UGB Expansion Analysis for Park Land

I. Introduction

This study sets out the standards and process by which the City determined a need for additional park land within its urban growth boundary and the characteristics of that land, then follows that process to conclude by identifying the most suitable land to meet the City’s park land need.

Oregon’s Statewide Planning Goal 14 and its administrative rules (See OAR 660-024-0040) require a City to ensure that its UGB is located based, in part, on its population’s 20-year need for parks and open space. The City of Eugene’s most comprehensive consideration of its need for park land is captured in the “Parks, Recreation and Open Space Project and Priority Plan” that was adopted by the Eugene City Council in May 2006. This document includes more than 200 projects, including the need to acquire and develop park sites, to be implemented over a 20-year period to serve the city’s population. Each project is prioritized from 1 (highest) to 5 (lowest) as an indication of the order in which the projects should be implemented, while recognizing unique opportunities and other circumstances may lead the City, in some cases, to address lower priority projects before higher priority projects. The projects in the plan are depicted on maps, and are also listed in a variety of tables, and are organized by park planning sub-areas in which they occur.

The legislative review of Eugene’s UGB requires the City to consider its population’s park needs for the 20-year planning period and any requisite addition of park land to the City’s UGB. As Eugene’s population has increased over time, the need for additional homes has been largely met through infill and redevelopment. As a result, Eugene finds itself in a situation where it needs more parkland to serve residents within the current UGB than is available within that UGB. This is particularly relevant for parks with urban amenities, such as community and regional parks.

Much of the justification for the needs and priorities set out in the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Project and Priority Plan is based on a document referred to as the City’s Parks, Recreation and Open Space Comprehensive Plan. That guiding document was the textual result of a planning process conducted from 2002 to 2006, in which community needs for parks, open spaces, facilities, and programs were identified through extensive public engagement. During that process, City staff interacted with thousands of community members through meetings with neighborhood associations, representatives of interest groups, youth, seniors, adults, people with disabilities, and people from a variety of cultural backgrounds.

II. Determination of Need for New Community Park Sites

Eugene’s park needs are explained and discussed in a guiding, background document approved (but not formally adopted) by the Eugene City Council and referred to as the PROS Comprehensive Plan. (References to “strategies” in this study are to the strategies identified in the PROS Comprehensive Plan.)

The City considers its needs for park land and development in terms of six planning sub-areas that comprise the entire city (see “Planning Area Index Map” below from the PROS Project and Priority Plan). The PROS Project and Priority Plan identifies the need for new parks in all six of the planning sub-areas.
Eugene determines its park needs based on a numerical standard expressed in terms of acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, as well as on equitable distribution of park land. In Eugene, the desired numerical standard for total park land is 20 acres per 1,000 residents. Each park type has a standard as well. For community parks, the numerical strategy is to provide 1.5 acres of community parkland per 1,000 residents (Strategy B-30). It is equally important to ensure the equitable distribution of parks, recreation and open space areas throughout Eugene (Strategy B-2).

The majority of the need is for new “neighborhood parks,” which generally are smaller parks located within an existing or emerging neighborhood. The City has determined that there is an adequate supply of suitable land within the current Eugene UGB to meet the neighborhood park needs of all six planning sub-areas. However, the City has also identified a need for new “community parks” to serve its Bethel/Danebo and River Road/Santa Clara planning sub-areas in Northwest and North Eugene, respectively.

The PROS Comprehensive Plan describes community parks as larger parks that provide both active and passive recreational opportunities for City residents, intended to serve a 2-mile radius. Community parks have a minimum of 40 acres, potentially including school sites when the two uses are co-located. Community parks are intended to accommodate large group activities and are to include the following facilities (Strategies B-28 and B-31):

- Neighborhood park components, including children’s play area, basketball courts, open play area, etc.
- Reservable picnic areas;
- Performance and gathering space;
- Restrooms;
- Soccer and softball/baseball fields;
- Paved pathways and trails;
- Natural areas; and
- Off-street parking, transit access and bike parking.

Many of the features of community parks (community recreation facilities, restrooms, competitive sports fields, etc.) require urban levels of service, which cannot be provided outside of the UGB. Because of the minimum size requirements for community parks of 40 acres, it is more difficult to find suitable and available land for such parks as compared to neighborhood parks.

Aware of these needs for some time, the City of Eugene has actively searched for the most suitable property in the Bethel/Danebo and River Road/Santa Clara planning sub-areas. The City acted on opportunities to purchase land in 2007-2008 for the Bethel/Danebo sub-area and in 2007-2013 for the River Road/Santa Clara sub-area. Later sections of this study set out the Goal 14 analysis demonstrating that the properties are appropriate for inclusion in the UGB at this time.
Bethel/Danebo

The Bethel/Danebo planning sub-area is currently served by only three community parks. The Bethel Community Park, a 33-acre multi-facility park, is co-located with Meadowview K-8 School and located south of Barger Drive, west of Terry Street. The Shasta Ballfields Park, which consists of four ball fields and a soccer field on 15 acres, is co-located with Shasta Middle School and Clear Lake Elementary School and is located south of Barger Drive, east of Terry and west of Randy Papé Beltline. Petersen Park, a 19-acre park that includes the Petersen Barn Community Center, is located south of Barger and east of Randy Papé Beltline. Each of these parks is approximately three-fourths of a mile from the next community park within the sub-area. All three of the existing community parks in the Bethel/Danebo area are located south of Barger Drive, which is a minor arterial. The residential area north of Barger Drive does not have a community park.

The PROS Project and Priority Plan identifies the need for two community parks within the Bethel/Danebo park planning sub-area (Table 1: Proposed Projects & Priorities for Parks, Open Space and Recreation Facilities for Bethel Danebo). Both new community parks are identified to serve specific geographical areas that are currently underserved by recreational opportunities. The projects to meet the area’s needs are identified in the plan as follows:

- Acquire 100+ acres surrounding Golden Gardens ponds for community park (Priority 1&2)
- Develop Golden Gardens and acquired property as community park with significant natural area components and trails (Priority 2 & 3)
- Acquire portion of Union Pacific area for a neighborhood and community park, including improved connections, recreation and open space. (Priority 4)

The first is identified to be located in the area of Golden Gardens ponds, which is north of Barger Drive and west of Beltline. There is land both inside and outside the UGB in this area, which is evaluated in future sections.

The second needed community park for Bethel/Danebo is identified to be located in the Union Pacific area (between the Northwest Expressway and Highway 99 in the vicinity of the railroad tracks). Because the Union Pacific area is fully within the current urban growth boundary, development of an urban community park would not necessitate an urban growth boundary expansion. Therefore, it will not be addressed any further as part of this study.

