

Chapter 3

Urban Reserve Selection Process

1. URBAN RESERVE RULE (OAR CHAPTER 21, DIVISION 21)

LCDC's Urban Reserve Rule authorizes planning for areas outside urban growth boundaries to be reserved for eventual inclusion in an urban growth boundary and to be protected from patterns of development that would impede urbanization. OAR 660-021-0000.

Cities and counties cooperatively, and the Metropolitan Service District for the Portland Metropolitan area urban growth boundary, may designate urban reserves under the requirements of Division 21, in coordination with special districts listed in OAR 660-021-0050(2) and other affected local governments, including neighboring cities within two miles of the urban growth boundary. OAR 660-021-0020(1).

Urban reserves must include an amount of land estimated to be at least a 10-year supply and no more than a 30-year supply of developable land beyond the 20-year time frame used to establish the urban growth boundary. Local governments designating urban reserves must adopt findings specifying the particular number of years over which designated urban reserves are intended to provide a supply of land. OAR 660-021-0030(1).

The Urban Reserve selection process begins with:

- 1) Establishing a planning period, and
- 2) Forecasting population within the planning period for the planning area

The Greater Bear Creek Valley Regional Plan includes the coordinated establishment of Urban Reserves as one of the optional implementation strategies for meeting the plan's goals. The Plan establishes a 50 year planning period for the projected doubling of the 2007 base urban population. This concept has been termed "NOW X 2". The end year for this planning horizon is 2060. Therefore, given a 2010 adoption date for the Regional Plan, the urban reserve areas designated in the Plan are to provide a 30-year supply of land beyond each city's respective 20-year boundary and consistent with an allocation that will accommodate a doubling of the regional urban population.

2. OAR DIVISION 21 URBAN RESERVE PROCESS OVERVIEW

The Urban Reserve Rule provides a format for the methodology to use to determine which lands to designate as Urban Reserves. To identify suitable lands for urban reserves, the areas surrounding each participant city were analyzed through this multi-step process as summarized below.

2.1 Land Need Determination

As discussed in Chapter 2, the population growth forecasted for the region has been proposed to be allocated by Jackson County to the various participating jurisdictions in order to accommodate a doubling of the Region's urban population (50-year planning horizon). An estimate of the amount of land needed to accommodate generalized housing, employment, and other urban uses for the projected population was derived from analyses of regional housing and employment demand forecasts in relation to the build-out capacity of the existing urban areas (Volume II of the Plan, Appendices VII and VIII). These regional land needs were then allocated to the participant urban areas. This process set the stage for the analysis of selecting individual city urban reserve lands.

2.2 Preliminary Lands Analysis/ Coarse Filter

Next, the land area within the Region was inventoried to identify constraints and opportunities to accommodate future urban needs.¹ Comprehensive mapping of the regional land base assessed natural constraints including slope, flood hazard, wetlands, soil, and other County overlays. Maps of the study area identify existing development patterns, location of public facilities, transportation systems, comprehensive plan designations, and aerial photography. The Phase 1 RLRC composite mapping of agricultural land area and other agricultural land pattern maps were also consulted. The mapping and resulting database allowed for an evaluation of constraints and opportunities based upon the locational factors in Goal 14 (Urbanization). These factors are further described in the context of the individual city Urban Reserve selection processes in Chapter 4 of this Plan.

Coarse Study Areas were selected from the regional land base for each participating city. The Coarse Study Areas are illustrated in Volume III, page 14 of this Plan. These study areas were sized to consider all lands nearby and adjacent to existing respective urban growth boundaries and additional areas where urban reserves may be appropriately extended beyond one-quarter mile of a mile if needed to accommodate identified land needs over the planning horizon. Coarse study areas generally included lands within one-mile of existing growth boundaries, except where otherwise explained in the city-specific studies (e.g., where severe development or natural constraints were obvious). Lands that clearly were not supported by Goal 14 factors were then eliminated from further consideration. Subareas that were likely to comport with Goal 14 location factors in a manner responsive to the requirements of the Urban Reserve Rule were then passed through for further study.

2.3 Suitable Lands Analysis/ Fine Filter

The Subareas passed through the Coarse Filter for further study were then further evaluated in relation to the Goal 14 location factors for the purpose of creating an inventory of suitable lands to be prioritized for urban reserve inclusion. This process is illustrated in Volume III,

¹ Statewide Planning Goal 14 (Urbanization) includes the following Guidelines for Planning:

1. Plans should designate sufficient amounts of urbanizable land to accommodate the need for further urban expansion, taking into account (1) the growth policy of the area; (2) the needs of the forecast population; (3) the carrying capacity of the planning area; and (4) open space and recreational needs.
2. The size of the parcels of urbanizable land that are converted to urban land should be of adequate dimension so as to maximize the utility of the land resource and enable the logical and efficient extension of services to such parcels.
3. Plans providing for the transition from rural to urban land use should take into consideration as to a major determinant the carrying capacity of the air, land and water resources of the planning area. The land conservation and development actions provided for by such plans should not exceed the carrying capacity of such resources.
4. Comprehensive plans and implementing measures for land inside urban growth boundaries should encourage the efficient use of land and the development of livable communities."

page 15 of this Plan. These were the “candidate lands” to be considered for possible inclusion as “Future Growth Areas” (a precursor to their being identified as potential Urban Reserves). The RPS process generated recommendations and decisions from the Resource Lands Review Committee (RLRC), the project Citizens Involvement Committee (pCIC), the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the Policy Committee, and participating jurisdictions and agencies relating to Goal 14 which directed the selection of lands for the suitable lands inventory.

2.4 Prioritization of Suitable Lands

The lands which passed through the fine filter of the suitable lands analysis were prioritized for inclusion as urban reserves pursuant to OAR 660-0021-0030(3). The process is explained in detail in Section 3.3 of this chapter and the resulting lands are shown in Volume III, page 16 of this Plan. Lands were then selected for inclusion in an urban reserve in order of priority until sufficient lands were found to meet the calculated land needs by city.

