

Summary of Proposed Enabling Amendments to the Metro Plan September 8, 2014

Throughout the document there are numerous non-substantive, technical changes that are not listed in the table, below. These changes are proposed in order to update the Plan's history and provide correct references to internal and external documents.¹

In addition, there are the following specific, non-substantive, changes:

Preface and Chapter 1:

Page	Change
i, ii	Update historic account of actions taken on Metro Plan to remove incorrect implication that all Metro Plan text adopted in 1982 and 1986 is still (and will always be) in the Metro Plan
iii, iv	Add a section to historical notes to explain the requirements of HB 3337 (codified as 197.304) and provide a general discussion of the expected process for addressing the requirements of ORS 197.304 – enabling a transition toward a Metro Plan that addresses regional comprehensive planning issues and city-specific comprehensive plans that address local land use issues
iv	Add historical notes regarding Metro Plan amendments approved in 2013
I-1	Update purpose statement to enable a transition toward a Metro Plan that addresses regional comprehensive land use issues and city-specific comprehensive plans that address local land use issues Update footnote to add 2011 action taken by Springfield to adopt a city-specific residential element
I-3	Revise Planning Function 9 to enable a transition toward city-specific comprehensive plans that may provide the basis for some city land use decisions instead of, or in addition to, the Metro Plan Revise Planning Function 11 to remove reference to outdated population number
I-4	Delete "Contents" section to eliminate duplication Relocate Appendix references to page I-6 so that it is not lost in the deletion, above
I-4, 5, 6	Revise "Use of Metro Plan" section to enable an incremental transition toward a Metro Plan that addresses regional land use issues and city-specific comprehensive plans that address local land use issues, recognizing that, at some points in time, each city may be relying on portions of the Metro Plan to a different degree than the other city
I-6	Revise "Relationship to Other Plans" section to enable an incremental transition toward a Metro Plan that addresses regional comprehensive planning issues and city-specific comprehensive plans that address local land use issues

¹The ordinance to adopt this package of Metro Plan amendments will also include a grant of administrative authority to correct page numbers, footnote numbers, the Table of Contents and scrivener's errors.

	Add Appendix references relocated from page I-4
I-7	Revise “Relationship to Statewide Planning Goals” to enable cities to address these goals through city-specific plans and rely on the Metro Plan where such city-specific plans do not address the goals
I-7, 8	Delete historical text in “Relationship to the Technical Supplement and Working Papers” section as it is unnecessary and soon-to-be outdated
I-8	Add footnote to clarify that 2011 UGB action taken by Springfield made the “General Assumptions” (relating to population forecasting for entire region) inapplicable in Springfield

Chapter II:

Page	Change
II-A-1	Add language to enable the transition from a shared “Metropolitan UGB,” to a “Springfield UGB” and a “Eugene UGB”; allows Metro Plan to retain meaning as this transition incrementally occurs
II-A-1	Delete word “refinement” from Principle 1, so that “plan” also operates as a reference to a city-specific comprehensive plan, where applicable
II-A-1	Add footnote to clarify that 2013 action taken by the three jurisdictions moved the Metro Plan boundary on the east side of I-5
II-A-1	Delete word “metropolitan” from Principle 3, so that the term “UGB” operates as a reference to the “Metropolitan UGB,” the “Springfield UGB,” or “Eugene UGB” as applicable (see change to page II-A-1, above)
II-A-2	Add reference to “city-specific comprehensive plans” to Principle 4 to reflect that each city’s local regulations should be consistent with the precepts in its city-specific comprehensive plan, as applicable Add “metropolitan” to be clear that the population figure used in Principal 7 relates to the metropolitan UGB (see change to page II-A-1, above)
II-B-1, 2, 3	Delete redundant recitation of Goals (they are set out in the applicable sections of Chapter III) to better enable cities to develop city-specific comprehensive plans that address their individual goals on local land use issues
II-C-1	Revise to reflect the changes adopted by the three jurisdictions in 2013 that allowed each city to adopt UGB amendments (with Lane County) on its side of I-5
II-C-2	Add “metropolitan” to Finding 8 to clarify that finding’s reference to the UGB is to the UGB historically shared by Eugene and Springfield (see change to page II-A-1, above)
II-C-3	Add text to Objective 5 to clarify that state law controls the use of agricultural land for UGB expansions
II-C-4	Add text to Policy 2 to clarify that policy’s reference to the UGB is to the metropolitan UGB historically shared by Eugene and Springfield (see change to page II-A-1, above)
II-C-5	Delete Policy 12 to reflect that this policy became unlawful in 2007, when the State legislature abolished the Lane County Boundary Commission and made state annexation laws apply; renumber subsequent policies
II-C-7	Revise Policy 23 to clarify that it relates to the 1999 Residential Lands and add a footnote to clarify that study no longer applies to Springfield due to Springfield’s 2011 adoption of its own residential element
II-D-1	Update to reflect that the jurisdictional boundary between cities (I-5) was required by ORS