River Road / Santa Clara

The River Road/Santa Clara planning sub-area does not contain any community parks. Within this park planning sub-area, the PROS Project and Priority Plan identifies the need for one new community park (Table 1: Proposed Projects & Priorities for Parks, Open Space and Recreation Facilities for River Road/Santa Clara). The needed park is specifically intended to serve the Santa Clara area, which is located north of Randy Papé Beltline. (Although the River Road area (south of Beltline) is also not served by a community park, it does contain Emerald Park, which is a River Road Park and Recreation District facility that serves as a community park for this area.) The needed project is identified in the plan as follows:
• Acquire community park site to serve Santa Clara (Priority 1)

There is land both inside and outside the UGB in this area, which is evaluated in future sections.

III. CHARACTERISTICS OF NEEDED COMMUNITY PARK SITES

Statewide Planning Goal 14 requires that the “[e]stablishment and change of the [urban growth] boundaries shall be based on the following: (1) Demonstrated need to accommodate long-range urban population, consistent with a 20-year population forecast coordinated with affected local governments; and (2) Demonstrated need for ... parks or open space.” It provides that “[i]n determining need, local government may specify characteristics, such as parcel size, topography or proximity, necessary for land to be suitable for an identified need.” See also OAR 660-024-0040(1).

The new community park sites would need to have a number of site characteristics to meet the identified needs. In order to meet the need for equitable distribution, each park must be located within the boundaries of its planning area (Bethel-Danebo and River Road-Santa Clara, respectively). Within those boundaries, which are addressed through the establishment of each study area, there are more specific location-based, and other characteristics associated with the specific qualities needed in the new park sites.

Within the first category of “location-based site characteristics,” this analysis will consider both issues of feasible development of each new park, and planning area-specific issues of distribution to serve their local residents. In order to access the necessary urban services, each community park must be located within the urban growth boundary. Therefore, the new park sites must be either within the current UGB or near enough to be brought into the UGB.

For equitable distribution of parks, the two planning areas have different location-based characteristics. For the Bethel-Danebo area, the area north of Barger Drive has been identified as particularly underserved. Because the planning area does have some community parks, the new park site should be located no less than half a mile from existing parks. For the River Road-Santa Clara area, the Santa Clara portion, north of Randy Papé Beltline has been identified as particularly underserved. The new community parks should be located in these specific portions of the planning areas.

In order for parks to provide the most convenient access, as well as for health, safety and equity considerations, it is desirable for the new park sites to be adjacent to an urban residential neighborhood. This enhances the ability of residents, particularly children, to access the parks by active modes of transportation, such as walking or bicycling, and to make parks accessible to community members with limited mobility or transportation options.

Beyond identifying general areas that are appropriate for a new park sites (“location-based site characteristics”), individual properties also need certain characteristics to meet the need for a community park (“other site characteristics”). These characteristics include the needed size of sites, access via appropriate roads, and geographic attributes that enhance the recreational value of prospective parkland.

As noted above under “Determination of Need for Community Park Sites,” community parks require a minimum of 40 acres, either independently or in conjunction with a school site, to accommodate the
range of activities and opportunities that they provide. Therefore, 40 acres is the minimum size criterion for a new community park site. A wider range of recreational opportunities can be provided with more acreage, therefore, many community parks larger than 40 acres exist throughout the city.

Because community parks create significant foot, bicycle and vehicular traffic, it is important that the new park site be located adjacent to a street designated as an existing or planned arterial or collector. These streets are designed for higher volumes of vehicular traffic and connections for alternative modes of transportation.

Parks serve multiple functions for the community, including recreation, community gathering spaces, performance venues, educational opportunities, and spaces for respite and relaxation. A number of geographic attributes enable or enhance a site’s ability to perform those functions. While a site does not need to have all of the characteristics below to function as a community park, it must have at least some of these attributes. One attribute that is essential is availability. In order to develop and operate the park facility, thereby meeting the identified need, the City must have the ownership rights to do so. Therefore, a property’s availability for park use/City ownership is a key site characteristic in this evaluation. The City cannot lawfully redesignate and rezone privately owned land to limit it to a public park use. The City is attempting to address an imminent need for two parks that is a longstanding existing need, not only a future need. For this reason, current availability for public park development is especially important.

Adjacency to a school facility is another desirable geographic advantage. Eugene has historically found that collocation of community parks with school sites provides mutual benefit and significantly greater value to Eugene residents. As such, collocation with an existing or planned school is perhaps not necessary, but is a very desirable site characteristic of future community parks. Significant natural features (water bodies, high quality habitat, scenic viewpoints, etc.) also contribute to the experience of visiting a park. Therefore, sites that offer such features are prioritized in terms of park acquisition and development.

---

1 The PROS Comprehensive Plan (p. 2-3) explains that the City relies on voluntary participation of property owners when acquiring land or purchasing conservation easements. A key objective of the plan is to devise strategies that will not infringe upon the rights of property owners and will stress voluntary participation. Most park and open space protection programs rely on responsible negotiations with willing sellers based on appraisals of fair market value to benefit the public’s and owner’s interests.

2 Existing examples of co-located schools and parks are:
   - Amazon Park/South Eugene High School/Roosevelt Middle School
   - Ascot Park/Monroe Middle School
   - Bethel Community Park/Meadowview School
   - Cal Young Sports Park/Cal Young Middle School
   - Churchill Sports Park/Churchill High School/Kennedy Middle School
   - Crest Heights Park/Crest Elementary
   - Garfield Park/Chavez Elementary School
   - Gilham Park/Gilham Elementary School
   - Kincaid Park/Parker Elementary
   - Shasta Ballfields/Shasta Middle School/Clear Lake School
   - Sheldon Sports Park/Meadow Lark Elementary/Sheldon High School
   - Westmoreland Park/Arts & Technology Academy
In summary, the site characteristics below are necessary for land to be suitable for the needed community parks.

