

# Chapter 4.EP

## Proposed URAs

## Eagle Point

### 1. CITY DESCRIPTION

Eagle Point has been one of the fastest growing communities in the state over the past decade. The City’s population has nearly doubled in the past five years. The Population Element of the Jackson County Comprehensive Plan projects that population for Eagle Point’s urban area will be 16,964 residents in the year 2026 and 21,449 residents by the year 2040. To accommodate its proportional share of a doubling of the region’s urban population, Eagle Point will plan for an increase of 18,048 residents for a total of 26,750 residents within its urban area by the year 2060. Chapter 3 of the Regional Plan includes the methodology and discussion to estimate the projected land needs for urban reserve planning for residential and urban lands. The City of Eagle Point estimates that 151 acres of urban park land will be needed to accommodate future demand – or approximately eight acres per 1,000 additional residents. The estimated land demand needs are summarized in Figure EP.1 below.

**Figure EP.1**

<b>EAGLE POINT URBAN RESERVE LAND DEMAND SUMMARY (LOW DENSITY)</b>							
	<b>Residential</b>		<b>Employment</b>		<b>Urban Parks</b>		<b>Total Demand (acres)</b>
	Population	Land (acres)	Jobs	Land (acres)	Developed (acres)	Open Space (acres)	
Allocated Regional Share	18,048	1,058	5,376	575			1,633
Planned Inside UGB	4,502	307	495	53			360
<b>Urban Reserve Land Demand</b>	<b>13,546</b>	<b>751</b>	<b>4,881</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,424</b>

  

<b>EAGLE POINT URBAN RESERVE LAND DEMAND SUMMARY (HIGH DENSITY)</b>							
	<b>Residential</b>		<b>Employment</b>		<b>Urban Parks</b>		<b>Total Demand (acres)</b>
	Population	Land (acres)	Jobs	Land (acres)	Developed (acres)	Open Space (acres)	
Allocated Regional Share	18,048	928	5,376	575			1,503
Planned Inside UGB	4,502	307	495	53			360
<b>Urban Reserve Land Demand</b>	<b>13,546</b>	<b>621</b>	<b>4,881</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,294</b>

Eagle Point is currently a bedroom community that is planning to take on a more regionally significant role in accommodation of population and employment land needs in order to relieve growth pressures from cities located in the heart of the Region’s commercial agricultural land base. In order to succeed in this role while maintaining the community values and identity, Eagle Point must have an adequate land base and a land use plan to efficiently accommodate balanced population and employment growth.

Recently, the City has seen a significant increase in residential infill activity. It has quickly evolved from the timber and agricultural base that once defined it to a community better known for its world class Robert Trent Jones Golf Course.

In all respects, economic development has lagged behind residential growth. Today, upwards of 85 percent of the workforce is employed outside of Eagle Point. A Comprehensive Plan goal outlines the City's desire to improve the balance of different uses, and provide greater variety of local amenities for its residents and eventually become the socio-economic center for the Upper Rogue Region.

One of Eagle Point's goals is the revitalization of its downtown to include high quality, mixed use development designed to attract additional tourism, professional office and retail businesses, and encouraging high density residential living opportunities in the town's central core. The City has recently adopted a "Town Center Plan" outlining strategies to physically improve the downtown area and market Eagle Point as an attractive location for new business and employers. Older homes are now beginning to be converted to higher densities in the City center and abutting neighborhoods. In general, new commercial developments in other areas of the community have absorbed 90% of the available commercial land in Eagle Point.

Additional recreational and tourist related improvements are planned for the semi-resort atmosphere of the Eagle Point Golf Course. Expansion of light industrial uses on soon-to-be depleted aggregate mining sites west of Highway 62 will encourage family wage jobs. Local employment opportunities will also reduce traffic volumes on Highway 62 and other county connector routes between Eagle Point and the White City and Medford employment centers.

The recent opening of a large, regional retail store, combined with development of other retail/professional centers and individual businesses along Highway, have contributed to a significant increase in the City's economic base. The approval of a resort lodging complex with a residential townhouse component adjacent to the Golf Course, and several new businesses in the downtown core have signaled a significant shift in Eagle Point's place in the Southern Oregon economic environment. Eagle Point's emerging status as a focal point for both local and regional economic development opportunities rapidly consumed the existing supply of available commercial land within the existing Urban Growth Boundary.