3. GOAL 14 FACTORS

The Urban Reserve Rule requires that determinations of which lands are to be included in an urban reserve be based on the locational factors of Statewide Planning Goal 14- Urbanization. The section reads as follows:

660-021-0030 Determination of Urban Reserve

- (2) *Inclusion of land within an urban reserve shall be based upon the locational factors of Goal 14 and a demonstration that there are no reasonable alternatives that will require less, or have less effect upon, resource land. Cities and counties cooperatively, and the Metropolitan Service District for the Portland Metropolitan Area Urban Growth Boundary, shall first study lands adjacent to, or nearby, the urban growth boundary for suitability for inclusion within urban reserves, as measured by the factors and criteria set forth in this section. Local governments shall then designate, for inclusion within urban reserves, that suitable land which satisfies the priorities in section (3) of this rule.*

Goal 14 (Urbanization) establishes four locational factors that are the basis for establishment and change of urban growth boundaries and are referred to by the Urban Reserve Rule section above for also establishing suitability of lands for urban reserves. These factors are:

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

In applying these factors to the Greater Bear Creek Valley, the RPS process further examined and defined how they would relate to the region. For factors (1) and (2), the participants developed a set of questions which guided them in evaluating these factors in the areas under consideration. For the factors listed in subsection (3) above, the participants looked at comparative advantages. In applying factor (4) they relied on feedback from two citizen committees to guide land selection.

(1)&(2) Efficient Accommodation of Identified Land Need / Orderly and economic provision of public facilities and services

A primary purpose for designating urban reserves is to protect land that has been identified as suitable to accommodate future urban needs from patterns of development that would impede urbanization. Considerations under Factors (1) and (2) included:

- Would inclusion of the area contribute to a functional urban form?
- To what degree would the urban reserve area be better suited than other alternatives to provide land for the city's identified housing or employment needs?
- Would inclusion of the area reduce dependence on state highways for intra-city travel?
- Would inclusion of the area fit within future regional transportation connectivity?
- Could infrastructure be reasonably extended to serve the area if included?

(3) Comparative Economic/Social/Energy/Environmental Consequences (ESEE)

The comparative ESEE consequences for each study area were considered as follows:

- General **economic** factors considered during this process include comparative economic consequences (benefits or hindrance) resulting from urbanization to provide future additional residential, employment, or institutional land. A Regional Economic Opportunities Analysis (Volume III, Appendix VII) supplemented participating jurisdictions' locally adopted Economic Elements and strategic plans. Chapter 2 of this Plan examined the available economic data from the Regional EOA and adopted local plans. Considerations of economic consequences and compelling urban needs were required by the RPS process where the RLRC identified commercial agricultural land base within an area proposed for urban reserve inclusion for the area to remain as a proposed Urban Reserve Area. Chapter 4 provides specific details on the city specific proposed Urban Reserves.
- **Social** consequences may arise from a wide range of variables. For example, long established neighborhoods may have developed a strong cultural or historic identity that may affect the actual suitability of an area for future inclusion into an urban area. Some areas may significantly contribute to the sense of larger community identity and function most appropriately as a transition area between urban level development and a commercial agriculture resource base. This is not to say that a general aversion to urbanization would constitute a legitimate reason to consider an area unsuitable, but that these are considerations that must be balanced on the whole within the Goal 14 factors.

An important social question considered during this process, was to what degree would the proposed urban reserve area maintain or enhance the city's individual identity? The pCIC, as part of its role, was charged early in the process with identifying areas that should be left as rural buffers or otherwise retained for cultural, historic, or other social considerations. See, the pCIC Phase 1 Report (Volume 2, Appendix IV). Additionally, City specific considerations are included in the related subsections of this chapter.

- **Energy** considerations relate to comparing alternative boundary locations for efficiency of access and proximity to urban centers. Also, for dense urban development of employment sites, efficiencies are realized through the ease in which existing infrastructure can support new development and/or new infrastructure can be extended. Expected intensity of use can also be an important factor. More dense and intensive uses tend to reduce long-term energy consumption by clustering uses together, which makes shopping and employment trips more efficient. In some cases, separation of incompatible uses, such as freight-oriented industry from regional retail attractors, would actually improve mobility and reduce fuel consumption. The energy consequences are to be balanced with the other ESEE consequences which in turn are to be balanced with the remaining Goal 14 location factors.

- **Environmental** considerations identified during this process include potential impacts on streams, slopes, wetlands, airshed, and soil. A site that contains a stream, wetlands or steep slopes, has a higher likelihood of negative environmental impact than a candidate site that does not contain these features. Some cities may choose to include areas with these environmental features with built-in protections of such features, while others prefer to avoid them altogether. The following environmental factors were considered in the regional inventory and developable lands evaluation:
 - a) Floodplain and Floodway: FEMA 2009 Floodplain and Floodway data are mapped and included within the Atlas. Areas generally dominated by floodplain were excluded from suitability due to the potential impacts on the future development within the floodplain corridor and potential impacts on the floodplain itself. From a development potential standpoint, only lands mapped as floodway (and not floodplain) were removed from development potential calculations.
 - b) Vernal Pools: Oregon Division of State Lands (DSL) and Jackson County rely upon Nature Conservancy mapping of Vernal Pools as a guideline for identifying lands impacted by vernal pools which provide habitat to an ESA listed species (commonly known as vernal pool fairy shrimp). For the purposes of determining suitability of land for inclusion as Urban Reserve and for calculating potential buildable area, the Vernal Pool Categories established by the Nature Conservancy mapping were selected, illustrated, calculated and evaluated for each study area.
 - c) Rivers, Streams & Wetlands: County digital GIS layers derived from DSL National Wetlands Inventory mapping was used to identify wetlands. Areas completely encumbered by wetlands were identified as unsuitable. For development considerations, the entire polygon areas for wetlands were removed from development calculations. A 10-foot buffer was created around each linear wetland. That buffer area was subtracted from all buildable areas.
 - d) Slopes: A region-wide slopes map is provided in the Atlas. A threshold of 23 percent slope was used to distinguish between unsuitable and suitable lands. Lands completely comprised of slopes with 23%² or greater were removed as too steep and unsuitable. As with calculations for other environmental factors, where parcels or study areas are only partially encumbered by steep slopes, the actual acres of steep slopes within those areas was considered to be a natural constraint on potential yield. Overlaps were unioned for purposes of determining developable area yields to prevent any double-counting.
 - e) Mass Wasting potential (Landslides and Debris Flow Potential): Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) mapping entitled *Identified Landslides and Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) Debris Flow Potential* was used to identify areas potentially subject to mass wasting. A few areas have had landslides or have a medium to high potential for debris flow- see Map 8, '*Natural Constraints, Steep Slopes, Landslides and Debris Flow Potential*' in Atlas.
 - f) Acknowledged Scenic Resources: County adopted scenic resources are identified in the Atlas and the same are part of Jackson County's acknowledged comprehensive plan.
 - g) pCIC Scenic/Open Space Report: Lands identified by Project Citizen Involvement Committee as regionally significant open space are were evaluated in balance with all Goal 14 boundary location factors.

