Why we’re here:

1. Today—Project update & recommendation on preferred option
2. This fall—Council/Board of Commissioners direction on urban reserves
3. Following direction, formal adoption process begins
Urban Reserves

- Joint project—City and County
- Planning for the next two generations—as far out as 2062
- Areas for Eugene to grow into if/when needed
- Enough land for housing, jobs, parks, schools and utilities/services
- Remain rural unless brought into the Eugene’s urban growth boundary through a formal process
What is the difference between Urban Reserves, the UGB, and City Limits?
Why now?

- Housing supply and affordability
- Direction from City Council supported by County Board of Commissioners
- Coordinating with Growth Monitoring Program
- Planning for growth = better outcomes
Collaborative Effort

- Community members
- Property owners
- Lane County
- Nearby Cities
- Utility and Service Providers
- TBL Sounding Board volunteers
- Technical Advisory Committee (EETAC)
URBAN RESERVES OUTREACH PROCESS

Project Initiation
Winter - Spring 2018
- COMMUNITY MEETING
- ONLINE ENGAGEMENT
- STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS
- RECRUIT EETAC
- PCs, CC & BCC Work Session
- EUGENE PC WS

Technical Analysis
Summer 2018 - Spring 2019
- COMMUNITY MEETING
- ONLINE ENGAGEMENT
- STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS
- TBL SOUNDING BOARD
- ENVISION EUGENE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (EETAC)
- SERVICE PROVIDER WORKING GROUP
- PCs, CC & BCC Work Session
- EUGENE PC WS

Suitability Analysis
Summer 2019 - Winter 2019
- ONLINE ENGAGEMENT
- URBAN RESERVES AREA MEETINGS
- PCs, CC & BCC Work Session
- CC & BCC Updates

Develop Options
Winter - Fall 2020
- ONLINE ENGAGEMENT
- CC & BCC Action Proposed Urban Reserves
- CC & BCC Updates
- CC & BCC Hearings & REC

Formal Adoption Process*
Fall 2020 - Summer 2021
- CC & BCC Hearings & Decision

ABREVIATION KEY:
- TBL = Triple Bottom Line
- PCs = Lane County and City of Eugene Planning Commissions
- CC = City of Eugene City Council
- BCC = Lane County Board of Commissioners
- EETAC = Envision Eugene Technical Advisory Committee
- IGA = Intergovernmental Agreements
- WS = Work Session
- REC = Recommendation

* Outreach as needed, depending on direction.

We are here!
• Establish the urban reserve study area

• Identify land that is “developable” – land supply analysis

• Identify land need
Urban Reserves Study Area

• Initially included land at least one mile from UGB, except at rivers and I-5

• After analysis, not enough developable land for a 30-year Urban Reserve option

• Study area expanded west, around Highway 126 and Fisher Rd

• ≈ 27,000 acres in study area
Land Supply Analysis

Identify “developable land” by classifying its development potential:

- **Protected** land: natural resources or natural hazards
- **Committed** land: public uses
- **Developed** land
  
  = *No development potential*

≈ 11,000 acres of developable land:

- **Partially vacant**
- **Undeveloped**
How many people are we planning for? How much land do we need?

10 years
2042
16,000 new Eugenians*
Smallest Urban Reserves
≈ 2,500 acres

30 years
2062
49,000 new Eugenians*
Largest Urban Reserves
≈ 6,300 acres

*Population change since 2032
Develop Suitability Criteria, per state rules

Split study area into 18 subareas

Evaluate and remove land unsuitable for Urban Reserves
Is Land Suitable for Urban Reserves?

Would the developable land ...

1. **Efficiently** accommodate our land needs?
2. Provide for orderly and economic provision of **public facilities and services**?
3. Have significant **environmental, energy, economic and social consequences**?
4. Be **compatible** with nearby agricultural and forest activities?

Then, dismiss land that *on balance* would be unsuitable for Urban Reserves. (Goal 14 Locational Factors)
Suitability Analysis

- Analyzed 18 subareas
- Initially removed over half the developable land
- Not enough for 30-year Urban Reserve
- Added in Fisher Rd subarea

Results:

≈ 6,700 acres of suitable land
≈ 350 acres more than needed
Study Area Open Houses

Three meetings in January 2020 | three locations | over 125 participants

Themes:
• Differences between Urban Reserves and UGB
• How will Urban Reserves impact landowners
• Concerns over increased traffic, wildfire risk, loss of farmland
We are here!