Through multiple planning efforts, the City and its residents have expressed the importance of retaining open spaces and the community's rural quality and historic heritage, while providing for balanced economic growth and expanded day-to-day services for Eagle Point and the Upper Rogue Region. These efforts continue to follow the outline of the City's Comprehensive Plan, fully recognizing ongoing efforts to increase residential densities in new subdivision and infill projects.

The City estimates that all available land within the Urban Growth Boundary will be built out by 2017. Eagle Point is surrounded almost completely by resource land, but this acreage is of lower agricultural value than the land that exists adjacent to the other cities in the Region located along the Bear Creek corridor.

Urban Reserve Planning for the City of Eagle Point is faced with the following challenges:

- Any residential growth on the west side of the Highway 62 would not be supported by ODOT in order to properly maintain the function of the highway as an "expressway". Future reclamation of an aggregate mining to the west of Highway 62 for industrial development has received ODOT support through the RPS process as traffic patterns associated with industrial use would be compatible with the highway function subject to controlled access.
- Growth opportunity to the south is limited by Antelope and Little Butte Creek basins and associated flood plains, and to preserve a community buffer between Eagle Point and White City as described in Chapter 1.
- Growth to the north is severely constrained by environmentally sensitive vernal pools and wetlands. Physical and Natural Constraints are depicted on Map 33 of Volume III of this Plan.

## 2. CITY GROWTH GUIDELINES & POLICIES

Through official resolution 2003-72, adopted in 2003, the City of Eagle Point established three goals designed to shape the growth of the City over the next fifty years. Those three goals are as follows:

- Goal 1: Manage future regional growth for the greater public good.
- Goal 2: Conserve resource and open space lands for their important economic, cultural, and livability benefits.
- Goal 3: Recognize and emphasize the individual identity, unique features, and relative competitive advantages and disadvantages of each community within the Region.

Through official resolution 2005-14, the City of Eagle Point adopted the *'Eagle Point Livability Statement and RPS Rationale, Assumption and Constraints: A Narrative'* as a technical guide for implementing the Goals outlined above.

Consistent with, and in response to, the above goals and Livability Statement, the City of Eagle Point carefully considered and applied a set of factors when evaluating all lands on its periphery. These factors included, but were not limited to, transportation in general, and specifically the issues posed by Highway 62; topography; flood plain and drainage constraints; wetlands; resource lands; proximity to downtown and other employment lands; urban form; and the need for enhanced employment.

Through the application of their goals and implementation requirements, coupled with technical analysis of surrounding lands, the City determined the following with regard to generalized suitability requirements:

- With exception of future conversion of some depleted aggregate pits to Industrial use, all lands west of Highway 62 were not recognized as suitable future growth area because of transportation impediments caused by the separation of said lands from the City core, by State Highway 62.
- Intact and heavily protected Vernal Pools and other wetlands prevent the City from extending any further north than approximately one-quarter mile. Existing development patterns provide a logical and consistent extent to a future northern boundary.
- The land immediately south of the City, along Highway 62 is recognized as a necessary open space buffer for a multitude of reasons including, heavy floodplain constraints, high capability farm soils, and preservation of rural to urban interface at the City's primary entrance.
- Lands within mapped 100-year floodplain areas are to be excluded to fully preserve flood carrying capacity and to minimize impacts to protected fish habitat. The City's development patterns have resulted in fewer negative impacts to flood carrying and storm water drainage capacity. Implementation of Flood Zone construction standards exceeding FEMA minimums and engineered Storm Water Drainage and Detention Systems have had a positive effect on flood impacts.

### 3. STUDY AREA SELECTION & COURSE FILTER

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. The Course Study Area is depicted on Map 35a of Volume III of this Plan. Lands generally within one mile of the existing urban growth boundary are grouped into five large study areas designated EP-A, EP-B, EP-C, EP-D, and EP-E. The study areas are sized to consider all nearby and adjacent lands and areas where urban reserves may be appropriately extended beyond one-quarter mile if needed to accommodate identified urban land needs over the planning horizon. The estimated urban land need for the planning horizon is related to the initial study area in the table at Figure EP.2 below. The study area is reasonably sized to yield an inventory of suitable lands responsive to the future urban needs of Eagle Point. Of the 6,900 gross acres within the coarse study areas, 2,159 acres are passed through for further study.