² This contour information constituted the best readily available data set for the purposes of a region-wide GIS analysis.

(4) Compatibility with nearby agricultural and forest activities³.

The RLRC and pCIC examined the study area for agricultural land base impacts using a two tiered method. Under the first tier, the RLRC examined the inventory of farmlands within the region and used a model to identify critical farmlands. The model used a variety of factors including soil depth and capability, microclimate, existing practices, and proximity to external impacts. The result of the model is a map, titled "*Preferred Resource Lands Map*". The second tier measurement of impacts was to evaluate areas proposed for consideration in Urban Reserves at an area by area level.

Similar to the *Preferred Resource Lands Map*, an Agricultural Lands Composite Analysis Map was developed to show the locations of the valley's best farm land from a soils perspective in relation to existing development patterns which were established long before the Statewide Planning Goals were enacted or before Jackson County had adopted countywide planning and zoning controls. One key situation identified through examination of the composite map and the Preferred Resource Lands Map revolved around the existence of substantially developed exception areas that already exist in and around some of the valley's highest capability farmland. In general, the farm land west of Central Point, Medford, Phoenix, and Talent is located within the region's highest capability soils. These tracts of agricultural land are positioned between the cities along the Bear Creek corridor and the exception land areas that flank the West Valley slope. There are also some "islands" of residential exception areas interspersed throughout the farm areas which were developed prior to statewide planning. Based on recommendations by the pCIC and RLRC, each of the participating jurisdictions agreed that further urbanizing the interspersed exception lands in those areas or expanding municipal growth to the West Valley foothills (along the geographic path of exception areas) would have severe negative consequences for farmland in the interior valley.

4. APPLYING THE DIVISION 21 PROCESS TO THE REGIONAL PLAN

To develop the regional plan, the Division 21 process was applied to the Greater Bear Creek Valley planning area. This process is summarized below. The results of the Division 21 process were then compared with the results of the process followed by the Greater Bear Creek Valley RPS participants to identify lands suitable to be designated as Urban Reserves and to confirm that the selections made through the RPS process were consistent with the Division 21 results. The differences in approach are summarized in Section 5 of this chapter.

4.1 Land Need Determination

Identifying the planning horizon and population growth forecast established the foundation for the Division 21 process. The projected population was then allocated to each city to determine housing land needs. Two estimates were generated for each city using a lower density (number of units per acre) number which resulted in a higher land need and using a higher density number which resulted in a lower land need. Estimates were also developed to determine the number of jobs (employment) that would be needed to support the increased population and projections made as to the amount of employment land required to accommodate the employment needs. This estimate was then allocated to each city.

³ The analysis of agricultural compatibility included Goal 14 analysis of impacts on nearby lands as well as consumption and effect on resource lands and all analysis in the individual cities regarding impacts to resource land shall be construed to address both impacts on lands not designated as Urban Reserve and the degree to which alternatives would use or more or have more effect on resource land.

Estimates of each city's suitable land needs by type, as established in Chapter 2, are tabulated and reported in Figure 3.1 below⁴:

Figure 3.1

SUMMARY OF URA LAND DEMAND by JURISDICTION AND LAND USE TYPE						
Need by Land Type (acres)						
Jurisdiction	Residential		Parks	Employment	Total	
	Higher	Lower			Higher	Lower
Central Point	1,038	858	163	521	1,722	1,542
Eagle Point	751	621	151	522	1,424	1,294
Medford	2,650	2,189	630	1,354	4,633	4,172
Phoenix	374	309	72	369	815	750
Talent	239	198	9	87	335	294
Ashland	-	-			-	-
TOTALS	5,051	4,174	1,025	2,854	8,930	8,053

4.2 Preliminary Land Analysis / Coarse Filter

4.2.1 Study Area Selection

Identification of suitable lands for urban reserves begins with the selection of an appropriate study area. The study area must be adequately sized to be responsive to the amount and types of land found to be needed while remaining consistent with Goal 14 and individual City Growth Plans. Study areas for each City were selected consistent with and under the provisions of OAR 660-021-0030(2) and Goal 14 based on four primary components: (1) Land Type and Amount Needed; (2) Goal 14 Location Factors; (3) Area Growth Plans; and (4) Acknowledged Comprehensive Plan Designations. The extent of the study area was established in consideration of OAR 660-21-0030(3), which states in pertinent part:

“(3) Land found suitable for an urban reserve may be included within an urban reserve only according to the following priorities:

*(a) First priority goes to land **adjacent to, or nearby**, an urban growth boundary and identified in an acknowledged comprehensive plan as an exception area or nonresource land.” (emphasis added)*

OAR 660-21-0010 defines the following terms for the purposes of the rule:

“(6) "Adjacent Land": Abutting land.

(7) "Nearby Land": Land that lies wholly or partially within a quarter mile of an urban growth boundary. “

A thorough and adequate land inventory is both a prerequisite and response to each of the steps set forth in the Urban Reserve Rule. In order to sufficiently and accurately conduct the Urban Reserve selection process as a whole, an inventory of lands for each study area was created and evaluated. The inventory maps are included in the Regional Plan Atlas (Volume III of this Plan).

⁴ The City of Ashland is not included as it elected not to include additional lands over the planning period.

The rule requires inventory of lands that are adjacent to (abut) or nearby (partially or wholly within a ¼ mile) an urban growth boundary. The rule provides no strict outer constraint to the study area. Thus, in situations where the supply of suitable land within one-quarter mile of an urban growth boundary is insufficient to accommodate the identified urban need, it may be necessary that urban reserves extend further than one-quarter mile so as not to conflict with the requirement in OAR 660-021-0030(1). OAR 660-021-0030(1) requires that urban reserves contain an amount of land sufficient to meet the urban land need over a defined planning period.

To assure that an adequately sized inventory of suitable lands would be available from which to designate urban reserves in a manner responsive in quantity and in composition to the requirements of the rule, an initial study area was created for each city that generally considered the urban suitability potential of lands within one mile of an urban growth boundary. The table in Figure 3.2 shows the total acreage studied for potential urban reserve areas under the Coarse Study in relation to the identified need stated in Figure 3.1.

