CHAPTER 7. URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY EXPANSION ANALYSIS

The purpose of this section of the Study, the UGB Expansion Analysis, is to identify where to expand the urban growth boundary (UGB) so that the City has enough land to meet residential, economic, and public land needs for the next twenty years (2010-2030). The analysis meets the Statewide Planning requirements that cities must follow to expand their UGB. This report builds on the Housing Needs Analysis, Economic Opportunities Analysis and the Buildable Land Inventory to analyze where and how much to expand the UGB. The analysis examines eleven possible expansion alternatives and recommends preferred alternatives.

To provide for the unmet future need, Coburg must inventory and assess the lands that surround its current boundary to determine those lands that are most appropriate to accommodate future urban development, consistent with Goal 14 and the City’s plan policies. This chapter presents an evaluation of potential areas for a UGB expansion.

Steps in the Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3. Buildable Land Inventory:</td>
<td>Inventories all types of vacant, potential infill, potential redevelopment and environmentally constrained land within the existing UGB for residential, commercial, and industrial development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4. Housing Needs Analysis:</td>
<td>Determines types and densities of residential development within the UGB using the Housing/Land Needs. Determine the amount of land needed to meet future demand at appropriate types and densities based on historical and potential future development trends, population changes and growth projections, and economic factors. Address all Goal 10 Housing, and Goal 14 requirements. Housing needs are estimated using a Housing Needs Model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5. Economic Opportunities Analysis:</td>
<td>Estimates need for commercial and industrial land based on historic and current trends related to employment projections and local economic potential. Identify size and characteristics of employment land needs. Address requirements of Goal 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6. Supply and Demand Comparison:</td>
<td>Determines whether there is a deficit or surplus of buildable land for residential, commercial, and Industrial needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Section | Chapter 7. UGB Expansion Areas Analysis: |

Regulatory Framework

The State of Oregon, Lane County, and the City of Coburg all have policies and rules that direct when, where, and how to expand the UGB. The following outline lists the various pieces of this framework of regulation. Each section of the Study references the applicable regulation.

- State Planning
  - Goal 9: Economic Development
  - Oregon Administrative Rule, Division 9
  - Goal 10: Housing
  - Oregon Administrative Rule, Division 8
-Goal 14: Urbanization
  -Oregon Revised Statute 197.298: Priority of land to be included within UGB
  -Oregon Administrative Rule 660 Division 24, Urban Growth Boundaries

- Lane County
  -Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan
    -Policies regarding priority of land to be included in a UGB expansion

- City of Coburg
  - Local Criteria

What does this regulatory framework mean? Once a Buildable Lands Inventory determines there is a need for more land within the UGB to accommodate the growth planned for the next twenty years, the City must decide how to meet that need. The options are to increase the development capacity inside the UGB, to expand the UGB, or do both.

**Need for Expansion**

Statewide planning Goals 9, 10 and 14 all require cities to provide a 20-year supply of buildable land within urban growth boundaries (UGBs). Chapter 6, Table 6.8, presents a summary of the comparison of the City of Coburg's 20-year Land Supply and 20-year Land Demand. The report has concluded that an additional 147 acres of gross vacant buildable residential (and public) land beyond the current urban growth boundary would be necessary in order to serve the city's anticipated residential growth to the year 2030. The buildable lands analysis determined that Coburg has 41.9 acres of vacant or underdeveloped residential land, far less than needed for the planning period. Likewise, the Economic Opportunities Analysis also presented the argument that an additional one to two 20 plus acre sites could be added to the existing Coburg employment inventory to accommodate economic potential over the planning period. This employment expansion was also supported by the City Council.

**Chapter Outline**

Following is a summary of the sections included in this chapter and how they address and relate to the expansion analysis:

**Section A** provides a discussion of Coburg’s efficiency measures for accommodating growth within the UGB.

**Section B** addresses the state and local priorities for expanding the UGB. The statutes and rules that implement Statewide Planning set forth priorities for determining what types and areas of land should be considered for inclusion in a UGB. These regulations also set forth circumstances under which the priorities may be altered and allow cities to set their own local criteria to tailor the UGB expansion to meet local needs.

**Section C** evaluates and compares the expansion study areas. The evaluation uses the Goal 14 location factors (OAR-024-0060(1)), “characteristics” identified by the local government to be necessary for land to be suitable for inclusion, as well as the priorities outlined in ORS 197.298. Goal 14 requires that the analysis of each expansion alternative take into account factors such as the feasibility and orderly provision of urban levels of services, and the compatibility with surrounding resource lands. Another Goal 14 requirement is to consider the environmental, economic, social and energy related consequences of selecting each of the expansion alternatives. This essentially is a weighing and balancing of the relative merits and drawbacks of
each alternative. This section also analyzes and compares the development status of each expansion alternative based on the amount of vacant buildable land.

**Section D** provides a summary of the analysis as well the recommendation for expansion. In the majority of cases, recommendations will include combinations of acreage from different study areas. The Goal 14 location factors and Coburg’s local criteria are summarized and compared for each expansion alternative. Further discussion and justification is also provided for the selected alternative(s).

**A. Efficiency Measures-Accommodating Needs inside the UGB**

One of the organizing principles of Oregon’s land use planning system is an emphasis on using land within the UGB more “efficiently” before expanding the boundary. Land use efficiency measures can address multiple issues - including meeting housing needs, utilizing existing infrastructure, conserving energy, as well as other local objectives. A variety of land use efficiency measures are mentioned in state statute (ORS 197.296), including the following:

1. Increase permitted densities in residential zones
2. Provide financial incentives for higher density housing
3. Permit additional density beyond that generally allowed in the zoning district in exchange for amenities and features provided by the developer
4. Removal or easing of approval standards or procedures
5. Establish minimum density ranges
6. Develop strategies for infill and redevelopment
7. Authorize housing types not previously allowed by the plan or regulations
8. Adopt an average residential density standard
9. Consider rezoning non-residential land

In order to justify expansion of the City of Coburg’s UGB, the City should outline existing measures, or new measures that encourage the efficient use of land within the UGB in accordance with Goal 14. This document presents a summary of Efficiency Measures that Coburg may choose to implement. All or none may be implemented, but the City must establish to a sufficient degree that measures have been taken to accommodate development within the UGB. These “Efficiency Measures” are included with greater detail within the Study’s Appendix G.

One of the required steps in an analysis of UGB Expansion is to first examine whether additional efficiency measures could be used within existing UGB boundaries to increase residential densities and determine whether these measures would forego the City’s need to expand the UGB. Coburg has previously taken steps to incorporate efficiency measures, such as

- Incorporating increased densities in the Traditional Residential zone, by allowing duplex units on corner lots, and creating a new zone (Traditional Medium Residential) which contains a range of uses and densities.
- Providing a Master Plan process that can allow for increased flexibility in design, including lot size flexibility, as long as the density established in the Comprehensive Plan is not exceeded.
- Establishing minimum density standards for certain developments.
- Modification provisions to certain provisions without a requirement for a variance.
• Authorizing accessory dwelling units; and
• Adopting an average residential density goal for new development in the Comprehensive Plan.

One measure that was examined as part of the 2004 Urbanization process was to include a mixed-use zone. Staff used this concept in the housing needs model (Chapter 4), to include re-designation of a TR-zoned Stevenson property on the north side of Pearl St., west of Coburg Industrial Way (see Map 26). Based upon City Council direction, staff has presumed that site will be re-designated to a mixed-use area that would allow high density residential development (15 dwelling units per acre), containing a mixture of small lot single-family, duplex units, and triplex-fourplex units.

The option to include mixed-use within the existing UGB was also considered by staff for the following reasons:

• The area proposed to be re-designated for mixed-use development is presently designated as Traditional Residential, a low-density residential zone that would bordered on two sides by major roads (Pearl Street is designated as an arterial, while Coburg Industrial Way is designated as a collector), industrial development to the east, and a planned 15-acre residential rehabilitation facility. The mixed-use development could provide a transition from these higher intensity uses to the adjoining residential development to the west.

• The mixed-use would be located upon a high-capacity transportation corridor (Pearl Street), which is serviced by bus transportation.

• A portion of the Coburg Loop trail is planned along Industrial Way and could be integrated into a mixed-use development proposal.

• A market analysis of Coburg (measured within a 1 mile radius of the City Hall) shows a leakage of retail sales in several areas, which could be met with additional retail development in the area, supported in part by higher density development. A convenience center (10,000-30,000 square feet offering an array of goods and services, typically anchored by a small specialty food mart or pharmacy, together with 5-8 other smaller (1,500-3,000 square foot) businesses) would need about 2,000 residents to be supported and have a typical retail trade area of up to a 1-mile radius. Given the anticipated population increase within Coburg and current market leakages based on the marketing analysis, there may be potential for a convenience center type development to form within Coburg. If the community would support development of this type, then of the vacant or redevelopable sites outside of the CBD, this site would make the most sense, given its location and size.

• While some demand will be met with development within the CBD, the CBD lacks larger parcels sizes that would be needed to accommodate a cluster of businesses.
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like a convenience center, where businesses typically benefit from being located in close proximity.

This option is also supported by several existing policies contained in the Coburg Comprehensive Plan.

**B. Expansion Alternatives Identification**

Goal 14 states that:

*The Location of the urban growth boundary and changes to the boundary shall be determined by evaluating alternative boundary locations....*

**Preferred Alternative Identification Methodology**

The first step narrows the universe of land surrounding the UGB (the planning area) into a set of manageable study areas. Practically speaking, study areas become a more manageable way to review the benefits and disadvantages associated with expansion into properties with relatively similar dynamics. This is not to say that each of the study areas identified contain properties that are identical. Although care was taken to include like properties in each study area, it was impossible to avoid variation. For this, and other, reasons the preferred expansion alternative may include portions of one or several study areas.

The second step evaluates the study areas against state requirements as well as local criteria and needs. In this study, “study areas” are not viewed as alternatives in and of themselves, since no one study area is likely to satisfy the expansion needs identified in this Study. Therefore, the third step includes the formation of expansion alternatives which incorporate the specific acreage needs of expansion with those areas that the study area analysis has shown to be most favorable. The final step would include the selection of a preferred expansion alternative and justification of its selection against state requirements and local criteria. This final step will be presented in Section D.

The following definitions provide a summary of important geographic distinctions in this analysis:

- **Planning Area**: A broad and general conception of the area surrounding Coburg’s UGB.
- **Study Areas**: A grouping of tax lots and properties of generally similar characteristics and geographic proximity, for purposes of more easily evaluating the areas around the UGB against state requirements and local criteria. Eleven separate study areas were identified for this Study.
- **Expansion Alternatives**: Areas that incorporate the results of the study areas analysis as well as limitations of actual acreage demand as identified in Chapter 6 of the Study. These often are composed of acreage from several different study areas. This study identified three final residential expansion alternatives and three final employment expansion alternatives. The three residential alternatives range in size from 132 to 139 acres (addressing a need of 122.7 acres), and the employment alternatives range in size from 42 to 65 acres (addressing a need for one or two 20+ acre sites). One preferred alternative will be selected or identified.
- **Preliminary Expansion Recommendations**: Utilizing feedback from the public, stakeholders, and advisory and decision making bodies, staff developed recommended employment and residential expansion alternatives. These alternatives were presented to the Technical Advisory Committee, Planning Commission, City Council and public for feedback.
Final Expansion Recommendations: The final expansion recommendations represent the final employment and residential expansion configurations that incorporate feedback from city officials, stakeholders, and the public, and, most importantly, are approved by the Coburg City Council.

ORS 197.298—Expansion Priorities Analysis
The selection of preferred growth alternatives must be based on Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 197.298. ORS 197.298 sets forth priorities for determining what types and areas of land should be considered for inclusion in an urban growth boundary. It also sets forth circumstances under which the priorities may be altered. These priorities serve as an initial guide in developing a study methodology. In the analysis which will proceed each priority subsection is addressed to determine its relevance to this particular study and to identify what data and analytical approaches would be used to construct a basic expansion alternative evaluation. Maps 10 through 17 provide a visual reference for the Priorities Analysis. ORS 197.298 establishes the following priorities for expanding UGBs: (listed in the order in which they must be included in or considered for expansion)

5. Established Urban Reserves;
6. Exception land, and farm or forest land (other than high value farm land) surrounded by exception land;
7. Marginal lands designated pursuant to ORS 197.247;
8. Farm and forest land.

Following is a summary of the expansion study area selection process undertaken by staff per the language of ORS 197.298:

a) First priority is land that is designated urban reserve land under ORS 195.145 (Urban reserves), rule or metropolitan service district action plan.

Although Coburg’s 2004 Urbanizations Study process provided some conceptualization of potential urban reserve areas, Coburg has no adopted urban reserve lands adjacent to its urban growth boundary.

(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 (High-value farmland description for ORS 215.705).

The area surrounding and adjacent to Coburg’s UGB includes portions of both exceptions and resource land (see Map 11). Exception lands are mostly those County lands near or adjacent to Coburg which have residential zoning (and currently contain interspersed residential uses). These lands are often referred to as “Developed and Committed” lands. There are several study areas that contain these existing areas with development and population of note. Exceptions Land is designated by the County based on it being an approved “exception” to statewide planning goals. That is why these areas are the highest priority for UGB expansions. Map 11 shows that these lands are predominantly located adjacent to the northwest corner of Coburg, in the Stalling Road area. Additional exception areas exist south and west of Coburg as well. Study areas were selected to include all near or adjacent areas identified as exception lands by Lane County.
(c) If land under paragraphs (a) to (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

Coburg has no identified marginal lands adjacent to its urban growth boundary.

(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.

The majority of land surrounding Coburg’s current UGB is zoned Exclusive Farm Use (30 or 40 acre lot size minimum) by Lane County (see Map 11). Every expansion study area contains some farm land with high-value soils. Because it is anticipated that expansion needs cannot be accommodated on exception lands alone, study areas include farm and forest land (as will recommended expansion alternatives).