**Location-based Site Characteristics:**
- **Distribution.** These characteristics provide for equitable distribution of parks within each of the following planning sub-areas:
  - Within the Bethel-Danebo parks planning area
    - North of Barger Drive
    - More than half a mile from existing community parks
  - Within the River Road-Santa Clara parks planning area
    - North of Randy Papé Beltline
- **Adjacency to urban residential neighborhoods.** This characteristic provides a site that is safely accessible to active modes of transportation, including walking and bicycling, as well as maximizing the number of residents who are able to live in close proximity to the parks.
  - Adjacent to an existing or planned urban residential neighborhood

**Other Site Characteristics:**
- **Size.** This characteristic ensures that the future park sites are of an appropriate size for the intended use:
  - Minimum size of 40 acres, either independently or in association with a collocated school facility
- **Accessibility.** This characteristic ensures that the future parks are fronting a street that carries or is intended to carry higher volumes of traffic, has or will have a high degree of connectivity, and provides or is intended to provide for pedestrian, bicycle and transit travel:
  - Located on existing or planned collector or arterial street
- **Geographic Attributes.** This characteristic ensures that the future parks are suitable for development, as evidenced by a sufficiency of the following attributes:
  - Owned or available to be owned by the City for purposes of park development
  - Adjacent to an existing or planned school facility
  - Presence of substantial natural features

**IV. DETERMINATION OF NEED FOR EXPANSION (Screening)**

Before evaluating land outside of the urban growth boundary, the City is required to determine whether the park need can be met with land already within the UGB. For the two areas identified above under characteristics of needed community park sites, the City evaluated possible sites within the urban growth boundary. Each planning area is evaluated below.

**Bethel-Danebo**

As described by the “Distribution” characteristic above, the needed Bethel-Danebo site must be north of Barger Drive and more than half a mile from an existing community park. Due to the configuration of the current UGB, there are three separate areas of land inside the current UGB that meet these distribution characteristics, shown in the map “Vacant and Partially Vacant Land – Bethel-Danebo.” The northern area (north of Clear Lake Road and west of Highway 99 (the eastern boundary of the Bethel-Danebo

---

3 These distribution characteristics could have, alternatively, been a factor in establishing the study areas.
parks planning area) includes some vacant land (there is no partially vacant land in this area), but it is entirely composed of industrial land that is distant from urban neighborhoods and is therefore clearly unsuitable for park siting based on the needed characteristics described above.

The southwestern area, near the intersection of Terry Street and Barger Drive, is designated Residential. The City’s Buildable Lands Inventory shows only seven vacant (and no partially vacant) sites in this area. None of these sites are larger than 0.2 acres, and most of these sites are isolated from each other, providing no suitable park sites.

The southeastern area, near Highway 99 north of Barger Drive but south of Clear Lake Road, includes land designated both for employment and residential uses. No sites in this area are of sufficient size for a community park, with the largest vacant area being composed of fourteen (14) residential lots with a maximum individual size of 1.0 acres. This area, therefore, also has no suitable sites for a community park.

These factors of size and location require the City to conclude that there is insufficient available land within the urban growth boundary with the characteristics needed for a new community park site for the Bethel-Danebo area. Because of the lack of available land, an expansion of the urban growth boundary is necessary to accommodate a community park for the Bethel-Danebo planning area.

**River Road-Santa Clara**
In the mid to late 2000s, City of Eugene Parks and Open Space Planning staff conducted an exhaustive analysis of land suitable for a community park to serve the Santa Clara sub-area, considering size, location, land use, service availability, surrounding uses and access. While there are vacant and partially vacant properties within the current urban growth boundary (as shown on the City’s Buildable Lands Inventory) that were of sufficient size and suitability for a community park in the Santa Clara sub-area, staff found that there were no willing sellers. None have come to light, since. As described in the PROS...
Comprehensive Plan (p. 2-3), a willing seller is a key criterion for the City when prioritizing acquisition opportunities. Because of the lack of available land, an expansion of the urban growth boundary is necessary to accommodate a community park to serve the Santa Clara area.

V. ANALYSIS OF LAND FOR UGB EXPANSION

ORS 197.298(1) and OAR 660-024-0060(1) set out a “priority” system among four land categories. The categories are described below. The order of priority is the order in which the categories are listed, highest (a) to lowest (d). This priority system begins with the general rule that cities will expand onto land in the highest-priority land category, expanding onto lower priority land only if the higher-priority land is “inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed.” ORS 197.298(b), (c) and (d). A number of regulations, together, direct the way in which the City must apply the priority system. In the case of land for parks, they include: ORS 197.298, the locational factors of Statewide Planning Goal 14 and OAR 660-024-0060(1), (5) and (6).

ORS 197.298 provides:

1. In addition to any requirements established by rule addressing urbanization, land may not be included within an urban growth boundary except under the following priorities:
   a. First priority is land that is designated urban reserve land under ORS 195.145, rule or metropolitan service district action plan. [Note: Eugene has no land in this category.]
   b. If land under paragraph (a) of this subsection is inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed, second priority is land adjacent to an urban growth boundary that is identified in an acknowledged comprehensive plan as an exception area or nonresource land. Second priority may include resource land that is completely surrounded by exception areas unless such resource land is high-value farmland as described in ORS 215.710.
   c. If land under paragraphs (a) and (b) of this subsection is inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed, third priority is land designated as marginal land pursuant to ORS 197.247 (1991 Edition). [Note: the study area has no land in this category.]
   d. If land under paragraphs (a) to (c) of this subsection is inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed, fourth priority is land designated in an acknowledged comprehensive plan for agriculture or forestry, or both.

2. Higher priority shall be given to land of lower capability as measured by the capability classification system or by cubic foot site class, whichever is appropriate for the current use.

3. Land of lower priority under subsection (1) of this section may be included in an urban growth boundary if land of higher priority is found to be inadequate to accommodate the amount of land estimated in subsection (1) of this section for one or more of the following reasons:
   a. Specific types of identified land needs cannot be reasonably accommodated on higher priority lands;
   b. Future urban services could not reasonably be provided to the higher priority lands due to topographical or other physical constraints; or
   c. Maximum efficiency of land uses within a proposed urban growth boundary requires inclusion of lower priority lands in order to include or to provide services to higher priority lands.

Statewide Planning Goal 14 provides:
The location of the urban growth boundary and changes to the boundary shall be determined by evaluating alternative boundary locations consistent with ORS 197.298 and with consideration of the following factors:

(1) Efficient accommodation of identified land needs;
(2) Orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services;
(3) Comparative environmental, energy, economic and social consequences; and
(4) Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural and forest activities occurring on farm and forest land outside the UGB.

OAR 660-024-0060 provides:
(1) When considering a UGB amendment, a local government must determine which land to add by evaluating alternative boundary locations. This determination must be consistent with the priority of land specified in ORS 197.298 and the boundary location factors of Goal 14, as follows:
   (a) Beginning with the highest priority of land available, a local government must determine which land in that priority is suitable to accommodate the need deficiency determined under OAR 660-024-0050.
   (b) If the amount of suitable land in the first priority category exceeds the amount necessary to satisfy the need deficiency, a local government must apply the location factors of Goal 14 to choose which land in that priority to include in the UGB.
   (c) If the amount of suitable land in the first priority category is not adequate to satisfy the identified need deficiency, a local government must determine which land in the next priority is suitable to accommodate the remaining need, and proceed using the same method specified in subsections (a) and (b) of this section until the land need is accommodated.
   (d) Notwithstanding subsection (a) to (c) of this section, a local government may consider land of lower priority as specified in ORS 197.298(3).
   (e) For purposes of this rule, the determination of suitable land to accommodate land needs must include consideration of any suitability characteristics specified under section (5) of this rule, as well as other provisions of law applicable in determining whether land is buildable or suitable.