Figure 3.2

COARSE STUDY AREAS BY JURISDICTION						
Jurisdiction	Estimated Need		Coarse Study Areas			
	Low Density	High Density	Lots	Acres	Percent of Need	
					Low Density	High Density
Central Point	1,722	1,542	1,037	4,800	279%	311%
Eagle Point	1,424	1,294	609	6,900	484%	533%
Medford	4,633	4,172	2,103	18,000	388%	431%
Phoenix	815	750	777	3,720	456%	496%
Talent	335	294	419	3,300	984%	1123%
Totals	8,930	8,053	4,945	36,720	411%	456%

4.2.2 Coarse Filter/ Goal 14 Location Factors

To begin differentiating between suitable and non-suitable lands for urban reserves, the study lands were first evaluated using a broad application of the Goal 14 locational factors as described in Section 2.

These Goal 14 locational factors combined with the growth policies of the related city were used to examine the coarse study areas for basic suitability of the lands for inclusion as urban reserve. Lands that clearly did not meet these factors were eliminated from the suitable lands inventory that proceeded to the Fine Filter phase. The Coarse Filter provided the basis for eliminating areas that clearly did not support the locational factors and for retaining any areas that are beyond ¼ mile from the UGB for further study.

With few exceptions set forth for each City, lands within one-quarter mile were automatically passed through to the Fine Filter as they were presumed more likely to provide an efficient transition from rural to urban use. Lands further away from existing urban growth boundaries were seen as more likely to encroach upon contiguous blocks of agricultural land and be more disruptive to the overall pattern of agricultural uses and practices. Where consideration of Goal 14 factors indicated an area was obviously unsuitable, the area was dropped from further consideration. Areas beyond the quarter-

mile that could be suitable in consideration of the Goal 14 factors and that could provide a reasonable alternative to minimize the use or effect on resource lands were passed through to the Fine Filter.

Figure 3.3

SUMMARY of COARSE STUDY AREA ANALYSIS			
Jurisdiction	Gross Acres Studied	Eliminated through Coarse Filter	Study Acres Remaining
Central Point	4,800	2,136	2,664
Eagle Point	6,900	4,741	2,159
Medford	18,000	11,003	6,997
Phoenix	3,720	1,848	1,872
Talent	3,300	1,497	1,803
Totals	36,720	21,225	15,495

** Note: Medford numbers exclude Prescott Park and Chrissy Park*

The initial coarse study area resulted in 36,720 acres of raw land from which a potential pool of suitable lots were derived (illustrated in Figure 3.3). 21,225 acres were eliminated through the Coarse Filter, leaving a fine study area with 15,495 raw acres. This amount was still approximately 6,565-7,442 acres greater than the identified demand specified in Figure 3.1.

4.3 Suitable Lands / Fine Filter

The lands remaining after the Coarse Filter was applied were then further evaluated to determine the number of acres yielded to meet the identified needs and then put through a “Fine Filter” process in relation to Goal 14’s location factors and alternatives to resource land impacts.

4.3.1 Suitable Lands

The Urban Reserve Rule recognizes that not all suitable land examined for inclusion is completely unencumbered by existing development and other physical and/or natural constraints. First, the study area lands were reviewed for the ability to support additional development. The rule contemplates the potential inclusion of exception lands that may currently be completely built-out, with little opportunity for redevelopment. Under this premise, higher priority lands may be substantially developed, but provide limited potential for redevelopment. Therefore, a block of suitable exception land may total 20 acres but has development potential for 10 acres. As such, the entire 20 acres may be included as Urban Reserve, but yield the equivalent of only 10 acres toward developable land supply. Consequently, the amount of raw land needed may exceed the amount of estimated developable suitable land need. Oregon Administrative Rule OAR 660-21-0030(10) defines developable land as:

(5) "Developable Land": Land that is not severely constrained by natural hazards, nor designated or zoned to protect natural resources, and that is either entirely vacant or has a portion of its area unoccupied by structures or roads.

This definition assumes all ‘portions’ of lots not occupied by structures or roads, or natural hazards can potentially accommodate urban development. Figure 3.4 quantifies the constraints on the land remaining from the Coarse Filter. Additionally, an estimate of the

proportion of raw land that may be reasonably developed⁵ based on GIS analysis of physical or natural constraints, is also included in the table. By city, the study also provides potential areas from which to assemble an adequate amount of raw and reasonably developable land into a suitable lands inventory. Lands within the study areas were next reviewed in more detail for development potential.

4.3.2 Fine Filter/ Goal 14 Location Factors

The remaining suitable lands were then reviewed through a Fine Filter to determine which lands should be included as suitable lands for urban reserve consideration. All lands which were identified as suitable and reasonably developable are the lands that constitute the lands proposed as Urban Reserve Areas. These lands total approximately 7,540 acres as shown in Figure 3.4. These lands were then sorted by priority.

Figure 3.4

OVERVIEW SUMMARY of FINE STUDY AREA									
Jurisdiction	Gross Acres Studied	Constraints		Land Type			Suitability		
		Constrained	Generally Unconstrained	Exception Land	Aggregate	Resource	Unsuitable	Suitable	Suitable & Reasonably Developable
Central Point	2,664	399	2,264	1,080	54	1,529	942	1,721	1,430
Eagle Point	2,159	287	1,873	320	131	1,708	896	1,263	1,154
Medford	6,997	586	6,411	1,086	0	5,911	2,587	4,410	4,123
Phoenix	1,872	363	1,509	453	0	1,419	1,027	845	571
Talent	1,803	444	1,359	179	0	1,657	1,508	296	263
Totals	15,495	2,079	13,416	3,119	185	12,224	6,960	8,536	7,540

** Note: Medford numbers exclude Prescott Park and Chrissy Park*

4.4 Prioritization of Suitable Lands

Inclusion of the land in an urban reserve must be justified either according to the established priorities at OAR 660-021-0030(3) or it must be demonstrated that the land is appropriate for inclusion under the “internal exception” found at OAR 660-021-0030(4). Therefore, lands inventoried as suitable for urban needs were then prioritized in accordance with OAR 660-021-0030(3) of the Urban Reserve Rule, which provides:

- (3) Land found suitable for an urban reserve may be included within an urban reserve only according to the following priorities:
 - (a) First priority goes to land adjacent to, or nearby, an urban growth boundary and identified in an acknowledged comprehensive plan as an exception area or nonresource land. First priority may include resource land that is completely surrounded by exception areas unless these are high value crop areas as defined in Goal 8 or prime or unique agricultural lands as defined by the United States Department of Agriculture;
 - (b) If land of higher priority is inadequate to accommodate the amount of land estimated in section (1) of this rule, second priority goes to land designated as marginal land pursuant to former ORS 197.247 (1991 edition);
 - (c) If land of higher priority is inadequate to accommodate the amount of land estimated in section (1) of this rule, third priority goes to land designated in an acknowledged comprehensive plan for agriculture or forestry, or both. Higher priority shall be given to

⁵ The term “reasonably developable” as used in this step is not a determination of suitability for urban reserves. Lands selected for further study are evaluated in more detail to determine suitability for urban reserves.

land of lower capability as measured by the capability classification system or by cubic foot site class, whichever is appropriate for the current use.