(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.

A summary of the Soil Class dynamics for each study area is presented and considered in the analysis.

(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 high 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. [1995 c.547 § 5; 1999 c.59 § 56]

The priority provisions outlined above in ORS 197.298 will be given considerable consideration in the analysis and comparison of study areas and expansion alternatives. Locally identified expansion priorities will weigh heavily on expansion outcomes related to this provision as well. State OAR 660-024-0060(5) states the following related to local criteria in urban expansion:

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.

Expansion Study Areas
Following the priorities analysis described above, and mirroring the process followed in the 2004 Study, the Coburg Study team developed 11 study areas. They are, once again, areas of similarity which provide for more specific and themed characterization and evaluation. As noted
earlier, the actual expansion alternatives may include portions of one or more study area as deemed appropriate.

Coburg’s Urban Growth Boundary has a perimeter of approximately 7.5 miles. The study areas constitute almost all lands adjacent to the current UGB (see Map 10). The study areas are generally numbered in a clockwise direction, beginning with Study Area 1, located along the southern portion of the current Coburg Urban Growth Boundary and continuing around its perimeter. The study areas utilized for this expansion analysis are identical, for the most part, to the study areas utilized in the 2004 Study. The only difference is the addition of Study Areas 9, 10 and 11, and the reconfiguration of Study Area 8 to account for lands which have been added to Coburg’s UGB since 2004.

The following considerations were useful in developing logical study area boundaries:

- Property lines/ownership patterns, based upon Lane County Assessors Maps record of the Tax Lot boundaries.
- Natural Features, such as wetlands, streams, and 100-year floodplains
- Streets and roads
- Tax lots reported by the County Assessor records as “Unimproved.”
- Fundamental understanding of Water and sanitary sewer service infrastructure.

Not all of the area adjacent to the existing UGB is included in the study areas. An initial review of the land surrounding the UGB identified areas adjacent to the UGB that could be excluded from consideration for expansion. State OAR (660-024-0060(5) provides local governments the authority to guide the selection of expansion alternatives through City policies specifying certain land characteristics as necessary for land to be suitable for expansion.

The identification of study areas included considerations of both ORS Priorities as well as locally specified characteristics or “local criteria” (as they will be referred to throughout the Study). Lands to the north east of Coburg are the only lands excluded entirely from consideration within a study area. These areas were not included based on a local priority for expansion that “provides the best opportunity for developing an efficient urban form.” The isolated nature of the lands adjacent to the northeast corner of Coburg was viewed by staff as sufficient justification for disregarding their inclusion within a study area.

The study areas, which range in size from 26 to 240 acres, are presented in greater detail in Table 7.1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Areas</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
<th>Size (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Coburg Road – Roberts Road</td>
<td>Adjacent to southwestern portions of the current UGB. Consisting parcels east of Coburg Road and West of Roberts Road.</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Coburg Road- Funke Road</td>
<td>Adjacent to the UGB at the north end. Includes lands south of the existing UGB, west of Coburg Road and east of Funke Road.</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coburg Bottom Loop East</td>
<td>Includes lands south and west of the existing UGB, west of Coburg Road and Vintage Way, and east of Coburg Bottom Loop. The area is contiguous with the existing UGB on the northeast side.</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coburg Bottom Loop</td>
<td>Includes lands west of the existing UGB, between Coburg</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
West

Bottom Loop and the western boundaries of the larger tax lots along Coburg Bottom Loop. The area is contiguous with the existing UGB on the north side and part of the east side.

5. Stalling Lane – Coburg Road North
Includes lands north and west of the existing UGB, along Stalling Lane and Coburg Road (north of the elementary school). The area is contiguous with the existing UGB on part of the east side.

6. Van Duyn – Coburg Industrial Way
Includes lands north of the existing UGB, between Van Duyn and Coburg Industrial Way. The area is contiguous with the existing UGB on the north side and part of the east and west sides.

7. East I-5 North
Includes large parcels east of the existing UGB and across Interstate 5 north of Van Duyn Street. The area is not contiguous with the existing UGB.

8. East I-5 South A
Study area 8 includes lands east of the existing UGB and across Interstate 5. The area is contiguous with the existing UGB.

9. East I-5 South B - Selby Way
Study area 9 includes lands south and east of the existing UGB and across Interstate 5 along Selby Way. The area is contiguous with the existing UGB only in the very northwest corner.

10. Coburg South
Study area 10 includes lands south of the existing UGB on both sides of Coburg Road from Interstate 5 to almost Funke Road. The area is contiguous with the existing UGB only in the very northeast corner.

11. Coburg North-Indian Drive and Paiute Lane
Includes lands north of Study Area 6 along North Coburg Road. Includes developed Indian Drive and Paiute Lane. Is adjacent to the UGB on the eastern side.

C. Alternative Location Analysis

This section of the Study provides a comparative analysis of the eleven study areas utilized to determine expansion alternatives for potential inclusion into the UGB. Each study area is to evaluate for consistency with ORS 197.298 priorities, Goal 14 (Urbanization) Boundary Location Factors 1-7, as well as local expansion criteria.

The purpose of statewide planning Goal 14 is to “provide for an orderly and efficient transition from rural to urban land use. To accomplish this, statewide planning Goal 14 establishes seven criteria, or “location factors” for evaluating UGB expansions. These factors supplement the priorities analysis. They include:

Factor 1. Demonstrated need to accommodate long-range urban population growth requirements consistent with LCDC goals;
Factor 2. Need for housing, employment opportunities, and livability;
Factor 3. Orderly and economic provision for public facilities and services;
Factor 4. Maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area.
Factor 5. Environmental, energy, economic and social consequences.
Factor 6. Retention of agricultural land as defined, with Class I being the highest priority for retention and Class VI the lowest priority.
Factor 7. Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural activities.
Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-024-0060(1)(b) states the following:

*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.*

Additionally, OAR 660-024-0060(8)(a-c) states the following:

(8) The Goal 14 boundary location determination requires evaluation and comparison of the relative costs, advantages and disadvantages of alternative UGB expansion areas with respect to the provision of public facilities and services needed to urbanize alternative boundary locations. This evaluation and comparison must be conducted in coordination with service providers, including the Oregon Department of Transportation with regard to impacts on the state transportation system. "Coordination" includes timely notice to service providers and the consideration of evaluation methodologies recommended by service providers. The evaluation and comparison must include:

(a) The impacts to existing water, sanitary sewer, storm water and transportation facilities that serve nearby areas already inside the UGB;

(b) The capacity of existing public facilities and services to serve areas already inside the UGB as well as areas proposed for addition to the UGB; and

(c) The need for new transportation facilities, such as highways and other roadways, interchanges, arterials and collectors, additional travel lanes, other major improvements on existing roadways and, for urban areas of 25,000 or more, the provision of public transit service.

Local Expansion Criteria
As identified within the Expansion Priorities Analysis section, local governments are given the authority to identify specific criteria to guide the selection of land for expansion per OAR 660-024-0060(5). This section evaluates each expansion alternative based on the Local Criteria identified by the City of Coburg.

Coburg Expansion Policy Analysis:
Important to note in an analysis of urbanization related policies in the City of Coburg, is a history of the policies developed. Coburg has undertaken a number of expansion related planning processes in the last decade. These include the Coburg Crossroads visioning process of 2003, the 2004 Study and periodic review effort, and the 2005 update of the Comprehensive Plan. These processes were all interrelated and constituted a significant effort on the part of Coburg City residents, staff and public officials. The policies that were incorporated into the 2005 comprehensive plan update are a reflection of extensive efforts to summarize the City’s ideals, including (and especially) those related to the City’s growth. Below are listed a few of these guiding policies specifically related to outward expansion:

Urbanization Policies

**Coburg Objective:** Promote land use and development patterns that sustain and improve quality of life, are compatible with mass transit, maintain the community’s identity, protect significant natural and historic resources, and meet the needs of existing and future residents for housing, employment, and parks and open spaces.
**Policy 1:** The City shall preserve urbanizable land and provide for orderly, efficient development by controlling densities through provision of the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances, thereby preventing the need for overly extensive public services and restricting urbanization to that commensurate with the carrying capacity of the land.

**Policy 17:** The City shall promote the efficient use of land within the urban growth boundary and sequential development that expands in an orderly way outward from the existing city center.

**Policy 18:** The City shall provide a sufficient supply of developable land within the urban growth boundary to meet the needs of the existing and projected population for residential, commercial, industrial, and recreational uses over the next 20 – 50 years, while preserving the small town character of the community.

**Policy 19:** The City shall accommodate projected growth, expand the urban growth boundary in a manner that balances the need to protect high quality farm and forest resource lands with the needs of the existing and future population and with efficient public facility and service delivery.

**Land Use and Development Patterns**

**Policy 40:** The City shall promote land use and development patterns that sustain and improve quality of life, are compatible with mass transit, maintain the community’s identity, protect significant natural and historic resources, and meet the needs of existing and future residents for housing, employment, and parks and open spaces.

**Policy 42:** Future residential and commercial development shall be constructed in a manner that preserves the small town, historic character of the community.

**Transportation**

**Policy 1:** Develop a street network system that evenly distributes traffic throughout the community, lessening traffic impacts on residential streets, and identifying a system of arterials for moving people, goods, and services safely and efficiently.

**Policy 46:** Provide a transportation system that is safe, convenient, accessible, environmentally responsible, efficient, responsive to community needs, and considerate of neighborhood impacts, particularly in the National Historic District.

**Policy 47:** Develop and maintain a street network that is inter-connected.

**Sanitary Facilities**

**Policy 15:** The city shall expand the urban growth boundary and city limits and provide sanitary sewer service, when available, to existing exception areas and other appropriate areas when such expansion is appropriate to meet city needs.

**Housing**

**Policy 21:** The City shall promote livability and community in existing and future neighborhoods.

**Policy 28:** The City shall encourage new housing to radiate out from the city center and discourage leapfrog development in order to promote connectivity and community interaction.
Natural Resources

**Policy 20:** The City shall protect, restore, manage, and enhance important natural resources; maintain high quality air, water, land and historic resources; and provide green spaces in and around the community.

**Policy 21:** The City shall protect or mitigate, whenever possible, fish and wildlife habitats including rivers, wetlands, and forests, and significant natural areas and habitats of rare or endangered species.

**Policy 17:** Areas containing any other unique ecological, scenic, aesthetic, scientific or educational values shall be considered in the planning process.

**Policy 26:** The City shall seek to ensure compatibility between the future needs of the community and growth of nearby sand and gravel operations.

Agricultural Lands

**Coburg Objective:** To retain the agricultural use of land in those areas where SCS’s Soil Suitability Classification indicates that it is the highest and best use.

**Policy 2:** To the extent to which it has influence, the City shall promote the retention of lands outside its Urban Growth Boundary for agriculture use by encouraging Lane County to maintain current agricultural zoning within the City’s area of influence as defined in the Intergovernmental Agreement with Lane County.

**Policy 5:** The City supports, and may require, measures to promote compatibility and transition between urban development at the edge of the Urban Growth Boundary and adjacent agricultural areas.

**Policy 7:** The City supports, and shall pursue, establishment of a southern greenbelt that ensures a permanent open character for the area between Coburg and the McKenzie River.

**Policy 8:** The City shall protect high quality farmland surrounding the community from premature development.

Project staff has generated a list of local expansion criteria or “local criteria” from the above listed guiding policies. They are as follows:

- **Local Criteria 1:** Expansion should be limited to areas and tax lots which promote the greatest order and efficiency.
- **Local Criteria 2:** Expansion should be limited to areas and tax lots that are appropriate to meet city needs.
- **Local Criteria 3:** Expansion should be limited to areas and tax lots that would promote sequential development that expands in an orderly way outward from the existing city center, and promote a street network that is interconnected in order to promote connectivity and community interaction.
- **Local Criteria 4:** Expansion should be limited to areas and tax lots that promote livability
- **Local Criteria 5:** Expansion should be limited to areas and tax lots that discourage premature development of agricultural lands and compatibility and transition between urban development and agricultural areas.

It is also important to note the Coburg’s historic efforts have also produced a number of maps of expansion conceptualizations. These town visioning and expansion visualization exercises have resulted in an expansion theme that can be said to generally represent Coburg’s local expansion policy.
Expansion Area Summary:
For each of the sub-areas the City has provided a general site description, vacant acres discussion of development patterns, inventory of available utilities, and discussion of factors influencing future urbanization (Goal 14). The following section provides some big picture summaries of all of the study areas.

Table 7.2 Summary of UGB Expansion Study Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Lots</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Acres</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>108.9</td>
<td>199.8</td>
<td>208.8</td>
<td>239.9</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceptions Zones</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Lots</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>171.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Acres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Acres</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>152.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Zones</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Lots</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>208.8</td>
<td>239.9</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Acres</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Acres</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>206.8</td>
<td>239.9</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LCOG Assessment; analysis for Study Areas 1-8 by ECONorthwest, and 9-11 by LCOG.

Table 7.2 summarizes basic parcelization and zoning characteristics of the eleven UGB expansion study areas. In total, the study areas include more than 1,000 acres adjacent to the existing UGB. The study areas include all lands zoned as exceptions that are adjacent to the existing UGB.

Coburg needs land for approximately 888 new dwelling units between 2010 and 2030. The housing capacity in exceptions lands and areas within the UGB may be insufficient to meet the City’s need, thus, Coburg may have justification to bring some non-exception land into the UGB. The City must consider the seven Goal 14 factors when evaluating which resource lands to include in an expanded UGB.

SOILS
ORS 197.298 and Statewide Planning Goal 14, Factor 6 address the retention of agricultural land “with Class I being the highest priority for retention and Class VI the lowest priority.” Class I soils have the highest agricultural “capability.”