* * *

(5) If a local government has specified characteristics such as parcel size, topography, or proximity that are necessary for land to be suitable for an identified need, the local government may limit its consideration to land that has the specified characteristics when it conducts the boundary location alternatives analysis and applies ORS 197.298.

(6) The adopted findings for UGB adoption or amendment must describe or map all of the alternative areas evaluated in the boundary location alternatives analysis. If the analysis involves more than one parcel or area within a particular priority category in ORS 197.298 for which circumstances are the same, these parcels or areas may be considered and evaluated as a single group.

Because the City needs two community parks, to serve two different areas, the UGB expansion study is necessarily split into two sections, below.

Bethel/Danebo Community Park

a. Establish the Study Area / Candidate Land for Evaluation
To identify the right location for its urban growth boundary expansion, the City of Eugene established a very expansive study area that includes all land west of Interstate 5 and south of the McKenzie River within ½ mile of Eugene’s current UGB or within the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan boundary (which extends beyond ½ mile in some areas). The study area includes some additional land to allow for analysis of exception areas or non-resource areas that abut the current UGB and extend beyond the study area described above.

For purposes of determining how the City of Eugene would meet its need for more an additional park site for the Bethel/Danebo planning sub-area, the study area was narrowed to meet the area-specific need of the parks planning area.

Eugene’s study area for a Bethel/Danebo community park site includes all land that is:

1. Within Bethel/Danebo park planning sub-area; and
2. Within one or more of these categories:
   a. within one-half mile from the current UGB;
   b. beyond one-half mile from the current UGB, but within the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (Metro Plan) boundary; or
   c. beyond one-half mile from the current UGB, but part of an exception area or non-resource area (see ORS 197.298(1)(b)) that abuts the current UGB.

The location of the study area is shown on the “Study Area” map, above. The study area includes about 4,621 acres. Of this land, 54 acres have already been identified for a school expansion for Bethel School District, and 648 acres have been identified for an industrial land expansion. Excluding those acres, the remaining 3,919 acres is 9,800% of the 40 acre minimum land needed for a community park.

---

4 The acknowledged regional comprehensive plan (the Metro Plan) provides that “[t]he division of responsibility for metropolitan planning between the two cities is the Interstate 5 Highway.” ORS 197.304 requires Eugene and Springfield to establish separate UGBs “consistent with the jurisdictional area of responsibility specified in the acknowledged comprehensive plan.”
b. **Categorize Candidate Land into the Four Priority Categories of ORS 197.298(1)/(ORS 197.298(1)(b))**

ORS 197.298(1) requires the City to identify the land in its study area as follows:

- **First Priority Land:** land that is designated urban reserve land under ORS 195.145, rule or metropolitan service district action plan.
- **Second Priority Land:** land identified in the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan or the Metro Plan as an exception area or non-resource land, including resource land that is completely surrounded by exception areas unless such resource land is high-value farmland.
- **Third Priority Land:** land designated as marginal land in the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan.
- **Fourth Priority Land:** land designated in the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan or the Metro Plan for agriculture or forestry, or both.

As required by state law, these priority categories are based on comprehensive plan land use designations. Therefore, the first map below, “Land Use Designations,” shows the designations of both the Metro Plan and the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan as they apply inside the study area. The base designations shown on this map are aggregated into priority categories, which are shown on the second map, “Priority Categories of Candidate Land.”

In Eugene’s park expansion study area, there are no lands designated as urban reserves (See ORS 197.298(1)(a), above) or as marginal land ((c), above); therefore there are no first priority or third priority lands included on the map or in the analysis that follows. Land within the study area that does not fall into any of the four priority categories is identified on the Priority Categories of Candidate Land map as “Other Lands.”

In addition to forming the basis for the priority category of candidate land, land use designations are referenced in the subsequent analysis to identify proximity of candidate land to incompatible uses (such as heavy industrial or airport), or desired uses (such as urban residential neighborhoods). These land use designations include those within the study area and those adjacent to the study area. For ease of reference, these designations are shown on the third map below, “Contextual Land Use Designations.”

---

5 These lands include those designated for Sand and Gravel, Airport Reserve, and Parks and Open Space, as well as a small portion of a tax lot designated Government and Education for which an exception was not required to be taken.
c. **First Priority Land – Apply State’s Factors for Dismissal of Candidate Land**

There is no land designated for urban reserves around Eugene. Therefore, there is no first priority land to consider for the proposed UGB expansion.

d. **Second Priority Land – Apply State’s Factors for Dismissal of Candidate Land**

The Bethel/Danebo park expansion study area includes 802.6 acres of second priority land, shown on the “Second Priority Land within Study Area” map. The largest area of second priority land in the study area is a portion of the Eugene Airport, designated Government and Education (Metro Plan), and Airport (Lane County). Other second priority areas are designated Rural Residential (Metro Plan), and Rural Commercial (Metro Plan).

The determination of the City’s need for an additional community park site to serve the Bethel/Danebo park planning sub-area is discussed above under Section I, while Section II addresses the characteristics required to make a site suitable for a park expansion. These site characteristics fall into two categories: location-based and other site characteristics. Analysis of location-based site characteristics (below) is the first step in evaluating whether any of the second priority land in the study area has the characteristics necessary to make it suitable to accommodate the needed park facility.
(1) Dismiss Candidate Land without Needed “Location-based” Site Characteristics

Location-based Site Characteristics:
- Distribution.
  - North of Barger Drive
  - More than half a mile from existing community parks
- Adjacency to urban residential neighborhoods.
  - Adjacent to an existing or planned urban residential neighborhood

The map below, “Second Priority Land: Location-based Site Characteristics,” is a visual representation of the analysis that follows.6

6 All maps in this analysis represent site characteristics in the order they are listed. For example, land that is dismissed because it is south of Barger Drive may also be dismissed because it is not adjacent to urban residential neighborhoods. However, it would only show on the map as being dismissed for the first noted site characteristic.
Distribution

- **Dismissal of Land South of Barger Drive**

  One area of second priority land is located south of Barger Drive within the study area. The southern-most area of second priority land (94.1 acres) is therefore outside of the established needed location and is dismissed from further consideration.