- (4) Land of lower priority under section (3) of this rule may be included if land of higher priority is found to be inadequate to accommodate the amount of land estimated in section (1) of this rule for one or more of the following reasons:
- (a) Future urban services could not reasonably be provided to the higher priority area due to topographical or other physical constraints; or
 - (b) Maximum efficiency of land uses within a proposed urban reserve requires inclusion of lower priority lands in order to include or to provide services to higher priority lands.

4.4.1 Priority (a)- Exception and Non-Resource Land

First priority was given to suitable Exception and Non-Resource lands consistent with OAR 660-21-0030(3)(a). The Jackson County Comprehensive Plan identifies exception and non-resource lands, which include all those lands designated for Commercial, Industrial, Limited Use, Rural Residential, Urban Residential, and Aggregate Removal (OAR 660-004-005(3)).⁶ Aggregate Removal lands are included in suitable lands inventories where sites are scheduled to be depleted and reclaimed within the 50 year Regional Plan horizon. These sites are anticipated to be reclaimed for industrial land use. Cities will be required to apply Goal 5 at the time of urban growth boundary expansion pursuant to OAR 660-024-0020(1)(c). No resource lands were found to qualify as first priority under subsection 3(a). Accordingly, first priority lands in the inventory include only exception and non-resource lands.

For the purposes of this study, all Exception and Non-Resource lands within the suitable lands inventory are assigned Priority (a), but are distinguished as follows:

Priority	Description
(a)1	Exception or Non-Resource land that is adjacent to or nearby an Urban Growth Boundary or is otherwise contiguous with other Exception or Non-Resource land that is adjacent to or nearby an Urban Growth Boundary.
(a)2	Exception or Non-Resource land within the Study Area that is neither adjacent to or nearby an Urban Growth Boundary nor contiguous with other Exception land or Non-Resource that is adjacent to or nearby an Urban Growth Boundary.

4.4.2 Priority (b) - Marginal Land

OAR 660-21-0030(3)(b) states that if the amount of first priority lands are inadequate to accommodate the amount of land needed, second priority goes to Marginal Lands – Priority (b), pursuant to former ORS 197.247 (Oregon Revised Statutes, 1991 edition). Jackson County is not a Marginal Lands county pursuant to ORS 197.247, nor has it ever designated “Marginal Lands” within the county in accordance with that statute. Therefore Second Priority Lands are not available in Jackson County to accommodate land needs.

⁶ OAR Chapter 660, Division 4, is the LCDC “Interpretation of Goal 2 Exceptions Process” rule. Section 0005 of the rule defines the terms “Exception” and “Nonresource Land”, which are relevant to the requirements of the urban reserve rule inquiry. “Nonresource Land” is land not subject to the statewide Goals listed in OAR 660-004-0010(1)(a) through (g) except subsections (c) and (d). Aggregate Removal Land is not subject to OAR 660-004-0010(1). Rather, the designation falls under OAR 660-004-0010(2)(a) – Goal 5 Natural Resources.

4.4.3 Priority (c) - Resource Land

OAR 660-21-0030(3)c) states that if first and second priority lands are inadequate to accommodate the amount of land need, then third priority goes to agricultural or forestry (resource) lands- Priority (c). Jackson County's acknowledged Comprehensive Plan identifies Agricultural Land and Forest/Open Space Land, hereafter referred to collectively as 'Resource Land'. Except for a few small inclusions of Forestry / Open Space Land dispersed throughout the study area, all of the resource lands reviewed are designated Agricultural Lands. Resource lands are further ranked by resource capability within the Priority 3 category, based on soil capability classification. Consistent with OAR 660-21-0030(3c), the NRCS agricultural capability classification system is used.⁷

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Description</u>
(c)1	Lands predominantly Class VI and worse receive a classification indicating the highest resource priority for consideration as urban reserve.
(c)2	Lands predominantly Class III and IV soils receive a classification indicating the middle resource priority for consideration as reserve.
(c)3	Lands predominantly Class I and II soils receive a classification indicating the lowest priority for consideration (highest soil agricultural capability).

4.4.4 Elevation of Lower Priority Lands

Designation of urban reserves is to occur by order of priority until the estimated land need is satisfied. However situations exist where lower priority lands are more appropriate for inclusion than higher priority lands. To accommodate these occasions, the rule provides:

- (4) *Land of lower priority under section (3) of this rule may be included if land of higher priority is found to be inadequate to accommodate the amount of land estimated in section (1) of this rule for one or more of the following reasons:*
- (a) *Future urban services could not reasonably be provided to the higher priority area due to topographical or other physical constraints; or*
 - (b) *Maximum efficiency of land uses within a proposed urban reserve area requires inclusion of lower priority lands in order to include or to provide services to higher priority lands.*

This is sometimes referenced as an "internal exceptions process" because it is built into the rule itself and provides a method to flex the rule without need to take an exception pursuant to Goal 2. In addition, flexibility is also permitted to accept or reject designations based upon additional regional criteria. While neither option have been exercised within the Regional Plan at this time, there may be situations that develop where use of these options would be appropriate. Urban Reserves established in this Plan are part of a broader Regional Problem Solving process. The RPS statute may provide flexibility to any step in the process as an alternative means and justification for study area alterations and/or justification of particular lands. Where this is the basis for particular justifications or as an alternative justification, the plan and/or the compendium legal findings attached to the Regional Plan adoption will provide the requisite analysis pursuant to that statute and the RPS process.

⁷ Pursuant to OAR 66-21-0030(3a), "...First priority may include resource land that is completely surrounded by exception areas unless these are high value crop areas as defined in Goal 8 or prime or unique agricultural lands as defined by the United States Department of Agriculture."