Table 7.3 shows soil class by study area. Study Areas 1, 4, 5, 6, 10 and 11 have Class I soils present within lands zoned for resource uses. With the exception of Study Areas 8 and 9, all of the study areas have Class II soils present. Study Areas 7 and 8 have significant percentages of Class IV or higher soils.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E40</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>E30</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>E30</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E30</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E40</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>E40</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>138.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>208.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>E40</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>230.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>240.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>E40</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>E30/E40</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>E30</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Study Area Resource Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rural Lands Database; analysis by InfoGraphics Lab and ECONorthwest, Additional analysis by LCOG (Areas 9-11)

**DEVELOPMENT CONSTRAINTS**

Not all lands within the study areas will be ideal or even appropriate for development. Coburg should be concerned about areas in wetlands and floodplains as it determines where to expand its UGB. No significant areas with steep slopes exist in any of the UGB study areas. Coburg presently allows development within floodplains provided that the development meets the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) and other applicable standards.

Development in identified wetlands may be subject to permitting processes through the Army Corps of Engineers and the Division of State Lands. Table 7.4 summarizes combined flood and wetland constraints by UGB study area and zone (exceptions and resource zones). Map 12 shows the extent of the constraints. The data show that substantial portions of Study Areas 2 and 3 are within the identified 100-year floodplain. Because of this fact and the elevation differences of expansion Study Areas 2 and 3, portions of these areas will be less ideal for UGB expansion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Const. Acres</th>
<th>UnConstr. Acres</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Const. Acres</th>
<th>UnConstr. Acres</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Total Acres (all zones)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>108.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>169.8</td>
<td>171.7</td>
<td>199.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>208.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>216.6</td>
<td>239.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>239.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LCOG Assessment; analysis for Study Areas 1-8 by ECONorthwest, and 9-11 by LCOG.

GOAL 14 LOCATION FACTORS
In this section, each of the 7 Goal 14 location factors is discussed as they generally pertain to Coburg’s study areas:

- **Factor 1:** Demonstrated need to accommodate long-range urban population growth requirements consistent with LCDC goals. Given the population and employment forecasts, lands in any of the UGB study areas could be justified to meet Factor 1. The amount of land, however, should not significantly exceed estimated housing, employment, and public needs.

- **Factor 2:** Need for housing, employment opportunities, and livability. While all of the study areas could be justified for housing need, areas 1 through 6 and 10 and 11 are better suited given other factors. Areas 7, 8 and 9 would be best suited for employment given their proximity to the I-5 interchange and existing employment concentration. Area 1 would also be suitable for employment. Area 6 has the highest potential to increase livability due to its location close to downtown and the elementary school.

- **Factor 3:** Orderly and economic provision for public facilities and service. LCOG did not conduct a detailed cost study, nor are such estimates included in the City’s water and wastewater plans. LCOG did discuss with City staff the relative cost and efficiency of servicing the various UGB study areas. Coburg Public Works staff provided this simple summary of their best estimates of relative costs:
Table 7.5 Public Works Cost Rating for the Extension of Water and Sewer to Study Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Cost Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$$$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$$$$$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$$$$$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$$$$$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$$$$$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area 6 was identified as the easiest and cheapest area to service due to its proximity to the sewer trunk line and the wastewater treatment plant. Area 11 was also seen as a less expensive alternative due to its proximity to the proposed wastewater treatment facility and the facilities which exist along Indian and Paiute Streets. Areas with large amounts of exceptions lands (Areas 2, 4, 5, and 8) will create challenges to providing services due to significant amounts of pre-existing development. If the City decides to extend services earlier in the planning period, then the remainder of Study Area 8 is a good candidate for inclusion in the UGB. Areas 1, 2, 3, are separated from the City by a water feature, which means extension to this area would be delivered at greater expense.

- **Factor 4:** Maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area. LUBA has generally used the term “efficiency” to mean “contiguous or adjacent to existing development.” Areas 1 and 6 probably have the greatest ability to meet the intent of this factor due to their proximity to the existing UGB. Area 5 meets this factor to a lesser extent. Areas 10 and 11 provide the least adjacency to the existing UGB. Areas 7, 8, and 9 are noted as prime locations for employment due to their proximity to the interchange. Areas further from the interchange may be good candidates for housing.

- **Factor 5:** Environmental, energy, economic and social consequences. Areas 2, 3, 4 and 10 have the greatest potential for negative environmental consequences given the amount of floodplain in these areas. Areas 1 and 6 probably have the least energy consequences from a transportation and service delivery perspective because of their location to the UGB. Any expansion that affects lands that are actively farmed has potential for economic impacts. Exceptions areas (predominantly in Areas 1, 2, 4 and 5) have the greatest potential for social impacts. In the Location Analysis section of this document, each study area will be provided an in depth, and individual discussion of its potential Economic, Social, Environmental and Energy consequences.

- **Factor 6:** Retention of agricultural land as defined, with Class I being the highest priority for retention and Class VI the lowest priority. Table 7.2 evaluated soil class more closely. Areas 7 and 8 have the lowest priority soil classes and are thus most consistent with this factor. Areas 5 and 6 have the largest number of acres in Class 1 soils.

- **Factor 7:** Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural activities. Areas with more land contiguous to existing development, such as areas 1 and 6 are
probably most compatible with nearby agricultural activities. However, any land that is adjacent to agricultural activities will have an impact with respect to Factor 7. The 2004 Study’s evaluation of this factor suggested that the compatibility impacts do not appear to be much different between the UGB study areas.

These factors are discussed in greater detail within the evaluation of each individual study area.

Location Analysis:
STUDY AREA 1: Coburg Road-Roberts Road (95 Acres)
Study Area 1 includes lands south of the existing UGB, east of Coburg Road and West of Roberts Road. The eastern edge of the study area is bounded by the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way. The area is contiguous with the existing UGB on three sides. The area consists of approximately 95 acres in five parcels.

More than 90 acres of the site is zoned for agricultural uses (E-40), with 4.4 acres designated RR-2 (an exception area). Three dwelling units exist on the site as well as a few farm-related structures. The land is largely in active farm uses. Topographically, the site is largely flat. While no identified wetlands exist on the site, about 16 acres of the site are in flood zone A (the 100-year floodplain).

Lands zoned for agricultural use in the study area are mostly Class I or II soils. Of the 90 acres zoned for agricultural use in the study area, 9.5 acres have Class I soils, and 71.5 acres are identified as Class II soils.

Study Area 1 appears relatively easy to service due to its flat topography. The site is a few feet lower than areas just to the north. Water service would be relatively easy to extend to the site, as would electrical. Transportation to the site would be from Roberts Road on the east and Willamette Street on the West. Opportunities exist to extend Coleman and Thomas Streets into the study area.

Economic Consequences
Study Area 1 is not seen as the least expensive area to service, nor is it the most. The growth scenarios that were generated from the Coburg Crossroads process identified area 1 as being an area for residential and open space use. It appears that there are limited opportunities in the area for commercial or even industrial uses, however, public sentiment favors residential use for the area. Impacts to existing economic conditions would include the removal of farmland acreage which is currently producing a commercial crop. Also, the area abuts industrial uses off of Roberts Court, and conflicting uses could create limited impacts or limitations (obvious or subtle) to their operation.

Social Consequences
Study Area 1 is adjacent to sections of Courg’s city limits that are developed with a residential neighborhood (to the north) and industrial uses (to the east). The area also includes existing residences, which occur on both County designated exceptions land (two homes) and non-exceptions land (one home). To the west and across from Coburg Road is a significant area of exceptions land as well. This dynamic has potential for both positive and negative social consequences. The lifestyle of current residents in this area will be altered; however the livability of the area will be relatively high for new residents moving in. Expansion in this area will also have significant potential to redefine (for better or worse) the southern gateway to the City along Coburg Road. There has been
some interest expressed from property owners in this area about future annexation into the City as part of long-term plans for the property.

**Environmental Consequences**

Muddy Creek flows through the western portions of Study Area 1. The area also contains significant acreage within 100-year floodplain. Although floodplain does not prohibit development, it does present an environmental conflict which does not exist in all study areas. Development within these floodplain areas would introduce an increased risk of hazard to housing stock within Coburg. The overwhelming majority of the resource land within Study Area 1 is Class II soils (84%), with areas of Class I (11%) and Class IV (5%) soils as well. These areas have proven agricultural productivity and are currently farmed.

**Energy Consequences**

Water and sewer lines already extend up to several areas adjacent to Study Area 1 and would provide a relatively efficient conversion to urban use. Access to Study Area 1 would be very good as the area could be served by Coburg Road, other local streets and perhaps Roberts Road to the east.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area 1 Summary</th>
<th>Constrained Acres/($)</th>
<th>% Class 1 or 2 Soils on Resource land</th>
<th>% Exception/ % Resource</th>
<th>Vacant Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94.6 Acres</td>
<td>16.3/(17%)</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>10/90</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advantages:**
- High livability potential (Factors 2 & 5, Local Criteria 4)
- Efficient, orderly and economic expansion (Factors 3 and 4, Local Criteria 1)
- Relatively high Urban-Ag compatibility (Factor 7, Local Criteria 5)
- Exceptions land included (ORS priority)

**Drawbacks:**
- High percentage of Class II soils, Class I soils present (Factors 5 & 6, ORS Priority)
- Relatively high amount of Agricultural acreage removed (Factor 6)

**STUDY AREA 2: Coburg Road-Funke Road (65 Acres)**

Study Area 2 includes lands south of the existing UGB, west of Coburg Road and east of Funke Road. The area is contiguous with the existing UGB only on the north side. The study area includes approximately 64 acres in 16 parcels. More than 40 acres of the site is zoned for agricultural uses (E-30), with about 22 acres designated for rural residential uses (an exception area). Nine dwelling units exist in the study area, eight of which are located on exceptions land. There is also a religious facility in the exceptions area. The land is largely in active farm uses.

Topographically, the site is largely flat. About 20 acres of the site are in flood zone A (the 100-year floodplain), of these, 14 acres are within exceptions areas—areas where most of the development in the study area exists. Of the 42 acres in this study area zoned for agricultural use, 39.4 are in Class 2 soils.
Transportation access could be provided from Willamette Street on the West. If just the exceptions areas were included in the UGB, it would be difficult to provide access from any place other than Willamette Street. However, the City could consider extending a street through the site and providing rear access to parcels.

**Economic Consequences**
Like Study Area 1, Study Area 2 would be neither the least expensive area to service nor the most. The area contains acreage that would be removed from active farming if developed. The area also presents increased risk to property due to 100-year floodplain in its northern and western portions.

**Social Consequences**
Study Area 2 contains a significant amount of exceptions land (35%). There are about eight residences in Study Area 2, most of which are within the exceptions land. Although there may be resistance to expansion in this area amongst current property owners, livability in the area, excepting floodplain dynamics, would be very high given its proximity to downtown and Coburg Road. Also because many Coburg residents work in the Eugene-Springfield Area, expansion on this end of town will ease traffic through Downtown Coburg on Willamette Street. There has been some interest expressed from property owners in this area about future annexation into the City.

**Environmental Consequences**
As noted, Study Area 2 contains significant acreage within the 100-year floodplain (21%). Most of the floodplain areas are located on the exceptions land. The remaining resource acreage is Class II soils, most of which is being actively farmed. There is also a small wetland identified in the National Wetlands Inventory located in the northwest corner of Study area.

**Energy Consequences**
The area would be relatively easy to service due to its flat topography. Water service would be relatively easy to extend to the site, as would electrical. Coburg Road provides access into the area. The overall energy consequences are generally positive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area 2 Summary</th>
<th>Constrained Acres/(%)</th>
<th>% Class 1 or 2 Soils on Resource land</th>
<th>% Exception/ % Resource</th>
<th>Vacant Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64.5 Acres</td>
<td>19.7/(21%)</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>35/65</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advantages:**
- Good livability potential (Factors 2 & 5, Local Criteria 3,4)
- Efficient, orderly and economic expansion (Factors 3 and 4. Local Criteria 1)
- Relatively average Urban-Ag compatibility (Factor 7, Local Criteria 5)
- Significant exceptions land included (ORS priority)

**Drawbacks:**
- High percentage of Class II soils, Class I soils present (Factors 5 & 6, ORS Priority)
- High percentage of land in 100-year floodplain, wetland present (Factor 5)
- Relatively average amount of Agricultural acreage removed (Factor 6)
STUDY AREA 3: Coburg Bottom Loop East (74 Acres)
Study Area 3 includes lands south and west of the existing UGB, west of Coburg Road. The area is contiguous with the existing UGB on the northeast side. The study area includes approximately 74 acres in 8 parcels. The majority of the study area (73.3 acres) is zoned for agricultural uses (E-30), with only one lot for rural residential uses. Agricultural lands in the study area are in orchards and other crops. Only two dwelling units exist in the study area, one of which is located in the exceptions area. Topographically, the site is largely flat. However, the site is several feet lower than the remainder of Coburg and is separated from the UGB by a vegetative buffer. The majority of the site (81%) is in flood zone A (the 100-year floodplain). Between the elevation difference and areas in the floodplain, this study area presents significant development constraints. All of the 73.3 acres zoned for agricultural uses in this study area are identified as Class II soil types.

Economic Consequences
Study Area 3 is identified by Coburg’s Public Works Director as one of the more expensive areas to service (likely due to its elevation and the vegetative buffer that separates it from existing service within the city limits currently). The site is not seen as having any employment potential. Most of the area is constituted by functioning and productive farmland. Risks to property would be higher in this area, due to the majority of it being in the 100-year floodplain. Expansion into Study Area 3 provides mostly negative economic consequences.

Social Consequences
Although Study Area 3 is partially adjacent to the UGB, it is separated by a water feature and vegetative buffer. Livability in this area would be reduced due its poor potential for connections to the rest of town. Transportation access to the site would probably have to come from Coburg Bottom Loop, a County Road that does not directly connect to areas within the Coburg UGB. One positive social consequence is that the limited number of existing dwelling units in the area would mean fewer land owners impacted by an expansion.

