

**Metro Plan Chapter IV: Metro Plan Review, Amendments, and Refinements
Summary of Proposed Changes**

Topic		Current Metro Plan	Proposed Change	Rationale
Amendment Types: Process		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments are classified as Type I or Type II (See below under amendment types: decision makers) Decision making process does not follow amendment types (i.e. Some Type I amendments require participation of all three governing bodies, some only require participation of two). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand to three Amendment Types (I, II and III) Align Amendment Types with the number of jurisdictions requires to approve the amendment (i.e. all Type I amendments require participation of all three governing bodies) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Makes <i>Metro Plan</i> consistent with HB 3337. Amendment types are defined by the participants required for decision making. Responds to the establishment of separate UGBs. Defines when jurisdictions may act alone as a home city and when the County and or the non-home city may participate.
Amendment Types: Decision Maker	Any change to the UGB or Metro Plan boundary; (currently Type I)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All three governing bodies must approve a site specific UGB or <i>Metro Plan</i> Boundary adjustments that cross the Willamette or McKenzie Rivers or that crosses over a ridge into a new basin. The home city and Lane County must approve a site specific UGB expansion or Plan boundary adjustment between city limits and plan boundary. Non-home city receives referral and may participate as decision make if determine regional impact (see below). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All three governing bodies must approve amendments of the common UGB along I-5 and for UGB or <i>Metro Plan</i> Boundary changes that cross I-5. The home city and Lane County participate in a UGB or plan boundary amendment east or west I-5 that is not described above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Narrows the opportunity of the none-home city to participate in UGB decisions by the home city and the County.
	Any change that requires a goal exception to be taken under Statewide Planning Goal 2 that is not related to the UGB expansion (Currently Type I)	All three governing bodies must approve amendments that involve a goal exception not related to a UGB expansion.	This section is removed.	<p>Actions requiring an exemption to Statewide Planning Goals that are not related to a UGB expansion are very rare. The goal exception to Statewide Planning Goal 15—Willamette River Greenway to for construction of the new I-5 Bridges and adjoining bike viaduct is the only one requested in recent memory.</p> <p>Virtually all goal exceptions are sought for UGB expansions or for the development of resource lands in rural areas.</p>
	Any amendment to the <i>Metro Plan</i> text that is not site specific or any change to a Fundamental Principle in Chapter II (Currently Type I)	All three governing bodies must approve.	Add changes to the Metro Plan’s Fundamental Principles to list of Type I non site specific text amendments requiring the approval of all three jurisdictions.	The Fundamental Principles found in Chapter II of the <i>Metro Plan</i> set forth the basic concepts of the <i>Plan</i> . The Principles are not site specific. Changing one or more of them fit the definition of a Type I amendment.
	Any change to the <i>Metro Plan</i> Diagram or <i>Metro Plan</i> text that is site specific and not otherwise a Type I amendment (Currently Type II)	Home City must approve	No change	Changes to the <i>Metro Plan</i> that are not site specific would affect all jurisdictions. Participation of all jurisdictions is appropriate for such amendments.
	Amendments to a regional transportation system plan, or a regional public facilities	Adoption or amendment of some refinement plans, functional plans, or special area plans may, in some circumstances, be	Either all three governing bodies, the home city and Lane County, or the home city, shall approve changes to	Consistent with the establishment of Type I, II, and III amendments, changes to TransPlan, functional plans