- **Dismissal of Land Within Half a Mile of an Existing Community Park**

  No second priority land is within half a mile of an existing community park. Therefore, no second priority land is dismissed from consideration on this basis.

Adjacency to urban residential neighborhoods

- **Dismissal of Land that is not Adjacent to an Existing or Planned Urban Residential Neighborhood**

  The remaining second priority land includes a large area of 642.8 acres and a smaller area to the south (52.1 acres), which are both designated Government and Education, and owned and used by the Eugene Airport, an important Goal 12 transportation facility. A very small area of land designated Rural Residential (3.3 acres) is also adjacent to the western edge of the Airport. There is also approximately 10.3 acres designated Rural Commercial on Bodenhamer Road, surrounded by land designated Agriculture. All of this land is significantly separated from the current urban growth boundary, and therefore remote from existing or planned urban residential neighborhoods, making it unsuitable for a community park. The remaining second priority land (totaling 708.5 acres) is therefore dismissed from further consideration.

(2) **Conclusion for Second Priority Land within Bethel/Danebo Community Park Expansion Study Area**

The location-based site characteristics needed for the new Bethel/Danebo community park are not present on any second priority land within the study area. Based on the analysis above, the City has determined that none of the second priority land within the study are is suitable for park expansion.

e. **Third Priority Land – Apply State’s Factors for Dismissal of Candidate Land**

There is no land designated as marginal land within the study area. Therefore, there is no third priority land to consider for the proposed park expansion.

f. **Fourth Priority Land – Apply State’s Factors for Dismissal of Candidate Land**

The park expansion study area includes 2,813.5 acres of fourth priority land (that is not already identified for school or industrial expansions), as shown on the “Fourth Priority Land within Study Area”
map below. Most (2,754.6 acres) of the fourth priority land in the study area is designated Agriculture, and 58.9 acres is designated Forest.

The determination of the City’s need for an additional community park site to serve the Bethel/Danebo parks planning sub-area is discussed above under Section I, while Section II addresses the characteristics required to make a site suitable for a parks expansion. These site characteristics fall into two categories: location-based and other site characteristics. Analysis of location-based site characteristics (below) is the first step in evaluating whether any of the fourth priority land in the study area has the characteristics necessary to make it suitable to accommodate the needed park facility.
(1) **Dismiss Candidate Land without Needed “Location-based” Site Characteristics**

*Location-based Site Characteristics:*

- **Distribution.**
  - North of Barger Drive
  - More than half a mile from existing community parks
- **Adjacency to urban residential neighborhoods.**
  - Adjacent to an existing or planned urban residential neighborhood

The map below, “Fourth Priority Land: Location-based Site Characteristics,” is a visual representation of the analysis that follows.
Distribution

- **Dismissal of Land South of Barger Drive**

923.9 acres of fourth priority candidate land in the study area are located south of Barger Drive, and are therefore outside of the established needed location. Therefore, this land is dismissed from further consideration.

- **Dismissal of Land Within Half a Mile of an Existing Community Park**

265.3 acres are within half a mile of the Bethel Community Park/Meadowview School complex, and therefore do not meet the criteria for equitable distribution. Therefore, this area is dismissed from consideration (79.2 of the acres within a half mile of the existing community park are also south of Barger Drive and are therefore dismissed for both reasons).

Adjacency to urban residential neighborhoods

- **Dismissal of Land that is not Adjacent to an Existing or Planned Urban Residential Neighborhood**

1,305.1 acres of fourth priority candidate land in the study area (both north and south of the Eugene Airport) are located on tax lots that are not adjacent to existing or planned urban residential neighborhoods, and are therefore dismissed as unsuitable for park siting.

Summary

After dismissing candidate land without appropriate location-based site characteristics, 377.3 acres (943% of the minimum needed 40 acres) of fourth priority land remains for further evaluation. These acres are made up of twelve (12) tax lots that, based on ownership, form six (6) potential park sites (labeled “P4.1” “P4.2” “P4.3” “P4.4” “P4.5” “P4.6” on the map below).

(2) **Dismiss Candidate Land without Other Needed Site Characteristics**

The next step is to evaluate the remaining fourth priority land in terms of the other needed site characteristics.

**Other Site Characteristics:**

- **Size.**
  - Minimum size of 40 acres, either independently or in association with a collocated school facility
- **Accessibility.**
  - Located on existing or planned collector or arterial street
- **Geographic Attributes.**
  - Owned or available to be owned by the City for purposes of park development
  - Adjacent to an existing or planned school facility
  - Presence of substantial natural features
The map below, "Fourth Priority Land: Other Site Characteristics," is a visual representation of the analysis that follows.
Size

- **Dismissal of Sites with Fewer than 40 Acres**

  The narrow strip of land ("P4.4") that connects Clear Lake Road to a tax lot primarily inside the current urban growth boundary is one acre total, far less than the needed 40 acres. Site “P4.6” is a 5.0 acre lot abutting the current UGB, which is substantially less than the 40 needed acres. Due to insufficient size, sites “P4.4” and “P4.6” are dismissed from further consideration.

Accessibility

- **Dismissal of Land that is not Accessible by an Existing or Planned Arterial or Collector Street**

  The two streets that qualify as an “existing or planned arterial or collector street” adjacent to the remaining candidate land are Terry Street and Clear Lake Road, which are both existing major collectors. The westernmost site (labeled “P4.1” on the map above) is a 40.1 acre tax lot that is not accessible by either of these streets. The other remaining sites are all accessible by one or (in the case of site “P4.5”) both of these streets. Due to insufficient accessibility, site “P4.1” is dismissed from further consideration.

Geographic Attributes

- **Dismissal of Land Lacking Sufficient Attributes Necessary for Park Development: Availability for City Ownership for Purposes of Park Development, Adjacency to a Planned or Existing School Site, and Presence of Substantial Natural Features**

  In anticipation of the need for an additional community park, the City has made efforts to purchase land in the appropriate area for several years. Site “P4.2” is owned by the Eugene Water and Electric Board, and is not available for park development. The site is also not adjacent to a planned or existing school facility, and lacks noteworthy natural features. This site therefore lacks sufficient geographic attributes for park development, and is dismissed from further consideration.

  Site “P4.3” is privately owned, and not available for park development. This site is separated from the future school site by Site “P4.4” (a portion of a tax lot primarily within the UGB), and lacks noteworthy natural features. This site therefore lacks sufficient geographic attributes for park development, and is dismissed from further consideration.