Environmental Consequences
Almost all of Study Area 3 is within 100-year floodplain. It also includes areas of wetlands identified on Coburg’s Local Wetland Inventory (more than any other area). Extension of services and City infrastructure would be either have significant impacts to these resources or would necessitate expensive and awkward measures to avoid them. The environmental consequences are negative.

Energy Consequences
Utilities would be generally more complicated to extend to this area. Additionally, as noted, no transportation access points other than Coburg Loop Road are immediately obvious. This study area appears to have significant transportation access limitations, and thus expansion into the area would necessitate longer and perhaps more vehicle trips.
### STUDY AREA 3: Coburg Urbanization Study

**Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constrained Acres/(%)</th>
<th>% Class 1 or 2 Soils on Resource land</th>
<th>% Exception/% Resource</th>
<th>Vacant Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74.1 Acres</td>
<td>59.9/(81%)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advantages:**
- Limited number of current residents (Factor 5)

**Drawbacks:**
- No exceptions land included (ORS priority)
- Less efficient, orderly and economic expansion (Factors 3 and 4, Local Criteria 1)
- Relatively low livability potential (Factors 2 & 5, Local Criteria 3, 4)
- Transportation limitations (Factors 4 and 5, Local Criteria 3)
- High percentage of Class II soils (Factors 5 & 6, ORS Priority)
- High percentage of land in 100-year floodplain, wetlands present (Factor 5)
- Relatively average amount of Agricultural acreage removed (Factor 6)

### STUDY AREA 4: Coburg Bottom Loop West (109 Acres)

Study Area 4 includes lands west of the existing UGB. The area is contiguous with the existing UGB on the north side and part of the east side. The study area includes approximately 109 acres in 24 parcels. The majority of the study area (92.3 acres) zoned for agricultural uses (E-30). About 17 acres are zoned for rural residential uses (RR-2 and RR-5). Agricultural lands in the study area are in orchards and other crops. Approximately 14 dwelling units exist in the study area; most of which (11) are located in exceptions areas. Topographically, the site is largely flat. However, much of the site is several feet lower than the remainder of Coburg. The site is several feet lower than areas to the north and east.

#### Economic Consequences

Study Area 4 was evaluated as being among the less expensive areas to extend utilities to. The area, however, exhibits a number of potentially negative economic consequences. The site is predominantly made up of a significant, operating hazelnut orchard. The discontinuance or reduction of this operation will remove a significant player in the agricultural economy in the area. The area is not viewed by the City as ideal for employment land, and is thus not anticipated to create economic opportunities.

#### Social Consequences

Expansion into Study Area 4 has significant potential for disruptive consequences to current residents in the area. This impact would likely be most significant to the owners of the hazelnut orchard. The area contains significant acreage of exceptions land. These residential areas are along Funke and Coburg Bottom Loop Roads. An expansion which included only the exceptions land in Study Area 4 would be problematic because the exceptions land is not contiguous with the UGB. An expansion which includes Study Area 3 would provide the exceptions land of Study Area 4 a feasible connection. Livability in Study Area 4 is good, particularly in the north where access to downtown and Coburg Elementary School are ideal. There have been concerns expressed from property owners in this area about urbanization.
Environmental Consequences
Like Study Area 3, Study Area 4 presents environmental challenges. The majority of the site (61%) is in flood zone A (the 100-year floodplain). Additionally, of the resource acres in this study area, 75% are Class II soils and 3% are identified as Class I soils.

Energy Consequences
Water service would be relatively easy to extend to the site, as would electrical. Transportation access to the site would probably have to come from Coburg Bottom Loop—a County Road. Van Duyn Road could provide access from the North. The northern portions of Study Area 4 present opportunities for energy efficient expansion, due to their proximity to downtown and other facilities. Exceptions lands provide an energy benefit in that they have many services and infrastructure already in place. The exceptions land in Study Area 4 does not have access opportunities that are as ideal as other area alternatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area 4 Summary</th>
<th>Constrained Acres/(%)</th>
<th>% Class 1 or 2 Soils on Resource land</th>
<th>% Exception/ Resource</th>
<th>Vacant Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>108.9 Acres</td>
<td>66.6/(61%)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22 / 78</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advantages:
- Good livability potential (Factors 2 & 5, Local Criteria 3, 4)
- Efficient, orderly and economic expansion (Factors 3 and 4, Local Criteria 1)
- Exceptions land included (ORS priority)
- Fair transportation opportunities (Factors 5 and 3, Local Criteria 3)

Drawbacks:
- Removal of/ Impact on active orchard (Factors 5, 6, 7, Local Criteria 5)
- High percentage of Class II soils, Class I soils present (Factors 5 & 6, ORS Priority)
- High percentage of land in 100-year floodplain (Factor 5)
- Relatively significant amount of Agricultural acreage removed (Factor 6)

STUDY AREA 5: Stalling Lane- North Coburg Road (200 Acres)
Study Area 5 includes lands north and west of the existing UGB. The area is contiguous with the existing UGB on part of the east side. The study area includes approximately 200 acres in 56 parcels. The majority of the study area (172.3 acres) is in exception areas (RR-5 zoning). Only one tax lot of about 28 acres is in agricultural zoning (E-40). A total of 43 dwelling units exist in the study area; 39 of which are located in exceptions areas. Topographically, the site is largely flat. Of the 28.1 acres in this study area zoned for agricultural uses, 18.1 acres are in Class I soil types and 9.4 acres are identified as Class II soil types. A pump station may be required to move sewage from the area to the treatment plant on the north end of Coburg. Water service would be relatively easy to extend to the site, as would electrical.

Transportation access to the site would probably have to come from Coburg Road and Stallings Lane. There may be opportunities to provide cross streets to improve access to the area.
Economic Consequences
According to Coburg’s Public Works Director, Study Area 5 is one of the least expensive areas to extend City water and stormwater service into. This is due to the fact that much of the area is currently served by water along North Coburg Road North. An important consideration in expansion into Study Area 5 is the sewer service obligation to existing residents that will be immediately effective if all or any portion of area 5 is included. This obligation is more significant in Study Area 5 than other areas, and is an important cost related issue for the City to consider.

Study Area 5 is not identified as an area for employment expansion and expansion would provide no benefit in that regard. The area contains a number of small farms and mid-sized farms. Economic impacts will be more substantial for the relatively few operating--mid sized farms. The only resource land in Study Area 5 is the 28 acre piece owned by Eugene 4J School District. The overall economic consequences of expansion into Study Area 5 are not seen as leaning significantly either way.

Social Consequences
Study Area 5 contains many existing residents (43 dwelling units). Expansion impacts will affect many more people in Study Area 5 than in most other areas. It can, however, be argued that the individual impacts will be relatively less to residents in Study Area 5 than in some other areas since the area is currently residentially zoned, of a certain residential character, and already has a relatively significant population. The area contains many rural residences, which, if included in the UGB will receive significant development pressure. Previous efforts have suggested the residents in Study Area 5 are split in their support of expansion in their direction. The area is in very close proximity to Coburg Elementary School, a potential future school site, and relatively near Coburg’s downtown, all of which promote high livability.

Environmental Consequences
The environmental consequences of expansion into Study Area 5 are seen as minimal. Although the area consists of Class I and II soils, the area contains significant existing development. The limited resource land within Study Area 5 is predominantly Class I soils. By directing growth to this area, areas of greater environmental significance and with greater potential can be avoided.

Energy Consequences
Study Area 5 appears relatively easy to service due to its proximity to the proposed sewage treatment plant. As noted, much of Study Area 5 is already served with both water and stormwater. Expansions on the north end of town will place greater traffic pressure on arterials that carry traffic through Coburg to reach Eugene-Springfield (Willamette Street and Pearl). With existing facilities in place, and high livability potential, the overall energy consequences are generally positive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area 5 Summary</th>
<th>Constrained Acres/($)</th>
<th>% Class 1 or 2 Soils on Resource land</th>
<th>% Exception/ Resource</th>
<th>Vacant Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>199.8 Acres</td>
<td>2/1(1%)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86/14</td>
<td>178.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advantages:
- High livability potential in more southern portions (Factors 2 & 5, Local Criteria 3, 4)
Very efficient, orderly and economic expansion (Factors 3 and 4, Local Criteria 1)
Good Urban-Ag compatibility (Factor 7, Local Criteria 5)
Mostly exceptions land included (ORS priority)
No land in 100-year floodplain, no wetlands present (Factor 5)

Drawbacks:
- Northern portions reduce compactness, livability (Factors 2 & 5, Local Criteria 3,4)
- High percentage of Class II soils on resource land (Factors 5 & 6, ORS Priority)
- Potential for public opposition (Factor 5)

STUDY AREA 6: Van Duyn-Coburg Industrial Way (209 Acres)
Study Area 6 includes lands directly north of the existing UGB. The area is contiguous with the existing UGB on the north side and part of the east and west sides. The study area includes approximately 209 acres in 4 parcels (one parcel contains over 100 acres) and the majority of the area is in a common ownership. Most of the study area (208 acres) is zoned for agricultural uses (E-40). Less than 1 acre is zoned for rural residential uses (RR-5). A total of 6 dwelling units exist in the study area. Topographically, the site is largely flat.

Study Area 6 is probably the easiest to provide sewer service to due to its proximity to the proposed sewer treatment plan. Water and stormwater service would be relatively easy to extend to the site, as would electrical.

Transportation access to the site would probably have to come from Coburg Road. Additional access could come from Roberts Road. This study area also provides an opportunity for the extension of Willamette Street—Coburg’s main street.

Economic Consequences
Study Area 6 is the least expensive area to provide water and stormwater service to. The area is adjacent to the proposed sewer treatment plant and therefore provides greater efficiency in that regard as well. Study Area 6 is currently made up of two residential lots and two large active farms.

Study Area 6 is not identified as an area for employment expansion; however industrial opportunities seem possible in the northeastern portions of the area, due to its proximity to existing Industrial uses, and its proximity to the water treatment plant.

Social Consequences
Study Area 6 has potential for creating a high livability standard for expansion. The area presents many options for connectivity to existing neighborhoods and street networks. Expansion into the area supports local policy encouraging “sequential development that expands in an orderly way outward from the existing city center.” Study Area 6 provides opportunities for excellent access to facilities such as schools and downtown. Expansion in this area involves a limited number of property owners, which minimizes the complexity of realizing expansion/planning objectives. It is also noted that the owners of the property adjacent to the current UGB have expressed interest in urbanization.

Environmental Consequences
Only 7 of the 209 acres in Study Area 6 are in flood zone A (the 100-year floodplain). Areas in flood zone A are mostly in a canal that transects the study area. Of the 208 acres in this study area zoned for agricultural uses, 63.6 acres are in Class I soil types and 138.5 acres are identified as Class II soil types, and 5.9 acres are in Class IV soil types. The area is prime farmland. Although Area 6 consists of Class I and II soils, the area contains significant development. By directing growth to Area 6, areas of greater environmental significance can be avoided.

Energy Consequences
Study Area 6 appears relatively easy to service due to its proximity to the proposed sewage treatment plant. Although Area 6 is not already served with both water and stormwater, an abundance of connection points make it a very serviceable option. As noted earlier, expansions on the north end of town will place greater traffic pressure on arterials that carry traffic through Coburg to reach Eugene-Springfield (Willamette Street and Pearl).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area 6 Summary</th>
<th>Constrained Acres(%)</th>
<th>% Class 1 or 2 Soils on Resource land</th>
<th>% Exception/ % Resource</th>
<th>Vacant Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>208.8 Acres</td>
<td>7/(3%)</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>100/0</td>
<td>206.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advantages:
- High livability potential (Factors 2 & 5, Local Criteria 3,4)
- Very efficient, orderly and economic expansion (Factors 3 and 4, Local Criteria 1)
- Good Urban-Ag compatibility (Factor 7, Local Criteria 5)
- Mostly large parcels (portions of which are currently within the UGB (Factor 5)
- Very little acreage in 100-year floodplain, no wetlands present (Factor 5)

Drawbacks:
- High percentage of Class II soils, relatively high percentage of Class I soils (Factors 5 & 6, ORS Priority)
- No exceptions land included (ORS priority)

STUDY AREA 7: East I-5 North (240 Acres)
Study Area 7 includes lands east of the existing UGB and across I-5. The area is not contiguous with the existing UGB. Inclusion of this area would require additional expansion of the UGB across I-5. The study area includes approximately 240 acres in 3 very large parcels. The entire study area (239.9 acres) is zoned for agricultural uses (E-40). Agricultural lands in the study area are used primarily for grazing. No development exists in this study area. Topographically, the site is largely flat. The study area has (23 acres) is in flood zone A (the 100-year floodplain) or in identified wetland area. The major development constraint in this study area is extending municipal services across I-5.

Economic Consequences
Study Area 7 is seen as more difficult to service due to its location east of I-5. It was among the most expensive alternatives as per Coburg’s Public Works Director. This is because water, sewer, electricity, and storm drainage would all probably require boring
under the Interstate. It is of note that Coburg’s recent inclusion of the Country Squire property (east of I-5) places a certain obligation on the City to extend service across the freeway regardless of the outcomes of this expansion process.

The overwhelming majority of the site is currently under one use (a cattle ranch), which also occupies significant acreage surrounding the study area. Due to the area’s proximity to I-5 (as well as the Eugene-Springfield area), it is viewed by the City as having prime employment potential. The economic consequences of the reduction of the ranching activities would likely be outweighed by potential economic gains of utilizing the land for industrial purposes. The economic opportunities for areas east of I-5 have the potential to outweigh the negative economic consequence of expansion into the area (cost of extending service, etc.).

The recently adopted Coburg / Interstate 5 Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) traffic forecasts are based on estimated of the growth potential inherent in the current UGB assuming some limited infill. As a result, full realization of the assigned population and employment forecasts will result is greater traffic volumes than assumed in the IAMP. The nature of those traffic increases will depend on the location and intensity of the new growth assumptions. If additional land east of I-5 was included in the UGB, and a development proposal was submitted to the City, the developer may be required to pay for transportation infrastructure improvements beyond the current reconstruction design, if deemed necessary by ODOT. These improvements could prove to be prohibitively expensive.