**Figure EP.2**

COARSE STUDY AREA COMPARED TO ESTIMATED NEED						
Jurisdiction	Estimated Need		Coarse Study Areas			
	Low Density	High Density	Lots	Acres	Percent of Need	
					Low Density	High Density
Eagle Point	1,424	1,294	609	6,900	484%	533%

#### Area EP-A

EP-A is the area north and northeast of Eagle Point, east of Highway 62, and generally west of Ball Road. The study area extends out approximately one mile from the City’s UGB, comprising approximately 1,000 acres. The existing lot configurations within approximately one-quarter of one mile north of the urban growth boundary provide a distinct and uniform east-west line which makes for a logical northern boundary. Beyond these parcels, the physical hydrology is dominated by vernal pools, as indicated on Atlas Map 33 (Physical Features – Natural Constraints) and Map 39 (Aerial Photo Map for EP-2 subarea of EP-A).

Most of the lands between the above-described northern line and the City are large-lot exception lands that warrant further suitability analysis and were passed through for further detailed review to consider constraints in balance with the benefits of proximity and other urban land needs. The lands northeast of the City are Agricultural land, but also warrant further detailed review to consider the balance of goal 14 location factors and growth policies.

**Coarse Filter Outcome for EP-A:** Because of the predominance of severe physical constraints and protected habitat within the vernal pool area, all lands north of the above noted one-quarter mile boundary were excluded from further consideration. The remainder of EP-A is passed through the coarse filter for further review.

#### Area EP-B

Area EP-B includes the lands immediately east of Eagle Point, along Brownsboro Highway. EP-B contains approximately 340 acres and is split north-south by both Brownsboro Highway and Little Butte Creek. The northern portion of EP-B, situated north of Brownsboro Hwy, is an area of agricultural land with a few (four) smaller (0.2, 0.6, 1.1 and 1.4 acres) Rural Residential designated properties. The portion of area EP-B that lies south of Brownsboro Highway is within the Little Butte Creek Canyon, a stretch of Little Butte Creek with a narrow corridor of flat flood plain leading to severe slopes (well beyond the maximum buildable limit for the city) to the south rising to a flat area that is identified in the City’s Comprehensive Plan as a protected viewshed.

**Coarse Filter Outcome for EP-B:** Because of the severe physical constraints affecting the lands south of the Highway, the south half of EP-B was dismissed as unsuitable for urban reserve. There are several factors relevant to the lands north of the Highway that require an in-depth analysis and as such, these lands are passed through the coarse filter for further review.

### **Area EP-C**

Land east and southeast of the City approximately 1.3 miles beyond the existing UGB, is identified as EP-C. This relatively large study area includes approximately 2,350 acres, and covers three distinct areas with physically dissimilar land types.

The northern extent is situated north of Little Butte Creek and includes approximately 650 acres. This area includes irrigated farmlands along both Brownsboro Highway and Brophy Road. The farthest northern extent is dominated by intact vernal pools. This area is separated from the UGB by at least one half mile. This area is excluded from further suitability review because of the potential impacts on farmland, separation from the City, and environmental constraints.

The southern one-third (730 acres) of EP-C is comprised of large tracts of irrigated farmland. These farm-lands are part of a larger agricultural area that extends a few miles south across Highway 140, east for several miles to the rolling oak foot-hills and north to Little Butte Creek. To urbanize these lands would not only take substantial amounts of farm-land directly out of production, could produce negative impacts on the remaining nearby farm lands. For this reason, the subarea is excluded from further reviewed for suitability.