  The City was able to purchase the full extent of the easternmost site (“P4.5”) for future park siting as the most obviously fitting site in the area based on geographic attributes. This site surrounds the significant natural feature of the Golden Gardens ponds, and is adjacent to the future Bethel school facility. It is also worth noting that selection of this site would maximize efficient urban form by “filling in” an area which would otherwise be an island of rural land surrounded by urban land, giving it accessibility from urban / urbanizable land on all sides.
Summary of Other Site Characteristics

After dismissing candidate land without appropriate site characteristics, Site “P4.5” is the only remaining site.

(3) Conclusion for Fourth Priority Land within Bethel/Danebo Park Expansion Study Area

Site “P4.5” is composed of 222.1 acres that meet the site requirements for a community park. The site is composed of six tax lots, as shown on the “Fourth Priority Land: Other Site Characteristics” map, above. Although this site is larger than the 40-acre minimum required for a community park, as noted above, many existing community parks are also larger than 40 acres, and the additional size enables additional recreational opportunities to be provided, enhancing the site’s ability to serve the community. The map below, “Site Selected for Park Expansion,” shows the identified expansion area for the Bethel/Danebo park planning area.

In order to create a contiguous UGB, Site “P4.6” is also included in the expansion. This site would otherwise be a small island of rural land completely surrounded by urban / urbanizable land. To avoid this and the complications it would create in terms of land uses, service provision, annexations and jurisdiction, the City and County will include Site P4.6 in the UGB expansion area, providing a contiguous boundary.
River Road/Santa Clara Community Park

a. Establish the Study Area / Candidate Land for Evaluation

To identify the right location for its urban growth boundary, the City of Eugene established a very expansive study area that includes all land west of Interstate 5 and south of the McKenzie River that is within ½ mile of Eugene’s current UGB or within the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan boundary (which extends beyond ½ mile in some areas). The study area includes some additional land to allow for analysis of exception areas or non-resource areas that abut the current UGB and extend beyond the study area described above.

For purposes of determining how the City of Eugene would meet its need for more an additional park site for the River Road/Santa Clara planning sub-area, the study area was narrowed to meet the area-specific need of the parks planning area.

Eugene’s study area for a park site to serve the River Road / Santa Clara residents includes all land in the vicinity of the UGB that has a reasonable potential to satisfy the need for a community park for the River Road / Santa Clara area. This includes only the land that is:

1. Within the River Road / Santa Clara park planning sub-area; and
2. Within one or more of these categories:
   (a) within one-half mile from the current UGB;
   (b) beyond one-half mile from the current UGB, but within the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (Metro Plan) boundary; or
   (c) beyond one-half mile from the current UGB, but part of an exception area or nonresource area (see ORS 197.298(1)(b)) that abuts the current UGB.

The location of the study area is shown in the “Study Area” map, above. The study area includes about 2,756.3 acres, or 6,890% of the 40 acre minimum land need.

---

7 The acknowledged regional comprehensive plan (the Metro Plan) provides that “the division of responsibility for metropolitan planning between the two cities is the Interstate 5 Highway.” ORS 197.304 requires Eugene and Springfield to establish separate UGBs “consistent with the jurisdictional area of responsibility specified in the acknowledged comprehensive plan.”
b. **Categorize Candidate Land into the Four Priority Categories of ORS 197.298(1)/ (ORS 197.298(1)(b)**

ORS 197.298(1) requires the City to identify the land in its study area as follows:

First Priority Land: land that is designated urban reserve land under ORS 195.145, rule or metropolitan service district action plan

Second Priority Land: land identified in the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan or the Metro Plan as an exception area or non-resource land, including resource land that is completely surrounded by exception areas unless such resource land is high-value farmland

Third Priority Land: land designated as marginal land in the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan

Fourth Priority Land: land designated in the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan or the Metro Plan for agriculture or forestry, or both.

Because these priority categories are based on comprehensive plan land use designations, the first map below, “Land Use Designations,” shows the designations of both the Metro Plan and the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan as they apply inside the study area. The base designations shown on this map are aggregated into priority categories, which are shown on the second map, “Priority Categories of Candidate Land.”

In Eugene’s park expansion study area, there are no lands designated as urban reserves (See ORS 197.298(1)(a), above) or as marginal land ((c), above); therefore there are no first priority or third priority lands included on the map or in the analysis that follows. Land within the study area that does not fall into any of the four priority categories is identified on the Priority Categories of Candidate Land map as “Other Lands.”

In addition to forming the basis for the priority category of candidate land, land use designations are referenced in the subsequent analysis to identify proximity of candidate land to incompatible uses (such as heavy industrial or airport), or desired uses (such as urban residential neighborhoods). These land use designations include those within the study area and those adjacent to the study area. For ease of reference, these designations are shown on the third map below, “Contextual Land Use Designations.”

---

8 These lands include those designated for Sand and Gravel, Airport Reserve, and Parks and Open Space, as well as a small portion of a tax lot designated Government and Education for which an exception was not required to be taken.
c. **First Priority Land – Apply State’s Factors for Dismissal of Candidate Land**

There is no land designated for urban reserves around Eugene. Therefore, there is no first priority land to consider for the proposed UGB expansion.

d. **Second Priority Land – Apply State’s Factors for Dismissal of Candidate Land**

The River Road/Santa Clara park expansion study area includes 392.3 acres of second priority land, shown on the “Second Priority Land within Study Area” map below. The majority of second priority land in the study area is designated either Rural Residential (if within the Metro Plan boundaries) or Residential (if within the Lane County Comprehensive Plan boundaries). The remaining second priority land includes three small areas designated Industrial (Lane County Comprehensive Plan), and one area designated Rural Industrial (Metro Plan).

The determination of the City’s need for an additional community park site to serve the River Road/Santa Clara park planning sub-area is discussed above under Section I, while Section II addresses the characteristics required to make a site suitable for a park expansion. These site characteristics fall into two categories: location-based and other site characteristics. Analysis of location-based site characteristics (below) is the first step in evaluating whether any of the second priority land in the study area has the characteristics necessary to make it suitable to accommodate the needed park facility.
(1) **Dismiss Candidate Land without Needed “Location-based” Site Characteristics**

*Location-based Site Characteristics:*

- **Distribution.**
  - North of Randy Papé Beltline
- **Adjacency to urban residential neighborhoods.**
  - Adjacent to an existing or planned urban residential neighborhood

The map below, Second Priority Land: Location-based Site Characteristics, is a visual representation of the analysis that follows.
Appendix C to Findings

Distribution

- **Dismissal of Land South of Randy Papé Beltline**

  No second priority land within the study area is south of Randy Papé Beltline. Therefore no second priority land is dismissed on this basis.