4.5 Summary of Suitable Lands

Figure 3.5 below summarizes the gross acreage of suitable and reasonably developable land categorized by jurisdiction and priorities outlined and described above.

Figure 3.5

SUITABLE LANDS BY PRIORITY AND JURISDICTION								
Jurisdiction	Priority	Lots	Gross Acres	Built Acres	Naturally Constrained	Reasonably Developable	Percent of Total ¹	
Central Point	(a)1	322	535	97	59	380	31%	
	(a)2	85	382	17	56	309	22%	
	(c)1	1	23	0	4	19	1%	
	(c)2	49	481	9	39	433	28%	
	(c)3	28	300	6	5	290	17%	
Subtotal		485	1,721	129	163	1,430	100%	
Eagle Point	(a)1	26	257	4	4	248	20%	
	(c)2	67	1,006	17	85	905	80%	
	Subtotal		93	1,263	21	89	1,154	100%
Medford	(a)1	203	610	69	12	529	14%	
	(a)2	11	34	10	1	24	1%	
	(c)1	3	50	0	1	49	1%	
	(c)2	159	3,576	22	169	3,386	81%	
	(c)3	19	139	3	2	134	3%	
	Subtotal		395	4,410	105	183	4,123	100%
	Park		7	1,877	0	0	1,877	30%
Subtotal		402	6,287	105	183	6,000	100%	
Phoenix	(a)1	212	308	251	3	55	36%	
	(c)2	10	434	1	14	419	51%	
	(c)3	7	103	1	5	98	12%	
	Subtotal		229	845	253	22	571	100%
Talent	(a)1	41	83	12	5	68	28%	
	(c)1	1	19	0	1	18	6%	
	(c)2	8	87	1	10	76	30%	
	(c)3	13	107	2	3	102	36%	
Subtotal		63	296	14	20	263	100%	
Totals	(a)1	804	1,793	433	83	1,280	21%	
	(a)2	96	417	27	57	333	5%	
	(c)1	5	92	0	5	86	1%	
	(c)2	293	5,585	50	317	5,218	65%	
	(c)3	67	650	11	15	623	8%	
TOTALS		1,265	8,536	522	477	7,540	100%	

The gross acreage shown in Figure 3.5 does not include the area within anticipated future roadways. Altogether, the total amount of land proposed for Urban Reserve Areas, including all land for housing, employment, parks, institutional land, and rights-of-way (for future roadways) equates to approximately 10,770 acres. For comparison, the area currently contained in existing City Limits of the participating cities is approximately 26,550 acres and the area within existing Urban Growth Boundaries is approximately 3,300 acres. Therefore, as proposed, a doubling of the urban population anticipated by the Regional Plan will take place in approximately 14,000 acres (existing UGB area + proposed URA area). This means that the doubling of the urban population would occur much more efficiently than it has to date—in an area approximately 53% smaller than what is in the existing City Limits.

Additionally, of the approximately 10,770 total acres proposed in the Urban Reserve Areas, approximately 7,540 is considered reasonably developable as shown in Figure 3.5. Thus, as compared to the total demand illustrates in Figure 3.1, the amount of reasonably developable land being proposed as Urban Reserve Areas is between 513-1,390 acres shy of completely meeting estimated demand. Individual City demand/supply comparisons are discussed in the individual City subchapters of Chapter 4 of this Plan.

5. COMPARISON OF GREATER BEAR CREEK VALLEY RPS PROCESS WITH DIVISION 21 PROCESS

Designation of urban reserves for the Greater Bear Creek Valley Regional Plan was a principal outcome of this regional problem solving process as discussed in Chapter 1 of this Plan. This process reached an outcome consistent with LCDRC's Urban Reserve Rule (OAR Chapter 660, Division 21), even though the approach taken through the collaborative effort varied as to the sequencing of steps. Coordination of urban reserves among the many jurisdictions, agencies, and stakeholders to complete this effort as part of an even larger Regional Plan was structured to enable flexibility in revisiting issues over and over as needed to arrive at a consensus on long term urbanization needs.

5.1 Greater Bear Creek Valley RPS Urban Reserve Selection Process

The Greater Bear Creek Valley RPS Urban Reserve selection process contained three phases, summarized as follows:

Phase 1: Suitability Analysis

The majority of Phase 1 was designed to center on the city-led process of identifying candidate lands for future growth. While it was the responsibility of each individual city to identify lands for growth, the process was guided in large part by regional input including: important farmland (a work product of the RLRC), recommended community buffers (a work product of the pCIC), and on potentially important constraints related to specific candidate growth areas (state agencies, Technical Committee). The second major focus of Phase 1 was the Policy Committee's analysis of all proposed growth areas with the aid of criteria ("Initial Criteria" or "Coarse Filter") designed to identify fatal flaws in individual growth areas. Growth areas that did not have fatal flaws associated with them were deemed eligible for consideration during Phase 2. To assist the decision-makers in the deliberative process, recommendations by state agencies, project committees, Jackson County, and stakeholders were made available based on each city's final list of selected candidate lands. The most important major product of Phase 1 was the final pool of candidate lands, from which a subset of urban reserve areas would be selected in Phase 2.

Phase 2: Needs-Based Analysis

The focus of Phase 2 was the Policy Committee’s second stage of the deliberative process, which employed a set of criteria (“Refinement Criteria” or “Fine Filter”) designed to assist decision-makers in selecting urban reserve areas (“Tier 1”) from the pool of candidate lands identified in Phase 1. Candidate areas not identified for urban reserve status (“Tier 2”) were removed from consideration and future status as an urban reserve. Because the final selection process was to be needs-based, the most crucial inputs needed to assist the Policy Committee’s deliberations were those issues impacting overall calculations of acreage, especially issues of density and the desired mix of land uses; the potential sub-regional allocations of future population based on the geographic availability of potential growth areas and each community’s individual definition of livability; and the regional and sub-regional distribution of land uses. Although cities had the opportunity to adjust their lists of candidate lands almost at any time during the course of the project, specific opportunity to do so was built in to Phase 3 at a point at which it was possible to judge the relative strengths and weaknesses of individual candidate growth areas, especially how they compared to other growth areas and how well they might meet local and regional needs. The process of deciding between Tier 1 and 2 status was to be assisted by a new integrated economic, transportation and land use model (Oregon2)⁸, which was used to analyze a variety of impacts of different urban reserve scenarios and potential regional distributions of certain land uses. Final community buffer areas were decided during Phase 2.

