated territory within the UGB is provided with any new urban service, that service shall be provided by the following method (in priority order).

- a. Annexation to a city;
 - b. Contractual annexation agreements with a city;
 - c. Annexation to an existing district (under conditions described previously in Policy #20); or
 - d. Creation of a new service district (under conditions described previously in Policy #15).
4. Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County shall continue to involve affected local governments and other **urban service providers** in development of future, applicable *Metro Plan* revisions, including amendments and updates.

E. Urban and Urbanizable Land

This section addresses the need to allow for the orderly and economic extension of **public services**, the need to provide an orderly conversion of urbanizable to urban land, and the need to provide flexibility for market forces to operate in order to maintain affordable housing choices.

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

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

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

3. Compact urban growth.
- 4 Cooperation with other utilities and providers of urban services to ensure coordination with their respective capital improvement programs.

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

Findings, Objectives, and Policies

Findings

2. In order to achieve urban densities, urban services, including public wastewater service, must be provided.

Objectives

2. Capitalize on existing public expectations by providing further public services which will allow the River Road and Santa Clara areas to achieve urban densities.
3. Deliver a full range of urban services to the River Road and Santa Clara areas through annexation.
4. Consider the unique situation of the residents of River Road and Santa Clara by providing financing mechanisms which will take into account the financial ability of the residents to pay for service delivery and the City of Eugene's ability to provide these services.

Policies

4. The City of Eugene shall provide urban services to the River Road and Santa Clara neighborhoods upon annexation. In the meantime, to reduce the groundwater pollution problem, Eugene will extend wastewater service to developed properties.

G. Metro Plan Diagram

Urban Growth Boundaries

Factor 3. "Orderly and economic provision for public facilities and services;"

The UGB is based partly on the cost of providing urban services to the metropolitan area (for example, ridgelines and other topographic features were considered). The *Metro Plan* Diagram reflects the concept of compact urban growth, sequential development, and opportunities for the least costly provision of public services and facilities.

Residential Land Supply and Demand

Policies

- A.7 Endeavor to provide key urban services and facilities required to maintain a five-year supply of serviced, buildable residential land.

G. Public Facilities and Services Element

This Public Facilities and Services Element provides direction for the future provision of urban facilities and services to planned land uses within the *Metro Plan* Plan Boundary (Plan Boundary).

The availability of **public facilities and services** is a key factor influencing the location and density of future development. The public's investment in, and scheduling of, **public facilities and services** are a major means of implementing the *Metro Plan*. As the population of the Eugene-Springfield area increases and land development patterns change over time, the demand for **urban services** also increases and changes. These changes require that service providers, both public and private, plan for the provision of services in a coordinated manner, using consistent assumptions and projections for population and land use.

The policies in this element complement *Metro Plan* Chapter II-A, Fundamental Principles, and Chapter IIC, Growth Management. Consistent with the principle of compact urban growth prescribed in Chapter II, the policies in this element call for future urban water and wastewater services to be provided exclusively within the urban growth boundary (UGB). This policy direction is consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 11: Public Facilities and Services, "To plan and develop a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of **public facilities and services** to serve as a framework for urban and rural development." On urban lands, new development must be served by at least the minimum level of **key urban services and facilities** at the time development is completed and, ultimately, by a full range of **key urban services and facilities**. On rural lands within the Plan Boundary, development must be served by rural levels of service. Users of facilities and services in rural areas are spread out geographically, resulting in a higher per-user cost for some services and, often, in an inadequate revenue base to support a higher level of service in the future. Some urban facilities may be located or managed outside the urban growth boundaries, as allowed by state law, but only to serve development within the UGB.

Goals

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

Findings and Policies

The findings and policies in this element are organized by the following four topics related to the provision of **urban facilities and services**. Policy direction for the full range of **urban facilities and services**, including wastewater service, may be found under any of these topics, although the first topic, Services to Development Within the Urban Growth Boundary, is further broken down into subcategories.

Services to Development Within the Urban Growth Boundary

Planning and Coordination

Water

Stormwater

Electricity

Schools

Solid Waste

Services to Areas Outside the Urban Growth Boundary
Locating and Managing Public Facilities Outside the Urban Growth Boundary
Financing

Services to Development Within the Two Metropolitan Area Urban Growth Boundaries: Planning and Coordination

Findings

3. **Urban services** within the UGB are provided by the City of Eugene, the City of Springfield, Lane County, EWEB, SUB, the MWMC, electric cooperatives, and special service districts.
7. In accordance with ORS 195.020 to 080, Eugene, Springfield, Lane County and special service districts are required to enter into coordination agreements that define how planning coordination and **urban services** (water, wastewater, fire, parks, open space and recreation, and streets, roads and mass transit) will be provided within the UGB.

Services to Areas Outside the Urban Growth Boundary

Findings

1. Providing **key urban services**, such as water, to areas outside the UGB increases pressure for urban development in rural areas. This can encourage premature development outside the UGBs at rural densities, increasing the cost of **public facilities and services** to all users of the systems.

Chapter IV *Metro Plan* Review, Amendments, and Refinements

The *Metro Plan* is the long-range public policy document which establishes the broad framework upon which Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County make coordinated land use decisions. While the *Metro Plan* is the basic guiding land use policy document, it may be amended from time to time.

Goal

Ensure that the *Metro Plan* is responsive to the changing conditions, needs, and attitudes of the community.

Findings, Objectives, and Policies

Findings

1. If the *Metro Plan* is to maintain its effectiveness as a policy guide, it must be adaptable to the changing needs and circumstances of the community.
2. Between *Metro Plan* updates, changes to the *Metro Plan* may occur through Periodic Review and amendments initiated by the governing bodies and citizens.

Objectives

1. Maintain a schedule for monitoring, reviewing, and amending the Metropolitan Area General Plan so it will remain current and valid.

Policies

1. A special review, and if appropriate, *Metro Plan* amendment, shall be initiated if changes in the basic assumptions of the *Metro Plan* occur.

Chapter V

Glossary

Key urban facilities and services:

Minimum level: Wastewater service, stormwater service, transportation, solid waste management, water service, fire and emergency medical services, police protection, citywide parks and recreation programs, electric service, land use controls, communication facilities, and public schools on a district-wide basis (in other words, not necessarily within walking distance of all students served).

Full range: The minimum level of key urban facilities and services plus urban public transit, natural gas, street lighting, libraries, local parks, local recreation facilities and services, and health services.

Attachment B: Concept Illustration of the Proposed Adjusted Metro Plan Boundary

- Existing Metro Plan Boundary
- New Metro Plan Boundary following Revised HB 3337 UGBs
- Eugene UGB
- Springfield UGB