Social Consequences
There has been public resistance in the past to expansion of Coburg’s UGB east of Interstate 5. Residents in the rural areas east of the interstate are particularly adverse to such proposals. Correspondence with property owners has suggested a willingness on their part to entertain ideas about expansion into Study Area 7 and/or 8.

Central to Coburg’s expansion policies is the principle of sustaining healthy and necessary growth while maintaining Coburg’s small town atmosphere. Economic growth is not a simple need to accommodate on Coburg’s existing lands west of I-5. Expansion to the east of the freeway will allow for both the growth of the community, and the preservation of appropriate buffers between the City’s industrial and residential uses.

Environmental Consequences
Of the 240 acres in this study area zoned for agricultural uses, 2% are in Class I soil types. The area is predominated by Class IV soil types (96%). The area also has soils identified as Class VI (2%).

Although Study Area 7 provides an opportunity for expansion onto low value soils, the area contains a relatively high number of wetlands identified by the national Wetland inventory. These wetlands exist along the western and northern portions of the area. Additionally, a small fraction of the northern portion of the area is within 100-year floodplain. Overall environmental consequences of expansion into portions of Study Area 7 are viewed as positive.

It is also noted that limiting the necessity for large trucks to travel through any portion of town results in better air quality in Coburg.
Energy Consequences
Transportation access to the site would come from Van Duyn Road—a county owned extension of Pearl Street. Economic activity is undertaken more efficiently in areas nearest to transportation corridors such as I-5. In this manner expansion into Study Area 7 has positive energy consequences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area 7 Summary</th>
<th>Constrained Acres/(%)</th>
<th>% Class 1 or 2 Soils on Resource land</th>
<th>% Exception/ % Resource</th>
<th>Vacant Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>239.9 Acres</td>
<td>23.3/(9.7%)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0/100</td>
<td>239.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advantages:
- Excellent economic potential (Factors 2 & 5)
- Predominantly Class IV and Class VI soils present (Factors 5 & 6, ORS Priority)
- Excellent transportation opportunities (Factors 5 and 3)
- Relative Urban-Ag compatibility (industrial use) (Factor 7, Local Criteria 5)

Drawbacks:
- No exceptions land (ORS priority)
- Costly delivery of services (Factors 3 and 4)
- Wetlands present and land in 100-year floodplain (Factor 5)
- Agricultural acreage removed (Factor 6)

STUDY AREA 8: East I-5 South A (106 Acres)
Study Area 8 includes lands east of the existing UGB and across I-5. Unlike Study Area 7, Study Area 8 shares a significant border with the existing UGB. A portion of the original Study Area 8, identified in the 2004 Study, was brought into the UGB in 2006. Study Area 8 now consists of the remaining acreage that was not included in that expansion.

Inclusion of this area would require additional expansion of the UGB across I-5. The study area includes approximately 105 acres in one parcel. The acres in this study area are zoned for agricultural uses (E-40). Agricultural lands in the study area are used primarily for grazing. Topographically, the site is largely flat. The study area has no identified wetland areas per the National Wetland Inventory, but it is suspected that more thorough fieldwork may reveal some jurisdictional wetlands on the site. The major development constraint in this study area is extending municipal services across I-5. Of the 106 acres in this study area zoned for agricultural uses, 2.2 acres are in Class III soil types, 53.2 acres are identified as Class IV soil types, and 50.3 acres are identified as Class VI soil types. Study Area 8 appears more difficult to service due to its location east of I-5. Water, sewer, electricity, and storm drainage would all probably require boring under the Interstate. A pump station might be required to move sewage from the area to the treatment plant on the north end of Coburg. Transportation access to the site would come from Van Duyn Road—a County Road. Development on the site may be constrained until the I-5 interchange improvements area completed. It is noted that Study Area 8 is adjacent to lands already within the UGB (east of I-5), and for which the City has an obligation to provide service to.
Economic Consequences
Like Study Area 7, Study Area 8 is among the most difficult to service due to its location east of I-5. It is also among the most expensive alternatives because water, sewer, electricity, and storm drainage would all probably require boring under the Interstate. In addition, improvements to the interchange may be necessary to address development not included in the IAMP review.

It should be noted that Study Area 8 is directly adjacent to the only portions of Coburg’s existing UGB east of I-5. The entire site consists of one parcel with one use (a cattle ranch). The acreage belongs to the same ranch operation occupying Study Area 7. Study Area 8 is viewed by the City as having prime employment potential. The economic consequences of the reduction of the ranching activities would likely be outweighed by potential economic gains of utilizing the land for industrial purposes. Additionally, the economic opportunities for areas east of I-5 have the potential to outweigh the negative economic consequence of expansion into the area (cost of extending service, etc.).

Social Consequences
Because Study Area 8 is separated from the other ranch properties to the north by Van Duyn, and is surrounded by other uses, the owners may be more amenable to its inclusion than Study Area 7. However, as noted, there has been public resistance in the past to expansion of Coburg’s UGB east of I-5. Study Area 8 is directly adjacent to a number of properties under various ownership and uses, including a few residents in the rural areas east of the interstate. Again, correspondence with property owners has suggested a willingness on their part to entertain ideas about expansion on their property.

Much like Study Area 7, expansion east into Study Area 8 will allow for both the growth of the community, and the preservation of appropriate separation and buffers between the City’s industrial and residential uses.

Environmental Consequences
Of all of the acreage in Study Area 8, 98% is Class V or VI soils. These soils are of the lowest values that are typically mapped. The study area has the lowest value soils overall of any other study area. Area 8 also contains no mapped wetlands, or floodplain areas.

Energy Consequences
Transportation access to the site would come from Van Duyn Road—a County owned extension of Pearl Street. Economic activity is undertaken more efficiently in areas nearest to transportation corridors such as I-5. In this manner expansion into area 8 has positive energy consequences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area 8 Summary</th>
<th>Constrained Acres/ (%)</th>
<th>% Class 1 or 2 Soils on Resource land</th>
<th>% Exception/ % Resource</th>
<th>Vacant Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105.7 Acres</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0/100</td>
<td>105.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advantages:
- Excellent economic potential (Factors 2 & 5)
Most favorable soil scenario of all study areas: predominantly Class V and Class VI soils (Factors 5 & 6, ORS Priority)

Excellent transportation opportunities (Factors 5 and 3)

No land in 100-year floodplain, and fewer wetlands assumed than Area 7 (Factor 5)

**Drawbacks:**

- No exceptions land (ORS priority)
- Costly delivery of services (Factors 3 and 4)
- Agricultural acreage removed (Factor 6)
- Urban-Ag compatibility less than Study Area 7 (industrial use) (Factor 7)

**STUDY AREA 9: East I-5 South B-Selby Way (26 Acres)**

Study Area 9 includes lands east of the existing UGB and across Interstate 5. The northwest corner of the area is contiguous with the existing UGB.

Inclusion of this area would require additional expansion of the UGB across I-5. The study area includes one parcel of approximately 26 acres. This parcel is designated by Lane County as resource (Forest) land. Half of the site is significantly wooded and the eastern most portion is nestled against the foothills of the Coburg Hills. As a result Study Area 9 contains the most significant slopes of any of the 11 study areas, although it is noted, the slopes are relatively insignificant.

Reed Road/Selby Way connects Study Area 9 to the City of Coburg and all areas west of I-5. Outside of the Coburg I-5 interchange, Selby Way is the only other existing alternative for crossing I-5. Study Area 9 is included as a possible expansion alternative largely due to this characteristic.

**Economic Consequences**

Study Area 9 joins Areas 7 and 8 in being the most expensive areas to extend services due to its location east of I-5. Most significant to Study Area 9’s profile is that the area abuts a rare crossing and connection to areas of Coburg east of I-5. It is also noted, however, that the condition of the bridge is not immediately known. Expensive repairs may be necessary if the bridge is not in proper condition, or does not meet required specifications.

Although Study Area 9 does not share the access advantages of Study Areas 7 and 8, it is in very close proximity to I-5 and is connected to sections of existing industrial land within Coburg via Reed Road/Selby Way. Reduction of or discontinuance of activities currently on the site is not viewed as having negative economic consequences when balanced with the potential positive economic consequences of employment growth on the site.

**Social Consequences**

There is one owner of Study Area 9 and one existing residence. As noted with previous areas, this can reduce the complexity of the expansion process and the potential for reaching planning objectives. It also may result in significant impacts (positive and/or negative) to the individual property owner.
The area would be most appropriately used for employment purposes. It is noted that one advantage for consideration of Study Area 9, is the existing access to the site over I-5 via Selby Way. Access via Selby Way would necessitate a relatively lengthy and circuitous route for commercial and industrial traffic, contributing to noise, pollution and traffic in the area. As compared to Study Areas 7 and 8, Study Area 9 appears to present greater negative social consequences.

Environmental Consequences
Study Area 9 includes the only forest designated land within all study areas. It is not prime forest land. Study Area 9’s soil profile is largely Class IV and VI, with smaller portions of Class III. The site includes several small water features; however none are located on either the National or Local Wetlands Inventory. Study Area 9 presents the only expansion alternative that encroaches onto the Urban-Wildland interface (foothills of the Coburg Hills). It is not immediately understood what impacts such expansion might have.

Energy Consequences
Study Area 9 will require the extension of all services. If residential uses are directed to the area, it is noted that the area does not have a school site or an existing school within several miles of its boundaries. Transportation access to the site would come from Selby Way—a County Road. The condition of the existing bridge across I-5 is not completely understood. Development on the site may be constrained if the bridge is not in proper condition, or does not meet required specifications.

Expansion into Study Area 9 does not as clearly meet the efficiency related policy of expansion that is “sequential development that expands in an orderly way outward from the existing city center.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area 9 Summary</th>
<th>Constrained Acres/ (%)</th>
<th>% Class 1 or 2 Soils on Resource land</th>
<th>% Exception/ % Resource</th>
<th>Vacant Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.2 Acres</td>
<td>.23/(1%)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0/100</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advantages:
- Economic potential (Factors 2 & 5)
- Favorable soil scenario: predominantly Class IV and Class VI soils (Factors 5 & 6, ORS Priority)
- Located near rare crossing of I-5 (Factors 2, 4 and 5)

Drawbacks:
- Poor access for Industrial and commercial traffic (Factors 4 & 5)
- No exceptions land (ORS priority)
- Costly delivery of services (more expensive than Study Areas 7 & 8) (Factors 3 and 4)
- Forest acreage removed (Factor 6, ORS Priority)
- Urban-Ag compatibility less than Study Areas 7 & 8 (industrial use) (Factor 7)
- Existing water features (Factor 5)
STUDY AREA 10: Coburg South (104 Acres)

Study Area 10 includes lands south of the existing UGB, both east and west of Coburg Road and south of Study Areas 1 and 2. The eastern edge of the study area is bounded by Interstate 5 and includes a parcel between I-5 and the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way. The eastern portion of the study area is contiguous with the southern most arm of the existing UGB. The study area is long and narrow running east and west and consisting of four parcels and two residences. The area straddles the southern gateway to the City of Coburg from Eugene along Coburg Road.

The entire area is zoned for agricultural use and much of the land is largely in active farm uses. Topographically, the site is largely flat.

Study Area 10 appears relatively easy to service due to its flat topography.

The active Egge Sand and Gravel property is located directly south of the westernmost parcel of Study Area 10.

Economic Consequences
According to Coburg’s Public Works Director, Study Area 10 is one of the least expensive areas to extend City services to. This is likely due to the fact that the eastern portion of Study Area 10 is directly adjacent to the recent industrial developments along Roberts Court. Although Study Area 10 is not explicitly identified as a prime option for employment expansion, its adjacency to Roberts Court does present a seemingly viable option for such use and could provide positive economic consequences in that regard.

The reduction or loss of agricultural land and farming activities in Study Area 10 as a result of economic or residential expansion, or both will have negative economic consequences. These consequences may be outweighed by positive economic outcomes related to increased employment land.

Coburg’s Comprehensive Plan includes a policy directing the City to “seek to ensure compatibility between the future needs of the community and growth of nearby sand and gravel operations.” Encroachment of urban uses on the sand and gravel operation will certainly create compatibility tensions and could have negative economic consequences on that operation.

Social Consequences
Coburg policy and previous planning processes have suggested local opposition to expanding towards the McKenzie. As noted in City policy: “The City supports, and shall pursue, establishment of a southern greenbelt that ensures a permanent open character for the area between Coburg and the McKenzie River.” It is anticipated that livability will not be maximized in development that is closely adjacent to the Egge Sand and Gravel operation directly adjacent to Study Area 10, nor will residential development be perfectly ideal in the areas adjacent to the industrial activities on Roberts Court. Both areas are fairly separated from downtown and local services.

Being on the southern end of Coburg, Study Area 10 does provide the identified benefit of reducing Coburg’s Eugene-Springfield commuter traffic through the downtown area.
**Environmental Consequences**

While no identified wetlands exist on the site, 7.7 acres (8%) of the site is in flood zone A (the 100-year floodplain). The floodplain is limited to the linear water features that exist across the site including Muddy Creek. The soils of Study Area 10 are largely Class II (78%), the remaining acreage is Class IV (16%) and 1 (6%).