Phase 3: Approval Process

Phase 3 was comprised of the deliberations and approval process. This took place on multiple levels — in individual jurisdictions locally, within the structure of the project regionally, and among state agencies on the state level. Some of the Phase 1 and 2 products and actions were revisited to reach consensus. A draft plan was developed and the Participant’s Agreement was signed. The final approved Regional Plan and the comprehensive plan changes that will make it operational, are to be Phase 3’s major products, along with a long-term regional oversight process/structure for the plan.

5.2 Comparison of RPS Process with Division 21 Process— Overview

Overall, the process that occurred through Regional Problem Solving differed from the Division 21 process in the following ways:

Process	Activities
A. LAND NEEDS DETERMINATION	
OAR Division 21 Process	Using a planning horizon and a projected population, determine urban growth land needs over the planning horizon. Estimates for the amount of land needed to accommodate generalized housing, employment, and other urban uses for the projected population growth were derived from RPS analyses of regional housing and employment demand forecasts and build-out capacity of the existing urban areas.

⁸ ODOT’s Transportation Planning Analysis Unit (TPAU) developed the model but named it Land Use Scenario Developer (LUSDR). The results of the modeling are included at Appendix VI: Land Use and Transportation Modeling for Regional Problem Solving.

Process	Activities
RPS Process	Determine planning horizon and projected population. Developed as part of NOWx2. Land needs were determined in Phase 2.
B. PRELIMINARY LAND ANALYSIS/ COARSE FILTER	
OAR Division 21 Process	Second, after estimating the amount of suitable land that will be needed over the planning period, Division 21 requires cities and counties to develop a study area of lands adjacent to, or nearby, the urban growth boundaries and review them for suitability for inclusion within urban reserves. Inclusion of land within an urban reserve shall be based upon the location factors of Goal 14. Areas that do not meet the basic Goal 14 locational factors are then excluded from further consideration by this Coarse Filter. Lands meeting those factors are passed through.
RPS Process	Phase 1 of the RPS process began identifying which issues were of regional concern on long term growth through the pCIC, RLRC, TAC and stakeholders. Each participating jurisdiction, along with the RLRC, pCIC, and other agencies, inventoried and studied all lands surrounding each respective jurisdiction. The Regional Problem solving objectives included having the pCIC provide a Phase 1 report with recommendations for community buffer areas and identification of important open space, and also having the RLRC provide a Phase 1 report identifying the regional commercial agricultural land base. From that data, an initial set of “growth/non-growth” lands were identified. Non-growth areas were to be removed from further consideration as unsuitable for urbanization, and the “candidate” growth areas were passed through a “Coarse Filter” of initial criteria from which a subset of urban reserve areas would be selected in Phase 2. The primary distinction in the RPS approach was that the Goal 14 location factors were derived through a community wide process before tackling the questions of how many people and over what time period, and how much land to designate.
C. SUITABLE LANDS ANALYSIS / FINE FILTER	
Division 21 Process	The third step in Division 21 is to determine which of the lands passed through from the Coarse Filter are “suitable” for inclusion in an urban reserve. The Fine Filter, a second, more detailed review of how each identified area meets the Goal 14 locational factors is used to identify “suitable” lands. Areas determined to “suitable” are then passed through for prioritization.
RPS Process	Phase 2 of the RPS process was to agree upon the allocation of the projected regional population projection and to obtain analyses to determine the resulting regional urban land needs. Iterations of deliberations occurred regarding issues of density, desired land uses, sub-regional allocations, and comparative advantages between candidate areas. An integrated economic, transportation and land use model was used to analyze a variety of impacts of different urban reserve scenarios. Phase 2 also employed a set of “refinement criteria” (Fine Filter) from which the final pool of candidate lands and final community buffers were determined.

Process	Activities
D. PRIORITIZATION OF SUITABLE LANDS	
OAR Division 21 Process	The fourth step in Division 21, following the study to inventory surrounding “suitable” lands, is to prioritize land within the suitable lands inventory according to the hierarchy of OAR 660-021-0030(3). The ordering by priority is the main objective in this step. Then a determination as to whether to elevate any lower priority lands in accordance with the two limited situations described at OAR 660-021-0030(4) is made. Once this step is complete the final selections are made for inclusion as Urban Reserves and they move forward as part of the Regional Plan into the approval process.
RPS Process	Phase 3 of RPS comprises the approvals process. This occurs on multiple levels – in individual City jurisdictions locally, for the entire project regionally, and among the state agencies on the state level.

A comparison of the RPS Urban Reserve Selection Process and the Division 21 Urban Reserve Selection Process indicates that the processes are substantially consistent with one another. The primary reason being that despite the varying approaches to selecting the lands, both approaches were based on the same Goal 14 factors which were appropriate for identifying reserve land for the participating cities in the Greater Bear Creek Valley.

6. SELECTED URBAN RESERVE AREAS

The Greater Bear Creek Valley Regional Plan provides for the establishment of long range urban reserves sufficient to serve a doubling of the Region’s base year (2007) urban population. The end year for the planning horizon is 2060. The proposed urban reserves have been coordinated to include an area adequate to accommodate 30 years of growth for each city beyond the 20 years of growth accommodated by the existing urban growth boundaries.

Urban reserves are proposed for the cities of Central Point, Eagle Point, Medford, Phoenix, and Talent by the respective cities and Jackson County as identified in and consistent with this Greater Bear Creek Valley Regional Plan and the accompanying Participant’s Agreement. The City of Ashland is also a signatory participant of the Agreement and may designate up to 50 acres of urban reserve area in the future as a minor amendment to the agreement, as discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5 of this Plan.

The urban reserve selection process was coordinated with other cities within two miles of each participating city’s Urban Growth Boundary, as well as special districts and other affected local governments pursuant to the Urban Reserve Rule requirements.

Chapter 4 contains individual subchapters describing the Urban Reserve Selection process for each of the participating cities in the region.

7. ESTABLISHMENT OF URBAN RESERVE AREAS

Establishment of Urban Reserve Areas pursuant to Division 21 of the Oregon Administrative Rules will result in: certain restrictions being placed upon lands within the Urban Reserve Areas, the creation of Urban Reserve Management Agreements between the County and

participating cities, implications on future Urban Growth Boundary expansions, and the replacement of Urban Fringe requirements as follows:

660-021-0040 Urban Reserve Area Planning and Zoning

(1) Until included in the urban growth boundary, lands in urban reserves shall continue to be planned and zoned for rural uses in accordance with the requirements of this section, but in a manner that ensures a range of opportunities for the orderly, economic and efficient provision of urban services when these lands are included in the urban growth boundary.