	197.304
II-E-1	Update to clarify that the text refers to the shared, metropolitan UGB that was intended to accommodate both cities' growth through 2015, and that (due to ORS 197.304) the cities are now planning for their independent growth within their separate UGBs; add a note that Springfield established its separate UGB in 2011
II-E-2	Delete reference to Boundary Commission (see change to II-C-5, above)
II-E-2	Replace references to "Metro Plan" with "comprehensive plan" so that text will operate as a reference to either plan
II-E-2, 3	Delete obsolete provision that refers to shared responsibility for providing land inside a shared UGB
II-G-1	Revise and update text to enable each city to incrementally transition from the metro-wide plan diagram to a city-specific plan diagram (due to ORS 197.304); add note to reflect Springfield's 2011 adoption of its separate UGB
II-G-2, 3	Revise to clarify references to plans and UGB and enable cities to adopt parcel-specific designations for land within their UGB's Add footnote to reflect amendment of Metro Plan boundary east of I-5 as adopted in 2013
II-G-11	Same as above
II-G-13	Revise to clarify that text refers to the "Metropolitan UGB" (not the "Springfield UGB" or "Eugene UGB.") (see change to page II-A-1, above)
II-G-15	Revise text to reflect that the location of Springfield's UGB is now specifically described by Metro Plan amendments passed in 2011
II-G-16	Delete superfluous text
II-G-17	Amend Metro Plan Diagram legend to change "Urban Growth Boundary" to "Metropolitan Urban Growth Boundary (applies to Eugene, only)" and to add a new legend label for "Springfield Urban Growth Boundary," amend Diagram to graphically depict both of these UGBs
II-G-18	Delete portions of text and table to reflect that the location of Springfield's UGB (and, therefore, the Metro Plan Boundary east of I-5) is now specifically described by Metro Plan amendments passed in 2011

Chapter III:

III-A-1, 2	Update text to explain relationship between Metro Plan's regional residential element and the city-specific residential element adopted by Springfield in 2011 (clarifies that Metro Plan residential element goals and policies continue to apply to Springfield but that findings do not, adds a reference to Springfield's city-specific plan, clarifies that entirety of Metro Plan residential element continues to apply to Eugene)
III-C-1	Add footnote to clarify that the general references to "UGB" refer to the Metropolitan UGB, the Springfield UGB or the Eugene UGB
III-C-14	Add reference to link boundary for LRAPA fine particulates plan to Metropolitan UGB, as it existed on the date that LRAPA Plan was adopted (prior to 2013 action to modify Metro Plan Boundary)
III-G-1	Add footnote to explain the transition from a shared "Metropolitan UGB" to a "Springfield UGB" and a "Eugene UGB"; clarify that the general references to "UGB" refer to the Metropolitan UGB, the Springfield UGB or the Eugene UGB

III-G-4	Delete word “metropolitan” and phrase “Eugene-Springfield” so reference to “UGB” will refer to the Metropolitan UGB, the Springfield UGB or the Eugene UGB
III-G-13	Same as above
III-G-15	Delete “portion of the” since Springfield has a separate UGB due to 2011 action

Chapter IV:

IV-2	Add footnote to clarify when one city’s withdrawal from a Metro Plan provision (due to the adoption of a city-specific comprehensive plan provision) is a Type I amendment
IV-3	Add footnote to clarify when one city’s withdrawal from a Metro Plan provision (due to the adoption of a city-specific comprehensive plan provision) is a Type II amendment
IV-4	Add text to specify that only a governing body may initiate the adoption of a city-specific comprehensive plan
IV-5	Add Policy 12 to clarify that Chapter IV process does not apply to amendments of city-specific comprehensive plans

Chapter V:

V-1	Delete reference to Lane County Boundary Commission from definition of “Annexation” (see changes to II-C-5, above)
V-1	Add reference to State’s definition of buildable lands to replace potentially inconsistent text in the definition of “Buildable residential lands” to enable each city to adopt its own provision, consistent with the State’s
V-4	Update definition of Metro Plan diagram to conform to enable the transition from a shared “Metropolitan UGB,” to a “Springfield UGB” and a “Eugene UGB”
V-7	Add text to definition of “Urban Growth Boundary” to also define the, more particular, terms: “Eugene UGB,” “Springfield UGB,” and “Metropolitan UGB” (see changes to II-A-1, above)