**Energy Consequences**

An expansion into Study Area 10 would necessitate (most logically) expansion into Study Areas 1 or 2, because they separate area 10 from the residential portions of the existing UGB. Expansion into 10 without expansion into Study Area 1 or 2 would not support the efficiency related policy encouraging expansion that is “sequential development that expands in an orderly way outward from the existing city center.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area 10 Summary</th>
<th>Constrained Acres/(%)</th>
<th>% Class 1 or 2 Soils on Resource land</th>
<th>% Exception/ % Resource</th>
<th>Vacant Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99.5 Acres</td>
<td>7.7/(8%)</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>0/100</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advantages:**

- Fair livability potential (Factors 2 & 5)
- Mostly large parcels (Factor 5)
- Very little acreage in 100-year floodplain, no wetlands present (Factor 5)

**Drawbacks:**

- Less efficient, orderly and economic expansion (Factors 3 and 4, Local Criteria 1)
- Less Urban-Ag compatibility (Factor 7, Local Criteria 5)
- Discouragement for excessive development to the south: “The City supports, and shall pursue, establishment of a southern greenbelt that ensures a permanent open character for the area between Coburg and the McKenzie River.” (City Policy)
- High percentage of Class II soils, Class I soils present (Factors 5 & 6, ORS Priority)
- No exceptions land included (ORS priority)

**STUDY AREA 11: Coburg North- Indian Drive and Paiute Lane (84 Acres)**

Study Area 11 includes lands north of the existing UGB. The area is contiguous with the existing UGB on its east side. This portion of the UGB adjacent to Study Area 11 constitutes the waste water treatment site and is largely removed from the urbanized areas of Coburg. The study area includes approximately 85 acres in 46 parcels (of which 44 are designated as exceptions land). Study Area 11 contains an isolated residential neighborhood along Indian Drive, Winnebago Street, and Paiute Lane.

The majority of the study area (67 acres) is one large resource designated parcel. This site contains one residence. The site is owned by the same party as the adjacent open farm acreage that constitutes most of Study Area 6.

Access to the site would probably have to come from Coburg Road. There may be opportunities to provide cross streets to improve access to the area.
Economic Consequences
According to Coburg’s Public Works Director, Study Area 11 is one of the least expensive areas to extend City water to. This is due to the fact that a significant portion of the area is currently served by water, and lines run along North Coburg Road. As previously noted in Study Area 5, an important consideration in expansion into areas with existing development is the sewer service obligation to residents that will be immediately effective if the exceptions land in Study Area 11 is included. This obligation is more significant in Study Area 11 than most other areas, and is an important cost related issue for the City to consider.

Economic impacts may be realized by the loss of the farmland located in Study Area 11. Overall the economic consequences of expansion into Study Area 5 are not seen as significant either way.

Social Consequences
Study Area 11 contains more existing residents than any other area (44 dwelling units). Expansion impacts will affect many more people in the study area. As with Study Area 5, however, it can be argued that the individual impacts will be relatively less to residents in Study Area 11 than in some other areas since the area is currently residentially zoned and already has a relatively significant population. Study Area 11 is in fairly close proximity to Coburg Elementary School, and a potential future school site. However livability is not optimized in Study Area 11 due to its isolation from downtown services.

Environmental Consequences
The environmental consequences of expansion into Study Area 11 are related primarily to existence of Class I and II soils on the existing resource land. It seems difficult to justify expansion onto these valuable soils given the potential negative social and energy consequences related to Study Area 11.

Energy Consequences
Study Area 11 appears relatively easy to service due to its proximity to the proposed sewage treatment plant. As noted, significant portions of Study Area 11 are already served with both water and stormwater. Expansions on the north end of town will place greater traffic pressure on arterials that carry traffic through Coburg to reach Eugene-Springfield (Willamette Street and Pearl). However, the substantial distance between Study Area 11 and Coburg’s center will necessitate longer trips than other alternatives.

It is also noted that expansion into Study Area 11 without expansion into Study Areas 5 or 6 would not support the efficiency related policy encouraging expansion that is “sequential development that expands in an orderly way outward from the existing city center.” The acreage demand figures would not suggest that demand would be great enough to bring any portion of Study Area 11 into the UGB in addition to Study Area 5 or 6.

The negative energy consequences of Study Area 11 temper the positive energy consequences.
Study Area 11 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constrained Acres/(%)</th>
<th>% Class 1 or 2 Soils on Resource land</th>
<th>% Exception/ Resource</th>
<th>Vacant Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84.6 Acres</td>
<td>3.6/(4%)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>19/81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advantages:
- Efficient and economic expansion (Factors 3 and 4)
- Relatively average Urban-Ag compatibility (Factor 7)
- Significant exceptions land included (ORS priority)
- Small percentage of land in 100-year floodplain (Factor 5)

Drawbacks:
- Less livability, compactness potential (Factors 2 & 5, Local Criteria 3,4)
- High percentage of Class II soils, relatively high Class I soils present (Factors 5 & 6, ORS Priority)
- Isolated and disorderly development/negative energy impacts (Factor 3, 5 &4, Local Criteria 3)
- Relatively average amount of Agricultural acreage removed (Factor 6)

Staff's assessment of each of the expansion Criteria (ORS Priorities, Goal 14 location factors, and Local Criteria) for each of the 11 study areas included in the expansion analysis is summarized in Table 7.6. The table shows a ranked score of between 1 and 5 for each criteria (5= most suitable and 1= least suitable) Not every criteria included a 1 or 5 score. Higher scores are shaded with a darker fill to aid in table interpretation. The table also summarizes the total scores for each study area and criteria set. Goal 14 factor 2 includes an indication of whether the site is determined to be most appropriate for Residential (R) or Employment (E) Land.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Priority Scheme (ORS)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptions Land (surr. by)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Farm or Forest Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location Factors (Goal 14)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff’s summary suggests that Study Areas 3, 4, 9, 10 and 11 are generally not well suited for expansion, while Areas 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 8 seem to be better suited, and particularly Areas 5, 6 and 8. Staff utilized the criteria analysis above in developing a set of themed expansion alternatives for the City Council, Planning Commission, TAC and Public to consider. These alternatives are presented and discussed in the following sections.

**UGB Expansion Alternatives:**
There are two different sets of expansion alternatives presented: One set for residential lands and the other for employment lands. To assist in the review of alternatives, staff provided Coburg City Council, Planning Commission and the public, with an overview of existing Coburg Comprehensive Plan policies that address urban growth boundary expansion. As outlined in this report, defining alternatives necessitated the inclusion of portions of study areas. Justification of those selections is provided where deemed appropriate.

### Residential Lands Alternatives
In general, the alternatives presented focus expansion into different portions of Study Areas 1, 2, 5, and 6. No alternatives show residential expansion occurring on the east side of I-5. Expansion is also not shown within Study Area 3, 4, 10 or 11 due to impacts on resource lands and natural resources (Study Areas 3 and 4) as well as prohibitive separation from the city center (Study Areas 10 and 11). The Housing Needs Analysis (Chapter 4) identified a residential land need of approximately 148 total acres. The alternatives were selected to provide developable acreage that would closely match this identified need. Development Capacity within the expansion alternatives was calculated using the methodology presented in Table 7.7:

### Table 7.7: Expansion Alternative Development Capacity Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Size</th>
<th>≤ $30k Improvement Value</th>
<th>&gt; $30k Improvement Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; Half Acre</td>
<td>Fully developable</td>
<td>Not developable = Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Half Acre</td>
<td>Fully developable</td>
<td>Partially developable: one-half acre deducted for existing development from unconstrained (buildable) acres. Remaining portion only included if ≥ 4,500 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following is a description of the selected alternatives:

**Residential Expansion Alternative 1: 165 Acres** (see Map 18).

This Alternative is comprised of portions of Study Areas 1, 2 and 5. The focus in this alternative is on concentrating UGB expansion to Lane County Exceptions Lands, and specifically those nearest to Coburg’s existing UGB. UGB adjacent exception lands to the south (Areas 1 and 2) were included in their entirety, and adjacent exception lands to the north (in Area 5) were included as to satisfy the remaining identified need as near to the City as possible (which included much of the exception lands to the north.

This alternative does not provide as orderly of an expansion outward from the city center as the other alternatives (2 and 3). Development would instead proceed in a more linear fashion around existing streets and development. This area is predominately comprised of Class I soils, with some Class II and Class IV soils. Soil class is less of a weighted concern for this alternative since all lands are exceptions land and have the highest statutory expansion priority regardless.

Due to the highly parcelized and developed nature of Residential Expansion Alternative 1, expansion in this area would create a more challenging environment for realizing desired development goals and achieving the City’s needs for growth.

**Residential Expansion Alternative 2: 156 Acres** (see Map 19).

This Alternative is most similar to the recommended expansion areas from the 2004 Study and is comprised of portions of Study Areas 1, 2, 5 and 6. Expansion occurs both to the north and south of the City, on exception lands and adjoining resource lands. This scenario includes exceptions land in Study Area 5 and lands within Study Areas 1, 2, and 6. The scenario provides for efficient, orderly and economic expansion out from the existing UGB boundaries. The alternative is also constituted by more than half (53%) exception lands.

The alternative’s boundaries were based on the 2004 study boundary, and were adjusted to match the current acreage need. To the south the boundary was defined by the areas north of the adopted Coburg Loop Multi-Modal Path Plan, acreage which also provides access to the exception lands in Study Area 1. To the north the expansion alternative boundary was defined to meet the identified 2004 recommendation as closely as possible. The recommended boundary to the north extends to a point which matches the northern boundaries of two significant properties (Stevenson and Monaco), with the exception of one lot flanked by Stallings and Coburg Roads. It is assumed that an East-West transportation corridor along these property lines may be a future opportunity. The large taxlot which constitutes most of Study Area 6 is divided to include a 70 acre portion of the 150 acre lot. Although Study Area 6 is farm land, it ranked very high on the criteria scoring and is included in both Residential Expansion Alternatives 1 and 2, because of its potential to satisfy many of Coburg’s growth priorities. It is assumed that Inclusion of Study Area 6 in its entirety would be unjustified; therefore the proposed expansion divides the lot. It is noted that the current UGB divides this tax lot further to the south than the 2004 study proposed.

This area is predominately comprised of Class I and II soils, with some Class IV soils. It is noted that most of the Class I soils in Expansion Alternative 1 are within the exceptions land in Study Areas 1 and 5, which are, statutorily, the highest priority for expansion. An additional north-south transportation connector may be needed to better distribute traffic coming from the northern residential development under this alternative.
**Residential Expansion Alternative 3: 150 Acres** (see Map 20).
This Alternative is comprised of portions of Study Areas 1, 2 and 6. Because of the location of the properties, this alternative provides for a very efficient, orderly and economic expansion that provides for sequential development that expands in an orderly way outward from the existing city center to both the north and south of the city center. This alternative, however, is comprised of a larger percentage of resource lands than Residential Expansion Alternative 2. An additional north-south transportation connector may be needed to better distribute traffic coming from the northern residential development under this alternative. The boundaries for Residential Expansion Alternative 2 were defined based on land need and its relationship to tax lot and exception area boundaries.

This area is predominately comprised of Class II soils, with some Class I and Class IV soils. This alternative also has a higher percentage of Class I and II soils on resource lands than Residential Expansion Alternative 1.

**Employment Lands Alternatives**
It is noted that all decision making bodies, as well as the public, were presented with a no “employment expansion” alternative, in addition to the alternatives addressed below. This was due to a finding of the Economic Opportunity Analysis that the Coburg is in a position to make a case for employment expansion or not. Because the “need” is ultimately tied to broader questions of economic priority, the facts directed decision bodies to make a policy decision regarding the matter.

All employment land expansion alternatives show expansion occurring on the east side of I-5 in order to take advantage of the excellent transportation opportunities presented at this location. The Economic Opportunities Analysis (Chapter 5) identified an employment need of 1 or 2 sites of 20 acres or greater. Alternatives were selected to adequately meet this range, while considering possible natural resource constraints on the most ideal properties along Van Duyn.

**Employment Expansion Alternative 1: 65 Acres** (see Map 21). This Alternative depicts expansion of the UGB for employment lands occurring on a portion of Study Area 7, located north of Van Duyn, with the expansion area primarily configured in a north-south orientation. This Alternative is identical to the recommended employment expansion areas from the 2004 Study. The area was selected due to its high scoring in the criteria analysis. This area is comprised of lower capability Class IV soils.

Future development in this area may require improvements to the interchange beyond those planned for in the adopted IAMP. In addition, under the IAMP there would be a need to consolidate all accesses to a point at least 1,320 feet from the north-bound ramp terminal intersection, which would require access through land within the County, necessitating an exception to Goal 3.

**Employment Expansion Alternative 2: 67 Acres** (see Map 22). This Alternative depicts expansion of the UGB for employment lands occurring on a portion of Study Area 7, located north of Van Duyn. This area differs from alternative 2 in that it is primarily configured to provide increased utilization of Van Duyn Street frontage than Alternative 1 provides. Its boundaries are intended to assume approximately the same acreage as Alternative 1 and to accommodate a land needed for “one or two 20-plus acre sites.” This area is predominately comprised of Class IV soils. Future development in this area may require improvements to the interchange beyond those planned for in the adopted IAMP. In addition, under the IAMP there would be a need to
consolidate all accesses to a point at least 1,320 feet from the north-bound ramp terminal intersection.

**Employment Expansion Alternative 3: 65 Acres** (see Map 23). This Alternative depicts expansion of the UGB for employment lands occurring on a significant portion of Study Area 8, located south of Van Duyn. This area is comprised of both Class IV and VI soils. Study Area 8 was the most favorable employment site in the criteria analysis. Its boundaries are defined based on a fairly subjective assumption of land needed for "one or two 20+ acre sites."

Like Alternatives 1 and 2, future development in this area may require improvements to the interchange beyond those planned for in the adopted IAMP. However, unlike Alternative 1 and 2, under the adopted IAMP there are already plans to purchase and develop right-of-way needed to construct an access road from the areas with the Coburg UGB east of I-5 to a point approximately 1320 feet east of the northbound ramp terminals. This frontage road alignment would include lands in Study Area 8.

**Urban Growth Boundary Future – Public Open House**

On November 18, 2009, the City of Coburg and CUS staff hosted a public open house addressing the future of Coburg’s Urban Growth Boundary. Approximately 35 residents attended the open house which included a formal presentation and opportunities for formal and informal questions and feedback. Following is a summary of the open house and its outcomes:

**What was shared?**

During the three hour Open House, participants had the opportunity to browse wall maps, acquire study summaries and materials, ask questions of staff, and experience a Power Point presentation addressing the Study process, a review of critical points for feedback and a summary of the next steps of the project.