(2) Urban reserve land use regulations shall ensure that development and land divisions in exception areas and nonresource lands will not hinder the efficient transition to urban land uses and the orderly and efficient provision of urban services. These measures shall be adopted by the time the urban reserves are designated, or in the case of those local governments with planning and zoning responsibility for lands in the vicinity of the Portland Metropolitan Area Urban Growth Boundary, by the time such local governments amend their comprehensive plan and zoning maps to implement urban reserve designations made by the Portland Metropolitan Service District. The measures may include:

- (a) Prohibition on the creation of new parcels less than ten acres;*
- (b) Requirements for clustering as a condition of approval of new parcels;*
- (c) Requirements for preplatting of future lots or parcels;*
- (d) Requirements for written waivers of remonstrance against annexation to a provider of sewer, water or streets;*
- (e) Regulation of the siting of new development on existing lots for the purpose of ensuring the potential for future urban development and public facilities.*

(3) For exception areas and nonresource land in urban reserves, land use regulations shall prohibit zone amendments allowing more intensive uses, including higher residential density, than permitted by acknowledged zoning in effect as of the date of establishment of the urban reserves. Such regulations shall remain in effect until such time as the land is included in the urban growth boundary.

(4) Resource land that is included in urban reserves shall continue to be planned and zoned under the requirements of applicable Statewide Planning Goals.

(5) Urban reserve agreements consistent with applicable comprehensive plans and meeting the requirements of OAR 660-021-0050 shall be adopted for urban reserves.

(6) Cities and counties are authorized to plan for the eventual provision of urban public facilities and services to urban reserves. However, this division is not intended to authorize urban levels of development or services in urban reserves prior to their inclusion in the urban growth boundary. This division is not intended to prevent any planning for, installation of, or connection to public facilities or services in urban reserves consistent with the statewide planning goals and with acknowledged comprehensive plans and land use regulations in effect on the applicable date of this division.

(7) A local government shall not prohibit the siting of a single family dwelling on a legal parcel pursuant to urban reserve planning requirements if the single family dwelling would otherwise have been allowed under law existing prior to the designation of the parcel as part of an urban reserve.

As indicated above, certain restrictions are imposed upon lands that are included within established Urban Reserve Areas. These restrictions will be imposed by the implementing Land Development Ordinance as well as within the required Urban Reserve Management Agreements, as discussed below.

660-021-0050 Urban Reserve Agreements

Urban reserve planning shall include the adoption and maintenance of urban reserve agreements among cities, counties and special districts serving or projected to serve the designated urban reserves. These agreements shall be adopted by each applicable jurisdiction and shall contain:

- (1) Designation of the local government responsible for building code administration and land use regulation in the urban reserves, both at the time of reserve designation and upon inclusion of these reserves within the urban growth boundary.*
- (2) Designation of the local government or special district responsible for the following services: sewer, water, fire protection, parks, transportation and storm water. The agreement shall include maps indicating areas and levels of current rural service responsibility and areas projected for future urban service responsibility when included in the urban growth boundary.*
- (3) Terms and conditions under which service responsibility will be transferred or expanded for areas where the provider of the service is expected to change over time.*
- (4) Procedures for notification and review of land use actions to ensure involvement by all affected local governments and special districts.*

Urban Reserve Management Agreements (URMAs) will be formed between Jackson County and each of the participating cities to comply with the aforementioned Urban Reserve Rule. This is similar to the Urban Growth Boundary Management Agreements currently in place between Jackson County and all of the cities within its borders. At a minimum, each URMA will contain all of the information required by the Rule. The URMAs will be completed prior to adoption of this Regional Plan.

660-021-0060 Urban Growth Boundary Expansion

All lands within urban reserves established pursuant to this division shall be included within an urban growth boundary before inclusion of other lands, except where an identified need for a particular type of land cannot be met by lands within an established urban reserve.

Once established, Urban Reserve Areas will be the first priority land for future Urban Growth Boundary expansions. Essentially, this means that unless there a demonstrated specific need for a particular land outside of the established Urban Reserve Areas, then Urban Growth Boundaries can be expanded only to include land contained in the Urban Reserve Areas.

660-004-0040 Application of Goal 14 to Rural Residential Areas

(8)(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section (7) of this rule, divisions of rural residential land within one mile of an urban growth boundary for any city or urban area listed in paragraphs (A) through (E) of this subsection shall be subject to the provisions of subsections (8)(b) and (8)(c).

(A) Ashland; (B) Central Point; (C) Medford; (D) Newberg; (E) Sandy.

(b) If a city or urban area listed in subsection (8)(a):

*(A) has an urban reserve area that contains at least a twenty-year reserve of land and that has been acknowledged to comply with OAR chapter 660, division 21; or
(B) is part of a regional growth plan that contains at least a twenty-year regional urban reserve of land beyond the land contained within the collective urban growth boundaries of the participating cities, and that has been acknowledged through the process prescribed for Regional Problem Solving in ORS 197.652 through 197.658; then any division of rural residential land in that reserve area shall be done in accordance with the acknowledged urban reserve ordinances or acknowledged regional growth plan.*

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of section (7) of this rule, if any part of a lot or parcel to be divided is less than one mile from an urban growth boundary for a city or urban area listed in subsection (8)(a), and if that city or urban area does not have an urban reserve area acknowledged to comply with OAR chapter 660, division 21, or is not part of an acknowledged regional growth plan as described in subsection (b), paragraph (B), of this section, the minimum area of any new lot or parcel there shall be ten acres.

Currently the cities of Ashland, Medford, and Central Point are regulated by OAR 660-004-0040. As such, land within 1 mile of the Urban Growth Boundary of each of those cities currently has a 10 minimum lot size restriction placed upon it. This is often referred as an Urban Fringe.

Consistent with the Rule, requirements imposed upon land within established Urban Growth Boundaries through this regional process will replace the 10 acre minimum lot size requirement currently in place. Therefore, as proposed, the Urban Fringe for the cities of Medford and Central Point will be replaced by the requirements imposed through the designation of Urban Reserve Areas. Since the City of Ashland has not proposed an Urban Reserve Area through this regional process, the Urban Fringe area and associated 10 acre minimum lot size requirement will remain.