- Select from suitable land--range of options based on state’s priority system
- Start with 30-year option
- Eight options refined to four for public review
Develop Urban Reserve Options

Order in which we select suitable land for urban reserves:

**First**, rural residential, commercial or industrial land (i.e., exception areas)

**Second**, land with marginal value for farming or forestry (i.e., marginal lands)

**Third**, farm and forest lands (*highest quality soils last*)

Final step of analysis; considering soils of farm and forest lands
Selecting suitable farm and forest land

- Land classification system for farm and forest land
- Lower soil capability/less productive land selected first
- Range of Options
30-Year Option

*Largest Urban Reserve option; provides the most flexibility in the future for urban growth boundary expansion*

**Includes** enough land to meet 30 years of growth beyond 2032; maximum size allowed by law.

**Excludes** Class 1 & 2 agricultural properties, flood hazard areas, and difficult to serve properties.

**Pros of this option:**
- Meets growth needs for longest time
- Most flexibility in future when considering best locations for homes, schools, jobs or parks.
- Highest av. residential capacity @ 5.1 dwelling units/acre.

**Cons of this option:**
- The most resource land (farm and forest) of all options.
- Limits protections on the most farm and forest land.
30-year Option: Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suitable Land Included</th>
<th>~6,355 developable acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suitable Land Removed from Consideration</td>
<td>~324 developable acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Year Land Need</td>
<td>~6,406 developable acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Residential Capacity</td>
<td>5.10 du/acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30-Year Option:

Farm and Forest Land Classification
30-Year Option:

Context Map
29-Year Option

Preserves the highest value farmland by removing from consideration the properties with the highest value soils

**Includes** enough land to meet 29 years of growth beyond 2032

**Excludes** agricultural properties with predominant Class 1 land (highest value soils).

**Pros of this option:**
- Removes highest value farmland, while still meeting needs of 29-years of growth
- Second highest av. residential capacity @ 5.0 du/acre

**Cons of this option:**
- Includes second most resource land (farm and forest)
- Creates inefficient development pattern for future serviceability
29-Year Option (No Class 1 Land): Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suitable Land Included</td>
<td>~6,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable Land Removed From Consideration</td>
<td>~470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-Year Land Need</td>
<td>~6,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av. Residential Capacity</td>
<td>5.02 du/acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29-Year Option (No Class 1 Land):

Farm and Forest Land Classification
29-Year Option
(No Class 1 Land):

Context Map

Preserves the highest value farmland by removing
from consideration the properties with the highest
value soils (Class 1 soils).

This option reserves enough land to meet the projected
needs of 29 years of growth beyond 2032.
27-Year Option

*Preserves the highest value farmland and additional properties with higher value soils*

**Includes** enough land to meet 27 years of growth beyond 2032.

**Excludes** agricultural properties with predominant Class 1 land and adjacent Class 2 land (highest value soils).

**Pros of this option:**
- Protections from future urbanization for more Class 2 agricultural land than 30- or 29-year options
- Has a more logical future development pattern than the 29-year option

**Cons of this option:**
- Removes large area of easy to serve suitable land from potential future urbanization
- Due to fewer large and flat properties, av. residential capacity drops to ~ 4.85 dwelling units/acre
27-year Option (No Class 1 or Adjacent Class 2 Land): Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suitable Land Included</th>
<th>~5,931 developable acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suitable Land Removed from Consideration</td>
<td>~748 developable acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Year Land Need</td>
<td>~5,934 developable acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av. Residential Capacity</td>
<td>4.85 du/acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suitable Land removed from consideration
27-Year Option (No Class 1 or Adjacent Class 2 Land):

Farm and Forest Land Classification
27-Year Option (No Class 1 or Adjacent Class 2 Land):

Context Map
10-Year Option

Smallest Urban Reserve option; provides the least land in the future for urban growth boundary expansion and preserves the most farm and forest land.

- Enough land to meet 10 years of growth beyond 2032
- Smallest size allowed by law

Suitable lands excluded from this option are all agricultural and forest properties with predominant Class 1, 2, 3, or 4 land

Pros of this option:
- Excludes the most resource land (farm and forest) of all options
- Only includes lowest value farm and forest land (Class 6)

Cons of this option:
- Scattered pattern of properties limits opportunities for efficient and cost-effective future neighborhoods
- Due to more hilly, smaller parcels, has the lowest av. residential capacity @ 3.65 dwelling units/acre
## 10-year Option: Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suitable Land Included</td>
<td>~2,560 developable acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable Land Removed from Consideration</td>
<td>~4,119 developable acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Year Land Need</td>
<td>~2,489 developable acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Residential Capacity</td>
<td>3.68 du/acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10-Year Option:

Farm and Forest Land Classification
10-Year Option:

Context Map

Smallest Urban Reserve option; provides the least land in the future for urban growth boundary expansion and preserves the most farm and forest land. The scattered pattern of properties significantly limits opportunities for efficient and cost-effective future neighborhoods.
## Option Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Years of Growth</th>
<th>Developable Land (acres)</th>
<th>Exception Areas/Non-Resource Land</th>
<th>Marginal Land</th>
<th>Farm and Forest Land</th>
<th>Other Land</th>
<th>Properties With Predominant Class 1 to 6 Land</th>
<th>Properties With Predominant Class 2 to 6 Land</th>
<th>Properties With Predominant Class 2 to 6 Land</th>
<th>Properties With Predominant Class 6 Land</th>
<th>Properties With Predominant Class 6 Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>30 years</td>
<td>30 years</td>
<td>6,365 acres</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>5,063</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Properties with predominant Class 1 to 6 land</td>
<td>Properties with predominant Class 2 to 6 land</td>
<td>Properties with predominant Class 2 to 6 land</td>
<td>Properties with predominant Class 6 land</td>
<td>Properties with predominant Class 6 land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>29 years</td>
<td>29 years</td>
<td>6,220 acres</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>4,899</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Properties with predominant Class 1 to 6 land</td>
<td>Properties with predominant Class 2 to 6 land</td>
<td>Properties with predominant Class 2 to 6 land</td>
<td>Properties with predominant Class 6 land</td>
<td>Properties with predominant Class 6 land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>27 years</td>
<td>27 years</td>
<td>5,940 acres</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>4,646</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Properties with predominant Class 1 to 6 land</td>
<td>Properties with predominant Class 2 to 6 land</td>
<td>Properties with predominant Class 2 to 6 land</td>
<td>Properties with predominant Class 6 land</td>
<td>Properties with predominant Class 6 land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>2,670 acres</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Properties with predominant Class 1 to 6 land</td>
<td>Properties with predominant Class 2 to 6 land</td>
<td>Properties with predominant Class 2 to 6 land</td>
<td>Properties with predominant Class 6 land</td>
<td>Properties with predominant Class 6 land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urban Reserves Options Virtual Open House

https://engage.eugene-or.gov/urbanreserves

Month-long (June 26-July 26)

Includes:

- Video
- Story Map
- FAQ’s
- Q&A
- Virtual Office Hours
- Downloadable maps & other info
- Survey with incentive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outreach examples:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postcards to study area residents (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook—(weekly &amp; cross-posting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUG Planning E-Newsletter (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council E-Newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails to Planning Commissioners, City Councilors, Board of Commissioners (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested Parties email notification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails to Service Provider Working Group, Triple Bottom Line Sounding Board (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails to Neighborhood Leaders Council, SCCO, ABC Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article in Neighborhood Bulletin, RRSC neighborhood newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envision Eugene Technical Advisory Committee (EETAC) communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stats:

- **1,300** visits to the Virtual Open House
- **Over 870** story map visits
- **210** surveys completed*

*as of 7/29
Outreach (Pre-Pandemic vs Pandemic)

- January Open Houses: 125
- Virtual Open House Survey: 210
- Virtual Open House Visitors: 1,300
Who Have We Heard From?

~ 34 % inside Study Area (County)

~ 60 % outside Study Area
30-Year Preliminary Survey Results

- **Support:** 33.8%
- **Neutral:** 16.2%
- **Oppose:** 50%

As of 7.29.20
29-Year Preliminary Results

Support: 36.6%
Neutral: 20%
Oppose: 43.3%

As of 7.29.20
27-Year Preliminary Results

Support: 47.6%
Neutral: 20.5%
Oppose: 31.9%

As of 7.29.20
10-Year Preliminary Results

Support: 35.3%
Neutral: 15.7%
Oppose: 49%

As of 7.29.20
Survey Themes

• Farmland Preservation*
• Support for longer term options
• Build up not out
• Connection to climate

*Over half of survey respondents
Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation

1. *The EETAC supports the Urban Reserves analysis as technically sound.* Passed by a vote of 11 thumbs up (supporting) and 1 thumb sideways (reservation or concern).

2. *The EETAC’s preferred Urban Reserve option is the 27-year option that preserves Class 1 and adjacent Class 2 land [Option 3], with the acknowledgement that the year-range is an estimate based on current population forecasts and existing land use code.* Passed by a vote of 10 thumbs up and 2 thumbs sideways.

July 16, 2020 EETAC meeting
Regulatory framework and IGAs

• Draft framework for Urban Reserves regulations and intergovernmental agreement – work underway
  • Led by County
  • Supported by City

• Minimal new regulations being considered; must continue to plan and zone Urban Reserve land for rural uses
  • Prohibit ‘upzoning’ of exception areas and non-resource lands
  • Prohibit zone and plan amendments of resource land designations to non-resource land designations

• IGAs:
  • County responsible for building code & land use code administration in Urban Reserves
  • County/other service providers remain responsible for provision of services in Urban Reserves
Next Steps

• **August 4** (tonight): LC PC recommendation on a preferred Urban Reserve option

• **August 17**: Eugene Planning Commission recommendation on a preferred Urban Reserve option

• **September 21**: City Council and Board of Commissioners joint presentation

• **October 12**: City Council direction on preferred Urban Reserves Option

• **October 13**: Board of Commissioners direction on preferred Urban Reserves Option

• After direction, formal adoption process begins
Questions and Discussion

www.eugene-or.gov/UrbanReserves