Wall maps presented at the Open House included the following:

- **Buildable Lands Inventory Map** (see Map 7 in Chapter 3)
- **Infill and Redevelopment Potential Map** (see Map 4 in Chapter 3)
- **Housing Needs Analysis Process Summary**
- **Overall Study Decision Tree/Process Chart** (Chapter 3)
- **Study Areas Map** (see Map 1 in Chapter 1)
- **All Six Expansion Alternative Maps (Aerial and Soil Maps)** (Maps 18-23)

The presentation given at the Open House was identical to the presentation given to the Planning Commission and City Council at a joint worksession in November, 2009. The Open House presentation summarized the urbanization analyses supporting expansion (BLI, HNA, EOA) up to that point. Staff felt that a primary focus of the Open House was providing the public with a background for how and why expansion happens. The second portion of the presentation presented expansion alternatives and the statutory analysis process which led to them.

**Open House Conclusions:**

It was staff's impression, that the open house provided an ideal environment for citizens to voice concerns, insights and support for the Study’s assumptions and conclusions up to this point. Staff’s presentations garnered a number of insightful and valuable questions from participants. Staff was also able to have a number of valuable one-on-one conversations with participants which supplemented the group questions and discussions that took place. Throughout the open house, participants were encouraged to participate in a dot exercise designed to rate their preferences related to the three identified residential expansion alternatives and the three
employment expansion alternatives. Finally, staff prepared a comment form with specific questions and ample space for any additional written feedback.

Appendix B provides a detailed summary of this feedback (including staff responses). Points which stood out from the discussion and exercises include the following:

- Concern about the impacts that inclusion in the UGB would have on property owner’s taxes, pressures for development, regulation.
- Concern about the state imposing a “one size fits all” framework on Coburg.
- The difference between annexation and being in the UGB
- The relationship of the Study’s findings to future Wastewater.
- Interest in expanding all land uses (not just employment) east of the interstate.
- Property owner concern about expansion boundaries and the resulting consequences to their property
- The possibility of a different and perhaps smaller employment lands alternative.
- Concern about and opposition to industrial employment growth
- Concern about the transportation impacts of various alternatives
- Concern about the location of mixed use development
- Concern about expansion to the south (maintaining the buffer between Coburg and Eugene-Springfield)
- Questions about the impacts of development east of I-5 on the I-5 interchange.

Attendees were presented Maps 18-23, the residential and employment UGB Expansion Alternatives and were asked to evaluate each through a dot exercise. In the exercise participants were given two sets of a green, yellow and red dot. The green dot represented the alternative which seemed most preferable, red represented the least preferable and yellow represented either second best (or second worst). Table 7.8 the results of that exercise. (N represents the number of total dots on the map).

| Table 7.8 Public Open House Alternatives Dot Exercise Results |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|
|                 | Green | Yellow | Red | N  |
| **Residential Alternatives** |     |     |     |    |
| Alternative 1   | 2    | 2    | 15  | 19 |
|                 | 11%  | 11%  | 79% |
| Alternative 2   | 10   | 5    | 1   | 16 |
|                 | 63%  | 31%  | 6%  |
| Alternative 3   | 5    | 5    | 4   | 14 |
|                 | 36%  | 36%  | 29% |
| **Employment Alternatives** |     |     |     |
| Alternative 1   | 6    | 1    | 2   | 9  |
|                 | 67%  | 11%  | 22% |
| Alternative 2   | 4    | 6    |     | 10 |
|                 | 40%  | 60%  | 0%  |
| Alternative 3   | 8    | 2    | 5   | 15 |
|                 | 53%  | 13%  | 33% |

As the table shows, the overall residential preference is Expansion Alternative 2. Residential Expansion Alternative 3 also received support. Residential Expansion Alternative 1 was applied a red dot by 79% of the participants with (least preferable).
The employment expansion alternatives revealed mixed preferences. Employment Expansion Alternative 1 received the most green dots, however Employment Expansion Alternative 2 received only green and yellow dots (no red dots). Employment Expansion Alternative 3 also received a high proportion of green dots. Additionally, other feedback from the event provided important insights that ultimately resulted in a reconfiguration of the alternatives for employment growth all together (represented in the Final Expansion Recommendations). For example significant questions and concerns regarding potential transportation impacts, development costs and site configuration were raised. Specific concerns were expressed by the landowner on whose property all employment expansion alternatives occur. This feedback was critical in the development of the final employment expansion alternative which was presented to the Planning Commission and City Council.

D. Summary and Final Expansion Recommendations

The question of employment growth alternatives was brought before the Coburg City Council in early December of 2009. In a 3-2 vote the Council expressed approval of employment expansion and specifically within staff’s recommended employment expansion alternative (a reconfiguration Employment Expansion Alternative 3). Because Planning Commission had not yet provided a recommendation to the Council, it was decided that Planning Commission feedback would be incorporated into a decision identified at the foregoing months Council meeting.

Planning Commission met in mid December of 2009 and voted 4-1 in opposition of employment expansion citing concerns about the form that industrial uses would take in the proposed location as well as well questions about the need for more industrial uses in Coburg.

In January 2009, the question of preferred expansion alternatives was once again brought before the Coburg City Council. The Council voted 4-1 in support of the employment expansion presented below. It is therefore recommended that expansion of the Coburg UGB be accomplished to include the land within the residential and employment expansion alternatives presented below. The recommended expansion alternatives are depicted in Maps 24 and 25.

Final Expansion Recommendations: City Council Approved

**Final Residential Expansion Recommendation: 169 Acres** (see Map 25).

Determination of a residential expansion recommendation by staff is the result of analysis of statewide planning goals, rules and statutes, public and public official feedback, as well as agency coordination. The Final Residential Expansion Recommendation is a slightly reconfigured version of Residential Expansion Alternative 2. The recommendation is the preferred alternative for both Planning Commission and City Council, is supported by previous planning efforts, and was the more preferred alternative at the Open House. This recommendation includes a justifiable balance of exceptions land and lands that provide for the City’s preference for livability and orderly expansion. Although 169 acres are proposed for inclusion in the UGB, approximately 145 acres of that land is assumed to be “developable.”

The Final Residential Expansion Recommendation is comprised of portions of Study Areas 1, 2, 5 and 6. The alternative provides for a very efficient, orderly and economic expansion that provides for sequential development that expands in an orderly way outward from the existing city center to both the north and south of the city center. The area was modified slightly from its original format by adding land (9.5 acres, tax lot 1603290003600) from Study Area 5 in order to match, without variation, the boundary to the north which matches the northern boundaries of
two significant properties (Stevenson and Monaco). Although the TSP has yet to be updated, this pattern of aligned property boundaries is viewed as having strong potential as a location for a future east-west connector on the north end of town, and thus makes for a good conceptual boundary.

To the south the boundary was defined by the areas north of the adopted Coburg Loop Multi-Modal Path Plan, acreage which also provides access to the exception lands in Study Area 1. The large taxlot which constitutes most of Study Area 6 was reduced slightly from its original configuration (to accommodate the increased acreage from Study Area 5). The reconfigured recommendation includes approximately 60 acres of the overall 150 acre lot. This change is viewed as not having a detrimental impact on the usefulness of the expansion lands within Study Area 6.

The Final Residential Expansion Recommendation is comprised of a larger percentage of resource lands than Residential Expansion Alternative 1, but includes significant acreage of exceptions land. It is noted that an additional north-south transportation connector may be needed to better distribute traffic coming from the northern residential development under this alternative. This alternative is predominately comprised of Class II soils, with some Class I and Class IV soils (noted in Map 19). It is also noted that this alternative also has a higher percentage of Class I and II soils on resource lands than Residential Expansion Alternative 1. It is also noted that this recommendation is consistent with the Hybrid Map developed during the Coburg Crossroads Vision project.

**Final Employment Expansion Recommendation: 106 Acres** (see Map 24). This alternative depicts expansion of the UGB for employment lands occurring on all of Study Area 8. The Final Employment Expansion Recommendation is a reconfigured version of Employment Expansion Alternative 3. The Final Employment Expansion Recommendation was reconfigured to include the remaining southern 40 acres of lot number 1603340000202, increasing the total expansion from 65 to 106 acres. It was determined after consultation with the property owners, that this southern portion of the lot, if separated from Van Duyn, and isolated by development, would be essentially useless to the property owners as agricultural land. Additional acreage was further justified due to the anticipated environmental constraints of the site (potentially limiting the “buildable” acres on the site). This area is comprised of both Class IV and VI soils.

Land south of Van Duyn (Study Area 8) was favored over lands north of Van Duyn (Study Area 7) largely due to the fact that a frontage road is already planned to be constructed to serve sites south and east of the interchange and because the area to the south (Area 8) is already separated from other like uses (Area 7) to the north by Van Duyn. Areas north of Van Duyn do have the benefit of greater separation from existing residential uses east of the interstate, and freeway frontage (exposure), but in the end Study Area 8 seemed better suited to the need overall. It is also noted that the 2004 Study recommended that the City consider Study Areas 7 and 8 for employment growth and to take steps to preserve these areas for future employment growth.

In the final section, the City Council’s preferred residential and employment expansion alternatives (staff’s recommendations) are evaluated against the statutory requirements of ORS 197.298, Goal 14 location factors, and local criteria.
**Factual Basis for the Expansion Recommendations**

Oregon law requires that alterations of a UGB be based on ORS 197.298, seven need and location factors identified by Statewide Planning Goal 14, and local policies addressing expansion. This section of the report describes the factual basis supporting the final UGB employment and residential expansion recommendations.

**ORS 197.298- PRIORITIES FOR INCLUSION**

Referring to the ORS priorities address earlier within this Study, ORS 197.298 states that

“In addition to any requirements established by rule addressing urbanization, land may not be included within an urban area growth boundary except under the following priorities…”

Therefore the recommended expansion alternatives cannot be included within the urban area except under the priorities outlined in ORS 197.298. This section will confirm that initial and final consideration of both expansion alternatives is within consideration of these priorities, as guided by Goal 14 location factors and Coburg’s local expansion criteria.

Following are the points of justification:

- The recommended expansion alternatives do not consist of any first priority Urban Reserve or third priority Marginal Land only because no such lands exist in Coburg’s Planning Area.
- The Final Residential Expansion Alternative contains significant amounts of Exceptions Land (88.5 acres - 52%). Additional Exception acreage was not included due to a local criteria emphasizing compact, sequential and orderly development which promotes interconnections with existing street grid. An alternative which included only Exceptions land (Residential Expansion Alternative 1) was deemed inconsistent with local expansion policies, and several Goal 14 location factors.
- Employment Expansion Alternative 3 does not include any Exceptions Lands because none of the areas identified as suitable for needed employment types contained any exceptions land.
- Both the Employment and Residential Final Expansion Recommendations, like all alternatives, contain Agricultural designated lands. Additionally, these recommended expansion alternatives contain greater proportions of Class 1 through 4 soils than some other alternatives. Selection of these areas (particularly from Study Areas 1, 6 and 8) in spite of their resource characteristics is based on the relatively similar nature of all other alternatives, and more importantly their favorable rankings for other critical characteristics in relation to other alternatives.

**GOAL 14 LOCATION FACTORS:**

**Factor 1:**
*Demonstrated need to accommodate long-range urban population growth requirements consistent with LCDC goals.*

The Goal 14 requirements to demonstrate need to accommodate long-range urban population growth are satisfied through the Study’s summary of the Housing Needs Analysis, Economic Opportunities Analysis and Buildable Lands Inventory.

**Factor 2:**
*Need for housing, employment opportunities, and livability.*
The Goal 14 requirements to demonstrate need to accommodate long-range urban population growth, and a need for housing, employment opportunities, and livability are clearly satisfied through the Study’s summary of the Housing Needs Analysis, Economic Opportunities Analysis and Buildable Lands Inventory.

Factor 3:
Orderly and economic provision for public facilities and service.
A review of the costs of extending services to each of the eleven expansion alternatives identified in the Study concluded that the Final Residential and Employment Expansion Recommendations both include areas that were rated among the least expensive alternatives.

Both Expansion Recommendations provide relatively efficient accommodation of the land required for the development of Coburg’s housing and employment needs, when compared to other alternatives.

Factor 4:
Maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area.
The analysis and discussion presented in this Study are intended to ensure that the Final Residential and Employment Expansion Recommendations maximize the efficiency of land uses both within and on the fringe of the existing urban area. The final recommendations were the result of careful consideration and balancing of priorities ranging from agricultural land preservation, efficient transportation provision, smart growth principals and economic well-being. Staff is comfortable that the area within and surrounding Coburg’s UGB can realize maximum efficiency under the expansion recommendations.

Factor 5:
Environmental, energy, economic and social consequences.
The areas selected and including in the Final Expansion Recommendations were those which showed comparative advantages with respect to the economic, social, environmental and energy consequences as compared to other areas.

Any possible economic concerns of impact to agricultural operations in Study Area 6 seem to be offset by the possibility of lower development costs, and greater opportunity to realizing high livability within the area (as well as the landowners expressed willingness to develop). Because the area would likely become an island of agricultural use surrounded by employment and residential lands, it is better suited to meet expansion needs than areas lacking that surrounding land use dynamic.

The residential expansion recommendation also provides the social benefit of housing developments near shopping and jobs, particularly the affordable housing provisions described in Chapter 4. Much of the expansion area is also very close to Coburg elementary school.

Employment expansion of any kind has considerable potential to have positive economic consequences. Coburg’s locational factors (proximity to I-5, Eugene-Springfield, and local, national and world markets) justify expansion to lands near the I-5 interchange (lands of a highly desired, and rare type). Employment expansion per staff’s recommendation would occur on lands of the lowest soil capability.