**Adjacency to urban residential neighborhoods**

- **Dismissal of Land that is not Adjacent to an Existing or Planned Urban Residential Neighborhood**

  Of the seven general areas of second priority land, five are distant from urban residential neighborhoods. In the far northwest, a 3.7-acre area is located near the edge of the study area. Three additional areas of second priority land (from west to east, a 52.9-acre area, a 36.5-acre area, and a 17.3-acre area) are adjacent to or near the current UGB around Awbrey Lane and Prairie Road. A fifth area of second priority (19.3 acres) in the far eastern portion of the study area is also distant from the current UGB. All five of these areas (totaling 129.7 acres) are not adjacent to existing or planned urban residential neighborhoods, and are therefore dismissed from further consideration.

**Summary of Location-based Site Characteristics**

After dismissing candidate land without appropriate location-based site characteristics, two areas totaling 254.8 acres (637% of the minimum needed 40 acres) of second priority land remains for further evaluation.

### (2) Dismiss Candidate Land without Needed “Other” Site Characteristics

The next step is to evaluate the remaining second priority land in terms of the other needed site characteristics.

**Other Site Characteristics:**

- **Size.**
  - Minimum size of 40 acres, either independently or in association with a collocated school facility
- **Accessibility.**
  - Located on existing or planned collector or arterial street
- **Geographic Attributes.**
  - Owned or available to be owned by the City for purposes of park development
  - Adjacent to an existing or planned school facility
  - Presence of substantial natural features

The map below, “Second Priority Land: Other Site Characteristics,” is a visual representation of the analysis that follows. Due to the large number of tax lots and the diversity of ownership (53 distinct property owners of different parcels of remaining second priority land), individual sites are not distinguished by label at this phase of the analysis.
Size

- **Dismissal of Sites with Fewer than 40 Acres**

The remaining second priority land is highly parcelized. Based on tax lot ownership, the remaining tax lots form fifty-three (53) sites, none of which are of sufficient size, either independently or in association with a school facility, for a community park. Because these small sites of second priority land could be combined with lower priority land that has yet to be evaluated, sites that meet the remaining other site characteristics will be reconsidered as part of the parks expansion with fourth priority land. In light of this possibility, no second priority land is dismissed on this basis.
Accessibility

- **Dismissal of Land that is not Accessible by an Existing or Planned Arterial or Collector Street**

The two “existing or planned arterial or collector streets” (identified on the map as “major streets”) adjacent to the two areas of remaining candidate land are: River Loop 2 (until it changes classification at the edge of the current UGB) and Beacon Drive (until it changes classification at its intersection with Scenic Drive). Both are existing neighborhood collectors. All of the second priority land that is not accessible from Beacon Drive east of Scenic Drive (29.2 acres), or is not accessible from River Loop 2 east of the western edge of the current UGB (110.9 acres), is therefore dismissed from further consideration.

Geographic Attributes

- **Dismissal of Land Lacking Sufficient Attributes Necessary for Park Development: Availability for City Ownership for Purposes of Park Development, Adjacency to a Planned or Existing School Site, and Presence of Substantial Natural Features**

Of the remaining second priority land, none of the sites north of Beacon Drive are available for City ownership, nor adjacent to a planned or existing school site. Additionally, none of the sites possess substantial natural features. Given this absence of any of the geographic attributes necessary for park development, this 89.7 acre area is dismissed from further consideration.

Two second priority sites are accessible from River Loop 2. The smaller of the two sites is located on the north side of River Loop 2. It is a single 3.0 acre tax lot that is not available for City ownership, and is not adjacent to a planned or existing school site. It is crossed by a tributary of the East Santa Clara Waterway, an identified Goal 5 resource, and stream that was noted as being of particular interest with regard to park acquisition. While this natural feature is an essential characteristic of availability for City ownership and adjacency to a school, and is therefore dismissed from further consideration. The second site is composed of four tax lots, totaling 20.4 acres, located on the south side of River Loop 2. In response to the need for a community park in this area, and this being the most fitting site, the City of Eugene has pursued and successfully purchased this site. This site is adjacent to Madison Middle school, and the East Santa Clara Waterway runs along its western edge. Other than being short of the 40-acre minimum (even in association with the adjacent school), this site meets all identified site characteristics and is highly desirable for park development. This area of second priority land will therefore be reconsidered as part of the park expansion in association with adjacent fourth priority land.

Summary

The four tax lots just north of Madison Middle School create the only second priority site that meets the site characteristics (other than size) for a community park. Although it does not meet

---

9 The identification of the East Santa Clara Waterway as a desirable natural feature in a community park was made in a work session with the Eugene City Council on November 27, 2006.
the size criterion, it is worthy of consideration in conjunction with lower priority land, and is reconsidered in that context below.

(2) Conclusion for Second Priority Land within the River Road/Santa Clara Community Park Expansion Study Area

After dismissing candidate land without appropriate site characteristics, 18.9 acres of second priority land has the potential to meet the required site characteristics for the park expansion if and only if it is considered in conjunction with school land currently within the urban growth boundary and additional, adjacent lower priority land. If adjacent fourth priority land meets the needed site characteristics for a community park, such an aggregated site would allow the City to expand on some of this higher priority land, minimizing expansion on lower priority land.

e. Third Priority Land – Apply State’s Factors for Dismissal of Candidate Land

There is no land designated as marginal land within the study area. Therefore, there is no third priority land to consider for the proposed park expansion.

f. Fourth Priority Land – Apply State’s Factors for Dismissal of Candidate Land

The park expansion study area includes 1,930.1 acres of fourth priority land, shown on the Fourth Priority Land within Study Area map below. All fourth priority land in the study area is designated Agriculture.

The determination of the City’s need for an additional community park site to serve the River Road/Santa Clara parks planning sub-area is discussed above under Section I, while Section II addresses the characteristics required to make a site suitable for a parks expansion. These site characteristics fall into two categories: location-based and other site characteristics. Analysis of location-based site characteristics (below) is the first step in evaluating whether any of the fourth priority land in the study area has the characteristics necessary to make it suitable to accommodate the needed park facility.
(1) Dismiss Candidate Land without Needed “Location-based” Site Characteristics

**Location-based Site Characteristics:**
- Distribution.
  - North of Randy Papé Beltline
- Adjacency to urban residential neighborhoods.
  - Adjacent to an existing or planned urban residential neighborhood

The map below, “Fourth Priority Land: Location-based Site Characteristics,” is a visual representation of the analysis that follows.
Distribution

- **Dismissal of Land South of Randy Papé Beltline**

  No second priority land within the study area is south of Randy Papé Beltline. Therefore no fourth priority land is dismissed on this basis.