	<p>plan,</p>	<p>classified as Type I or Type II amendments. Amendments to the <i>Metro Plan</i> that result from state mandated Periodic Review or <i>Metro Plan</i> updates also shall be classified as Type I or Type II amendments depending upon the specific changes that would result from these actions.</p> <p>Chapter VI of the <i>Eugene Springfield Metropolitan Area Public Facilities and Services Plan (Public Facilities Plan)</i> contains amendment provisions which are specific to that plan. Those provisions are not changed by these amendments.</p>	<p>the <i>Metro Plan</i> as required by the amendment type (Type I, II, or III). Plans with their own amendment provisions shall be governed by those provisions.</p> <p>The <i>Public Facilities Plan</i>, for example, contains its own amendment provisions which are not affected by the proposed changes to Chapter IV.</p>	<p>or special area plans shall follow the amendment process dictated by the amendment type.</p> <p>Plans which have their own amendment provisions are not affected by these changes.</p>
	<p>Creation of new <i>Metro Plan</i> designations and amendment of existing designation descriptions that apply only within the city limits of the home city.</p>	<p>All three jurisdictions must approve text amendments which are non-site specific. Creation of a new <i>Metro Plan</i> designation is a text amendment which is non-site specific.</p>	<p>Home city.</p>	<p>The proposed change amendments will allow a home city to independently approve new <i>Metro Plan</i> designations which apply only within its city limits.</p>
<p>Regional Impact</p>		<p>An amendment will be considered to have Regional Impact if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will require an amendment to a jointly adopted functional plan [<i>Eugene- Springfield Metropolitan Area Transportation Plan (TransPlan)</i>, <i>Eugene- Springfield Metropolitan Area Public Facilities and Services Plan (Public Facilities Plan)</i>, etc.] in order to provide the subject property with an adequate level of urban services and facilities; or • It has a demonstrable impact on the water, storm drainage, wastewater, or transportation facilities of the non-home city; or • It affects the buildable land inventory by significantly adding to Low Density Residential (LDR), Campus Industrial (CI), Light-Medium Industrial (LMI), or Heavy Industrial (HI) designations or significantly reducing the Medium Density Residential (MDR), High Density Residential (HDR), or Community Commercial (CC) designations. 	<p>Language referencing “Regional Impact” is removed from Chapter IV.</p>	<p>Removal of the regional impact language does not change Chapter VI of the <i>Public Facilities Plan</i> which provides for multi-jurisdictional review of public facility projects which have a significant impact on water, stormwater, wastewater and electrical facilities serving more than one jurisdiction. A <i>Metro Plan</i> amendment which causes a significant impact on public facilities will be subject to the provisions of Chapter VI.</p> <p>Amendments to other functional plans and refinement plans will be subject to the amended Chapter IV processes unless those documents specify a different amendment process like that found in the <i>Public Facilities Plan</i>.</p> <p>The establishment of separate UGBs has prompted each city to establish their own inventories of residential, commercial and industrial Lands. The proposed change allows cities to act independently to add or subtract land from their inventories so long as these amendments do not significantly impact public facilities outside of their jurisdiction.</p>
<p>Conflict Resolution</p>		<p>When there is no consensus on an amendment (such as when one jurisdiction approves and the other does not), the amendment is referred to the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) for additional study, conflict resolution and recommendation back to the governing bodies.</p>	<p>For a Type I amendment where there is no consensus, the amendment shall be referred to the Chair of the Lane County Board of Commissioners and the Mayors of Eugene and Springfield for examination of the issue(s) in dispute and recommendation back to the governing bodies.</p> <p>For Type II amendments, the amendments shall be</p>	<p>The MPC is comprised of two elected officials each from Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County. When the MPC is considering metropolitan transportation matters, the two members of the Lane Transit District (LTD) Board serve as voting members.</p> <p>The change provides more flexibility for decision</p>

			referred to the Chair of the Board and the Mayor of the home city.	makers to determine a conflict resolution method that is tailored to the specific situation.
Timelines		Public hearings by the governing bodies for <i>Metro Plan</i> amendments requiring participation from one or two jurisdictions shall be held within 120 days of the initiation date. <i>Metro Plan</i> amendments that require a final decision from all three governing bodies shall be concluded within 180 days of the initiation date.	The timelines for processing amendments are dropped from Chapter IV.	Current Plan amendments take longer than this 120 day limit because of challenges in scheduling meetings involving multiple jurisdictions and continued hearings or deliberations.