The middle 1,000 acres, and bulk of EP-C, predominantly consists of rolling oak hills separating the western portion of the City from the irrigated farm-lands to the east. Most of the area is sparsely developed, and the majority of the development that does exist is situated over one-half mile from the existing UGB, along Ayres Road. Unlike the irrigated farm-lands to the east, this agricultural designated area does not benefit from Eagle Point Irrigation District's East Canal, and has, for the most part, remained without intensive agricultural practices. Soils are comparably less productive as well. Stevens Road ties this area to the City east-west. Riley Road generally provides north-south access along the City's existing border. ,

**Coarse Filter Outcome for EP-C:** All lands along Stevens Road, outward approximately one-half mile from the City are passed through to the coarse filter for further review. Lands along Riley Road outward approximately one-quarter mile are also passed through the coarse filter for further review. All other lands within EP-C are excluded from further review, primarily due to distance from the existing UGB. Most of the residual lands are beyond one-half mile from the City's current UGB, and could not be efficiently served with public facilities and services in the projected time-frame.

### **Area EP-D**

EP-D is a 1,760 acre area south of the City and north of White City's Unincorporated Community Boundary. The dominate physical feature in this area is Antelope Creek, and its associated floodplain, which cross this area from east to west, generally parallel to the City's southern border. Most of the bottom-land along Antelope Creek is comprised of intensively farmed, irrigated lands. The lands within this area, along Highway 62, effectively separate Eagle Point from White City, and were recommended by the pCIC as one of the Region's most attractive community buffer areas in the Region. The northeast corner of EP-D is mostly elevated above the Antelope Creek floodplain, and relatively obscured from view along Highway 62.

**Coarse Filter Outcome for EP-D:** All lands within this area along Highway 62, along the Antelope Creek floodplain, and beyond one-quarter mile from the City's UGB were excluded from further analysis due to natural constraints and impacts on farm-land. The lands within the northeast corner of EP-D, immediately southeast of the City, are passed through for further review. The lands along Highway 62, between Antelope Creek and the City are also passed through for further review.

### **Area EP- E**

EP-E includes all lands west of the City and Highway 62, outward approximately one mile. EP-E, in total, includes approximately 1452 acres. The northern third (540 acres) is primarily made-up of exception lands with five to ten acre sized rural residential lots developed with single family

dwellings. This area is gently sloped, with good redevelopment potential, but lacks infrastructure (i.e. - water, sewer, and storm drain) necessary for urban-level development. Immediately west of the City, south of West Linn Road and north of Nick Young Road, is an area dominated by existing aggregate operations, estimated to be depleted within the projected time-frame. Immediately north of Nick Young Road is a steep hill not suitable for any development. Most of the area south of Nick Young Road is either part of the pCIC recommended community buffer or affected by the Little Butte Creek floodplain.

Most importantly, the entire EP-E area is separated from the City by Highway 62. Both ODOT and Jackson County have expressed concerns about protecting the functional quality of Highway 62. Allowing urban-level residential development west of Highway 62 will introduce significant impacts to the functional quality of the highway.

**Coarse Filter Outcome for EP-D:** All lands west of the highway, and further than one-quarter mile from the City's UGB, are excluded from further suitability review for future residential development. The portion of EP-E currently dominated by the Aggregate Removal designation is passed-through the coarse filter to be further reviewed for potential conversion or transfer of employment land, especially related to industrial uses. Other EP-E lands within one-quarter mile are passed through for further review.

#### 4. SUITABLE LANDS ANALYSIS / FINE FILTER

Lands within the initial coarse filter study areas selected for further study were then examined in more detail to determine which should be inventoried as suitable lands for Urban Reserve consideration. In general, the rationale and reasoning for Urban Reserve designation in these areas evaluated at the coarse filter level is applicable to the more detailed specific areas. All Goal 14 and Resource Land Impacts and Use analysis in the coarse filter analysis above is applicable to the fine filter suitability analysis unless specifically stated as it applies to the particular fine filter area analyzed. The structure of the fine filter analysis evaluates suitability under Goal 14 and the Resource Land and Use impacts, first for those lands found to be unsuitable, and then for those lands found to be suitable. Figure EP.3 is a summary table of the lands in each category for the more specific Fine Study areas:

**Figure EP.3**

OVERVIEW SUMMARY OF FINE STUDY AREA						
Fine Study Area	Lots	Existing Dwellings	Gross Acres	Physically Constrained	Built	Generally Unconstrained
EP-1A	7	3	152	3	3	146
EP-2	35	29	397	52	6	339
EP-3	40	23	430	21	11	399
EP-4	11	13	284	13	1	270
EP-B.a	11	13	90	2	10	78
EP-B.x	8	9	188	64	2	122
EP-C.x	3	0	23	0	0	23
EP-D.a	20	16	203	7	4	193
EP-D.x	2	1	12	0	0	12
EP-E.a	18	26	163	5	4	153
EP-E.b	14	8	218	77	3	139
<b>Totals</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>2,159</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>1,873</b>

#### 4.1 Fine Filter Study Areas – Unsuitable

Each of the areas identified in the accompanying Atlas Map 35b as EP-B.a, EP-D.a, EP-E.a, and EP-E.b were evaluated for suitability, considering the growth policies for Jackson County and Eagle Point and balance of Goal 14 boundary location factors. None of the following areas were found to be suitable for inclusion / protection as Urban Reserves for the detailed reasons explained herein below.

##### **Area EP-B.a:**

EP-B.a includes some of the more heavily evaluated lands under the RPS study. The sub-area was identified by RLRC as part of the Region's commercial agricultural land base; however, it is also an area immediately adjacent to the existing UGB that would be conducive to meeting the City's future urban land needs. The sub-area is bordered by Brownsboro Highway on the south/southeast, Reese Creek Road and the City limits to the west, and the Eagle Point Irrigation District ditch on the north. The underlying parcel extends well beyond the ditch, approximately one-quarter mile further to the north.

The area below and south of the ditch is flat and irrigated. Existing residential development is arrayed along Reese Creek Road and Brownsboro Highway as depicted on Map 32 (Existing Development Patterns – Eagle Point), of Volume III of this Plan. The area immediately west and within the City is developed as an urban residential neighborhood (Butte Crest Subdivision) containing over 600 residential units (.08 to 0.12 acre lots or 8 to 10 dwelling units per acre). A Middle School, constructed in 2001, is sited on the north side of that residential neighborhood. Urban infrastructure is readily available to provide an efficient extension of services.

Eleven tax lots make-up EP-B.a. The western 50 acres are comprised of ten separate EFU parcels recommended as part of the commercial agricultural base; all but two are less than 10 acres in size. Four of the eleven parcels are designated Rural Residential (exception lands) and are 0.4, 0.6, 1.2, and 1.4 acres in size, with each containing a residence. The remaining seven parcels are designated agricultural land. All but two of these are less than 10 acres in size. All have residences, and some are served with City water.

The largest of the eleven lots (35-1W-35-500) is split by the Eagle Point Irrigation ditch, the north border of EP-B.a. A dairy operation was formerly sited on the "split" portion of Tax Lot 500. It ceased operation as minimum herd sizes could no longer be supported on the available acreage. Another contributory factor is a historic general incompatibility between dairy operations and urban residential use that now exist as a result of historic City growth into the area. The land is currently used to graze cattle seasonally. An Order 1 soils study for this parcel was provided documents that the parcel as a whole is predominately comprised of non-agricultural soils (Class V-VIII). EP-B.a would also be wrapped by the City to the west and EP-2 to the north and east, subject to EP-2 designation as Urban Reserve, as an enclave bound by Brownsboro Highway on the south.

##### ***The Goal 14 location factors relate, in balance, to EP-B.a as follows:***

1. *Efficient Accommodation of Identified Land Needs-* EP-B.a is comparatively well suited to efficiently accommodate identified urban land needs in close proximity to existing neighborhoods and schools. The level topography and existing pattern of development would accommodate a full street grid with minimal constraints.
2. *Orderly and Economic Provision of Public Facilities and Services-* All necessary urban public facilities and services are available west of Reese Creek Road, and adjacent to the area.
3. *ESEE Consequences-* The overall comparative ESEE consequences of an Urban Reserve boundary in this area is positive, based upon the following:

- a. Economic- The subarea has significant infill potential and could be developed to supply a primary demand for residential and institutional uses. Farm value is in hay and pasturing. A dairy, once located on the largest parcel, closed years ago as the urban residential land developed nearby. Dairies are not compatible in any proximity to urban neighborhoods given significant odor impacts. The primary parcel in the subarea is comprised predominately of non-agricultural soils, and would be split by any resulting urban boundary. EP-B.a will be surrounded by urban area to the west, north, and east and exception land to the south/southeast. Consequently, economic value for continued farm use would be very limited.
  - b. Social- Urban use of the area would provide for neighborhoods within walking distance of the existing schools, and in proximity to the urban core. Loss of open space may have negative consequences. However, the area is sufficiently sized, and configured in a manner that would be conducive to the provision of park space through a master plan concept.
  - c. Environmental- No significant environmental constraints affect this subarea. Comparatively, this subarea is located closer than any other to the downtown core, in addition to its proximity to the u. Environmental consequences from vehicle emissions and related externalities would be comparatively favorable for this area.
  - d. Energy- Accommodating urban growth in close proximity to existing boundaries is generally considered as having positive energy consequences.
4. *Compatibility of the Proposed Urban Uses with Nearby Agriculture and Forest Activities Occurring on Farm and Forest Land Outside the Urban Growth Boundary-* There are no forest lands or uses within the vicinity. There would be no farm or forest lands remaining adjacent to EP-B.a were it to be urbanized. The City limits are located to the west, and a Rural Residential exception area flanks Brownsboro Highway and Little Butte Creek to the south. The EP-2 Urban Reserve, if approved, would abut the north and east sides. EP-2 to the north is, in any case, comprised of non-irrigated and predominately non-agricultural soils that are not in, nor likely to be in, active agricultural use to any significant degree.

Although the City maintained that it would not be practical to carve out the 40-acre minor share of a parcel that contains primarily non-agricultural soils, and combine it with ten smaller agricultural parcels for protection as commercial farmland, RLRC identified the subarea as part of the Region's commercial agricultural base. The City of Eagle Point asserts that the area is highly conducive to meet its identified urban needs. Urban services and facilities would be easily provided to this 91-acre area. The area is already surrounded by a cluster of moderately-high residential development (3,600 square foot lot minimums) along its western side, and the Brownsboro Highway to the south. The area's larger parcel sizes would allow the City to plan for mixed use housing, with commercial nodes serving as local neighborhood centers, as well as providing conservation buffers to protect adjoining lands from the effects of development.

However, State agencies participating in the RPS process were not persuaded by the City's findings of compelling urban need, and, therefore, did not support removal of the RLRC designation or inclusion of the area as Urban Reserve. Under the Division 21 Urban Reserve Rule, the subarea would normally be identified as suitable for urbanization, but assigned low priority as resource designated land. It would then be included as Urban Reserve only if the quantity of higher priority land was insufficient to meet the amount needed for future urban use. Under RPS, to maintain full support by all participants through a consensus process, the City chose not to pursue inclusion. Consequently, EP-B.a is excluded from the suitable lands inventory.

**Area EP-B.x:**

EP-Bx included 188 gross acres, totaling eight parcels. The area is known as Little Butte Creek Canyon, a stretch of Little Butte Creek with a narrow corridor of flat flood plain leading to severe slopes on the south side that are well beyond the maximum buildable limit for the City. See, Atlas Map 33: Physical Features – Natural Constraints. The canyon slope and upland area is identified in the City’s Comprehensive Plan as a protected view shed. There are two parcels designated as Agricultural Land and six parcels designated Rural Residential. The Rural Residential parcels are arrayed along the north bank of the creek, south of Brownsboro Highway. These are all developed with single family residences, and lie completely within the 100-year flood plain. The northern-most agricultural parcel (TL 2800) has approximately 51.50 acres adjacent and south of the creek. Irrigated pasture use of the parcel extends east to a 104 acre farm parcel in common (tract) ownership, but outside the study area where the home and farm buildings are located. The second agricultural land parcel in the subarea is located south and upslope from the first, and is also in common ownership. This parcel (TL 100) has approximately 120 acres of steep hillside with northerly aspect.