Adacency to urban residential neighborhoods

- **Dismissal of Land that is not Adjacent to an Existing or Planned Urban Residential Neighborhood**

  1,464.5 acres of fourth priority candidate land are located on tax lots that are not adjacent to existing or planned urban residential neighborhoods, and are dismissed from further consideration.

Summary

After dismissing candidate land without appropriate location-based site characteristics, 501.9 acres (1,255% of the minimum needed 40 acres) of fourth priority land remains for further evaluation. This land is located in three general regions of the study area and is divided into twenty-five (25) tax lots. Based on ownership, these tax lots form sixteen (16) potential park sites. In addition to this fourth priority land, the 39.3 acres of second priority land that were identified above are reconsidered in association with adjacent fourth priority land.

(2) **Dismiss Candidate Land without Other Needed Site Characteristics**

The next step is to evaluate the remaining fourth priority land in terms of the other needed site characteristics.

**Other Site Characteristics:**

- **Size.**
  - Minimum size of 40 acres, either independently or in association with a collocated school facility
- **Accessibility.**
  - Located on existing or planned collector or arterial street
- **Geographic Attributes.**
  - Owned or available to be owned by the City for purposes of park development
  - Adjacent to an existing or planned school facility
  - Presence of substantial natural features

The map below, “Fourth Priority Land: Other Site Characteristics,” is a visual representation of the analysis that follows. Due to the large number and small size of many of the sixteen (16) total sites, only those five (5) that meet the size and accessibility characteristics are labeled on the map below (P4.1, P4.2, P4.3, P4.4, and P4.5).
Size

- **Dismissal of Sites with Fewer than 40 Acres**

  Of the sixteen (16) remaining sites by ownership, twelve (12) are of fewer than 40 acres. One of these sites (P4.4) is adjacent to Madison Middle School and the second priority land that remains under consideration, making that site of sufficient size.\(^\text{10}\) In all, 11 sites are dismissed from further consideration based on insufficient size.

  The western portion of the study area contains seven total sites, of which four sites are of fewer than 40 acres, each made up of a small tax lot under individual ownership. The largest of these is 3.3 acres. Those four sites are, therefore, dismissed from further consideration.

  All four (4) sites in the northeastern portion of the study area are also fewer than 40 acres. One of those sites is two tax lots totaling 39.2 acres under common ownership, which in addition to being under 40 acres, is also divided by Beacon Road. The other three sites in this portion of the study area are tax lots under individual ownership, the largest of which is 14.6 acres. These sites are therefore dismissed from further consideration.

  The southeastern portion of the study area contains five total sites, including the site (P4.4) noted above as meeting the size criteria when considered in conjunction with Madison Middle School and the second priority land remaining under consideration. Three sites in this area are dismissed for insufficient size, the largest of which is composed of two tax lots totaling 28.1 acres under common ownership. Due to insufficient size, the three sites in the southeastern portion of the study area are dismissed from further consideration.

Accessibility

- **Dismissal of Land that is not Accessible by an Existing or Planned Arterial or Collector Street**

  Each of the remaining five sites is accessible by an arterial or collector street, or two in some cases. Site “P4.1” is accessible via Irvington Drive, a minor arterial, and Lancaster Drive, a neighborhood collector. Sites “P4.2” and “P4.3” are accessible via Beacon Drive, a neighborhood collector. Site “P4.3” is also accessible via River Road, a minor arterial at that point. Site “P4.4” is directly accessible via Wilkes Drive, a major collector, and in conjunction with the second priority land that remains under consideration and Madison Middle School, via River Loop 2, a neighborhood collector. Site “P4.5” is accessible on its southern border via Hunsaker Lane, a major collector. None of the remaining sites are dismissed for insufficient accessibility.

Geographic Attributes

- **Dismissal of Land Lacking Sufficient Attributes Necessary for Park Development: Availability for City Ownership for Purposes of Park Development, Adjacency to a Planned or Existing School Site, and Presence of Substantial Natural Features**

\(^{10}\) See “Conclusion for Second Priority Land within the River Road/Santa Clara Community Park Expansion Study Area,” above.
In anticipation of the need for a community park to serve this neighborhood, the City has made efforts to purchase land in the appropriate area for several years. The western portion of the study area includes Site “P4.1” (191.0 acres), “P4.2” (50.8 acres), and “P4.3” (41.8 acres), which are privately owned tax lots that have been unavailable for City ownership, are not adjacent to a planned or existing school facility, and lack noteworthy natural features. These sites lack sufficient geographic attributes for park development, and are dismissed from further consideration.

Site “P4.4” (16.3 acres of fourth priority land combined with the 18.9 acres of second priority identified above) is especially well suited for future park siting due to its geographic attributes. As such, the City pursued and successfully purchased this site, which is adjacent to Madison Middle School, and contains a branch of the East Santa Clara Waterway, a natural feature previously identified as being of particular interest with regard to park acquisition.

Site “P4.5” is composed of seven (7) tax lots totaling 71.2 acres that is owned by Delta Property Company. These tax lots are part of a larger property that includes a significant gravel mining operation, and is unavailable for City ownership. While this site a large water body that could serve as a substantial natural feature, its lack of adjacency to a school facility and unavailability for City ownership make it inappropriate for a park expansion at this time. Site “P4.5” is therefore dismissed from further consideration.

Summary

After dismissing candidate land without appropriate site characteristics, 16.3 acres of fourth priority land, in conjunction with Madison Middle School and 18.9 acres of second priority land identified above, meets all of the required site characteristics for the park expansion. This site has excellent accessibility via two collector streets, both of which run directly through an urban residential neighborhood to which the site is adjacent. The land is owned by the City and therefore available for development. It is also adjacent to an existing school facility, and an includes both the main channel and a branch of the East Santa Clara Waterway, a significant natural feature and Goal 5 protected resource in this neighborhood.
(3) Conclusion for Fourth Priority Land within River Road/Santa Clara Park Expansion Study Area

The second priority and the fourth priority land together create a 35.2 acre expansion that, in association with the adjacent Madison Middle School, meet the site requirements for a community park. The site is composed of five tax lots, as shown on the “Site Selected for Park Expansion” map. This expansion meets the land need for a new River Road/Santa Clara community park without the need for non-park land to be brought into the UGB in this area.

V. Conclusion – Land to be Added to Eugene’s UGB for Community Park Use

Based on the above findings and analysis, the City finds that the areas identified in the “Site Selected for Community Park Expansion” map for each park planning area are the most suitable sites for new community parks to serve the Bethel/Danebo park planning sub-area and the River Road/Santa Clara park planning sub-area.