Expansion into Study Area 8 was identified as having a negative social consequence. This is due to the expressed aversion of rural residents (east of the interstate near Study Area 8)
to develop of any nature. This is a significant concern, and was weighed by staff, the TAC, Planning Commission and City Council. Ultimately Council regarded the potential economic benefits to the community over the twenty-year time frame as justification for the potential expansion.

It is also noted that the comparative energy consequences for expansion into the Residential and Employment Expansion Recommendations appear to be positive.

**Factor 6:**
*Retention of agricultural land as defined, with Class I being the highest priority for retention and Class VI the lowest priority.*
Coburg is surrounded by soils of relatively high soil capability. It has a significant amount of acreage in Soil Classes I and II (the most productive soil type). The Residential Expansion Recommendation therefore occurs on lands of high value soil (Class I - IV). The majority of expansion is within Class II soils. Class I soils were utilized only if they occurred on Exceptions land (which is predominantly the case in Study Area 5), or the configuration of the soils was such that they couldn’t be avoided, or were not of a substantial size to warrant separate consideration from the area as a whole. Very few areas provided the opportunity for expansion without including Class I soils (Areas 2, 3 and 4). Portions of Area 2 are included in the Residential Expansion Recommendation, however, Areas 3 and 4 ranked very low in other critical categories.

The only areas of Coburg’s urban fringe with low value soils (Class V or higher) is the area east of the interstate. This area was identified in visioning processes (and recently by City Council) as the preferred location for economic growth. The Employment Expansion Recommendation occupies the least valuable soils on Coburg’s fringe (within Study Area 8).

**Factor 7:**
*Compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural activities.*
As noted in Factor 4 (and Factor 6) the final recommendations were the result of careful consideration and balancing of a number of priorities including agricultural land preservation. The analysis of each study provides some discussion of the land uses of adjacent areas. Certain areas were not consider for residential or employment expansion due to their proximity and potential impact on existing agricultural uses. Because Coburg is surrounded by lands in agricultural use, assessing “compatibility” was an exercise in relativity. The proposed expansion recommendations may not be the most compatible with agricultural use. They are however, the most compatible alternatives after accounting for other critical factors.

Additionally, development at City standards and the resultant increase of density within the urban area may be critical to protecting the remaining agricultural resources in Lane County.

**LOCAL CRITERIA**

**Local Criteria 1:**
*Expansion should be limited to areas and tax lots which promote the greatest order and efficiency.*
Local Criteria 1 essentially serves as a reiteration (and emphasis) of Location Factor 3. Staff is satisfied that these criteria were duly addressed and represented in the final recommendations.
Local Criteria 2:  
Expansion should be limited to areas and tax lots that are appropriate to meet city needs.  
Although very similar to Location Factor 2, (need to accommodate long-range urban population growth, and a need for housing, employment opportunities, and livability), Local Criteria 2 is based upon Coburg’s visioning process and expressed expansion policies (as outlined previously in this section). Care and coordination was used in applying these criteria for both the Residential and Employment Expansion Recommendations. In selecting the Residential Expansion Recommendation a balance of the State’s emphasis on Exceptions lands and the City’s desire for housing development of a certain nature (and within a certain timeframe) led to the inclusion of lands within both exception and resource lands.

For employment needs, the expansion took into account that Coburg lacks employment lands of significant acreage to seize regional economic opportunities. These were included as the Employment Expansion Recommendation.

Local Criteria 3:  
Expansion should be limited to areas and tax lots that would promote sequential development that expands in an orderly way outward from the existing city center, and promote a street network that is interconnected in order to promote connectivity and community interaction.

Local Criteria 4:  
Expansion should be limited to areas and tax lots that promote livability

Local Criteria 3 and 4 were critical in tempering the ORS 197.298 priorities requirement that expansion demands be met by Exception lands before other lands (Farm and Forest). Strict adherence to that provision would have resulted in an expansion configuration that would meet none of the principles outlined in Local Criteria 3 and 4. To promote interconnectedness, sequential development, livability and orderly expansion non-exceptions land needed to be included.

Local Criteria 5:  
Expansion should be limited to areas and tax lots that discourage premature development of agricultural lands and compatibility and transition between urban development and agricultural areas

Like many communities, Coburg is surrounded by lands in agricultural use; therefore any significant expansion is going to include agricultural areas. Local Criteria 5 emphasizes the importance of discouraging “prematurely” imposing development on agricultural lands. As with all considerations in this Study “premature” becomes a relative terms. What expansion alternative would result in the least “premature” development of agricultural land. Due to the dynamics of lands adjacent to Study Areas 1 and 6, and considering property owner dynamics of these areas, they were viewed as being among the most favorable in this regard.

The two most preferred employment expansion alternatives were owned by the same landowner (Knee Deep Cattle Co.) Their feedback and direction were critical in deciding the “premature” nature of development on those sites. Area 8 was selected partially to provide an accommodating and compatible environment for the continuation of Knee Deep’s operations to the north (Study Area 7).
Conclusion
In summary, the City faces some difficult decisions regarding where to expand its UGB. ORS 197.298 requires the City to look at Exceptions lands first. There is significant capacity for new housing on exceptions lands, however, there may not be support of existing landowners to be brought into the UGB and the development patterns in the exceptions areas, particularly those in Study areas 2 and 5, present significant service obligations to the City. Moreover, expansion into exceptions areas alone will not meet all of the City’s outlined expansion policies (especially Local Criteria 3 and 4). From an urban form, efficiency, and cost of service perspective, the Final Residential Expansion Recommendation (portions of Study Areas 1, 2, 5 and 6) appears to be the best choice. Study Areas 2 and 5 meet the exceptions requirement; Study Area 6 would round out the UGB and provide opportunities for extending Willamette Street. Unfortunately, Study Area 6 is primarily in Class I and II soils, making it lower priority based on Goal 14 Factor 6. Study Area 1 has many similar attributes as Area 6. Moreover, these are areas that were identified in the visioning process as highest priority.

Study Areas 7 and 8 are the highest rated lands based on the Goal 14 Factor 6 hierarchy. The Final Employment Expansion Recommendation constitutes all of Study Area 8. This area would require the City to expand further across I-5 (there is already some UGB land on eastern side) as well as extending water and sewer services to the areas. The area is prime land for industrial and office employment. Workshops held as part of the Coburg Crossroads visioning process suggest the public is supportive of taking steps to secure these lands for future employment.
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Study Areas
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Map 11: Study Areas & Zoning
Coburg Urbanization Study

Coburg Zoning Districts
- Central Business
- Highway Commercial
- Light Industrial
- Traditional Med Density Residential
- Parks, Recreation, & Open Space
- Residential
- Public Water Service
- Coburg Historic Overlay

Lane County Zoning inside UGB
- C2 - Neighborhood Commercial District
- PR - Public Reserve District

Lane County Zoning outside UGB
- F2 - Impacted Forest
- E30 - Exclusive Farm Use (30 acre minimum)
- E40 - Exclusive Farm Use (40 acre minimum)
- RR1 - Rural Residential (1 acre minimum)
- RR2 - Rural Residential (2 acre minimum)
- RR5 - Rural Residential (5 acre minimum)

Map Legend:
- Coburg City Limits
- Urban Growth Boundary

The information on this map was derived from digital databases on Lane Council of Governments' regional geographic information system. Care was taken in the creation of this map, but it is provided "as is". LCOG cannot accept any responsibility for errors, omissions, or positional accuracy in the digital data or the underlying records. Current designations (e.g., zoning) for specific parcels should be confirmed with the appropriate jurisdictions. There are no warranties, expressed or implied, accompanying this product. However, notification of any errors will be appreciated.
Map 12: Study Areas with Exception & Constrained Lands
Coburg Urbanization Study
Soil Capability Class

I  II  III  IV  V  VI  VII  VIII

Map 13:
Soil Capability Classes
Coburg Urbanization Study
**Existing Coburg Parks**

1. Norma Pfeiffer Park
2. Pavilion Park
3. Wetland Park
4. Moody Park
5. Coburg Estates Park

*Exact park or trail locations will be based on future development patterns and land availability.*

**Coburg Park and Open Space Master Plan**

**Proposed Parks and Open Spaces**

**Legend**

- Existing City Owned Park or Open Space Area
- School District 4J Property
- Urban Growth Boundary
- Existing Trail (soft surface)
- Proposed Mini Park*
- Proposed Neighborhood Park*
- Potential Community Park Locations (one needed)*
- Proposed Linear Park Corridor*
- Proposed Hard Surface Trail*
- Proposed Soft Surface Trail*

**Map 14**
Map 15: Coburg Loop Plan Path Themes
Proposed Sewer Urban Growth Boundary

Map 16: Proposed Sewer Coverage (2007)*
Coburg Urbanization Study

* This is the most recent mapped configuration that staff was able to attain. This generally reflects the proposed configuration of proposed sewer lines, but may differ slightly from more current plans.
Coburg Transportation System Plan
Future Study Areas
(Alignments to be determined)

Map 17

Northern Connector

Legend

\(\wedge\) Streets
\(\wedge\) New Streets
\(\wedge\) City Limits
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Map 18:
Expansion Alternative 1: 178 Acres
Residential: Exceptions Land Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Developable Acres</th>
<th>Exception Acres</th>
<th>Resource Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>152.2</td>
<td>131.5</td>
<td>152.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178.1</td>
<td>151.9</td>
<td>178.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 19:
Expansion Alternative 2: 169 Acres
Residential: 2004 Recommendation Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Developable Acres</th>
<th>Exception Land</th>
<th>Resource Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169.2</td>
<td>153.4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 20:
Expansion Alternative 3: 156 Acres
Residential: Compact Expansion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Exception Land</th>
<th>Resource Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156.2</td>
<td>150.2</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>130.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- **Expansion Alternative 3**
- **Exceptions Land**
- **Study Areas**
- **UGB**
Map 21:
Emp. Expansion Alternative 1: 65 Acres
North of VanDuyn/2004 Recommendation

Employment Need: 1-2 20+ Acre Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Developable Acres</th>
<th>Exception Land</th>
<th>Resource Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 22:
Emp. Expansion Alternative 2: 67 Acres
VanDuyn North/Longer Alternative

Employment Need: 1-2 20+ Acre Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Developable Acres</th>
<th>Exception Land</th>
<th>Resource Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 23:
Emp. Expansion Alternative 3: 65 Acres
VanDuyn South Scenario

Employment Need: 1-2 20+ Acre Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Developable Acres</th>
<th>Exception Land</th>
<th>Resource Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emp. Final Recommendation: 105 Acres
Knee Deep South Scenario

Employment Need: 1-2 20+ Acre Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Developable Acres</th>
<th>Exception Land</th>
<th>Resource Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>105.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>105.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimating for constrained lands

Map 24:
Map 25: Residential Recommendation: 169 Acres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Developable Acres</th>
<th>Exception Land</th>
<th>Resource Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>169.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>143.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>88.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>80.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 26: Mixed Use Redesignation Coburg Urbanization Study
CHAPTER 8. POLICY ANALYSIS

This chapter lists key planning and development issues the City should address during the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance updates.

A core component of the Study Update is to visit the Coburg Comprehensive Plan policies and objectives and determine which elements have been accomplished as well as decide if others remain aligned with the community’s vision. Table 8.1 in Appendix J contains an overview of some of the key Comprehensive Plan Policies addressing urbanization and analyzes the extent to which these policies have already been implemented. As noted, many of the recommendations have been implemented. Key areas that have not been addressed include:

- Establishment of agreements with Lane County to manage the use of land that is intended for future urban development but is yet to be annexed.
- Establishment of agreements with Lane County concerning development in and around Coburg.
- Intergovernmental agreements with Lane County and other jurisdictions to preserve the Coburg Hills as a scenic resource.
- Fostering a business environment and land use system that meet a variety of residents' needs for goods and services, to reduce daily travel to Eugene, while maintaining Coburg’s small town character.
- Development of Urban Reserve Areas.
- Provide a variety of residential housing types;
- Use of a range of tools to meet housing needs, including multiple residential zones, mixed-use zones, sufficient land to meet identified housing needs, appropriate minimum lot sizes, and accessory dwelling units.
- Encourage the location of future medium density development and mixed use along high capacity transportation corridors.
- Promote infill development that includes options such as triplexes on corner lots, mid-block developments (lots fronting a public or private lane), and flag lots. Allow variations in building setbacks and lot dimensions as needed to encourage development of lots that would otherwise be undevelopable, without requiring a variance process.
- Compatible integration of uses through design standards.

For each of the issues, the Planning Commission and City Council considered:

3. Whether the policy or recommendation remains aligned with the Community Vision and should be retained, or

4. Whether the policy should be deleted entirely or replaced with new policies that more accurately reflect current community sentiment.

The Planning Commission and City Council decided to retain the existing policies that have not been implemented, with the exception of those pertaining to the establishment of Urban Reserve Areas. The Planning Commission and City Council were in agreement not to pursue the establishment of Urban Reserves at this time.

In addition to the analysis of the Comprehensive Plan Policies, the City Council and Planning Commission also conducted an evaluation of the status of implementing policy recommendations stemming from the 2004 Study. Table 8.2 in Appendix J examines these
recommendations and notes how they have or have not been implemented. As noted, many of
the recommendations have been implemented. Key areas that have not been addressed
include:

- Development of a Mixed-Use Plan designation,
- Addressing truck traffic in a TSP update,
- Development of a cost estimate of servicing the various UGB expansion study areas
  as part of the public facilities and services plan update, and
- Development of a system of Urban Reserves.

The Planning Commission and City Council reviewed these recommendations and determined
that they still have merit to pursue, with the exception of those addressing the establishment of
Urban Reserve Areas.

Finally, the Planning Commission and City Council both reviewed potential gaps in existing
policies, based on issues that arose during the Study process. There was general agreement to
pursue new policies identified in Table 8.3 in Appendix J. Note: The policies contained in Table
8.3 express general concepts, and agreement on precise language is still needed.