***The Goal 14 location factors relate, in balance, to EP-B.x as follows:***

1. *Efficient Accommodation of Identified Land Needs-* EP-B.x is severely constrained by the Little Butte Creek flood corridor and the Little Butte Creek Canyon wall. Only the south bench of the creek north of the steep hillside would provide any potential buildable area. However, access to that area would be limited by the creek and existing development to the north, and the steep hillside to the south.
2. *Orderly and Economic Provision of Public Facilities and Services-* The creek would need to be bridged and slope public facilities extended from north of Brownsboro Road and over the steep hillside to the south. This area would therefore not provide for an orderly or economic provision of Public Facilities and Services.
3. *ESEE Consequences-* The overall comparative ESEE consequences of an Urban Reserve boundary in this area is positive, based upon the following:
  - a. *Economic-* Urban development could increase the tax base but would incur significantly higher infrastructure costs due to the need for stream crossings and slope, and would increase risk of flood hazard – thereby impacting the community’s insurance rating. Economic benefits of urbanization would also be somewhat offset by loss of farm use area.
  - b. *Social-* Visual impacts to the hillside would adversely affect an adopted view shed important to the community’s identity. Loss of open space may have negative consequences. The area is not configured in a manner that would be conducive to urbanization that would minimize these impacts.
  - c. *Environmental-* Severe environmental constraints affect this subarea. The canyon is a visual resource, and Little Butte Creek is an important riparian habitat for fisheries. Although proximity to the urban growth boundary would ordinarily be expected to have positive consequences relating to vehicle emissions and associated externalities, the topography isolates the area in a manner that would not be likely to promote alternative modes to automobile use. Environmental consequences would be comparatively unfavorable for this area.
  - d. *Energy-* Accommodating urban growth in close proximity to existing boundaries is generally considered as having positive energy consequences. However, the steep hillside would require relatively higher energy expenditures for pumping stations and vehicular fuel consumption. The northern aspect of the hillside is not conducive to solar access. Energy consequences would be comparatively negative.

4. *Compatibility of the Proposed Urban Uses with Nearby Agriculture and Forest Activities Occurring on Farm and Forest Land Outside the Urban Growth Boundary-* There are no forest lands or uses within the vicinity. Urbanization of this subarea would very likely impact continued farm use of the adjacent farm tract along the bottom land to the east.

Because the sub-area is primarily comprised of agricultural land and land that is severely constrained by natural features, Area EP-B.x is unsuitable to provide for the City of Eagle Point's identified future urban land needs.

#### **Area EP-C.x:**

EP-C.x is comprised of two whole parcels and a portion of a third parcel that together have a total area of 23 acres of designated Agricultural Land located southeast of the existing urban growth boundary. The parcels within this subarea within one-quarter mile of the existing urban growth boundary but separated from the City by Quarter Creek and its associated floodplain. The East Canal bounds the south of the subarea and joins Quarter Creek to the west. See, Atlas Map 33: Physical Features – Natural Constraints.

#### ***The Goal 14 location factors relate, in balance, to EP-C.x as follows:***

1. *Efficient Accommodation of Identified Land Needs-* EP-C.x is severely constrained by the Quarter Creek flood corridor and the East Canal. The area south of Quarter Creek not encumbered by floodplain is of limited area and would create an isolated island from the remainder of the urbanizable area were it to be included. The City has adopted a strict policy of excluding flood plain areas from inclusion. Riley Road to the west is the only nearby public road, but does not cross the creek until a point further south of this area and away from the City.
2. *Orderly and Economic Provision of Public Facilities and Services-* The creek would need to be bridged public facilities extended from the north to serve this area. Public facilities necessary for urbanization do not currently exist in proximity to this subarea, but would ultimately be extended to serve EP-3 subject to its inclusion and ultimate urbanization. However, the creek would still need to be bridged for access and utilities. Storm drainage could be directed to the creek, but available area for proper preliminary treatment would further reduce the limited area available for development outside the floodplain. Consequently, the subarea is not found to be conducive to this Goal 14 factor.
3. *ESEE Consequences-* The overall comparative ESEE consequences of an Urban Reserve boundary in this area is positive, based upon the following:
  - a. *Economic-* Urban development could increase the tax base but would incur significantly higher infrastructure costs due to the need for stream crossings, and would increase risk of flood hazard – thereby impacting the community's insurance rating. Economic benefits of urbanization would also be somewhat offset by loss of farm use area.
  - b. *Social-* Urbanization of this area would create an isolated neighborhood that would not be well connected to the community.
  - c. *Environmental-* Urbanization of this subarea would have negative environmental consequences to the riparian corridor along Quarter Creek. Although proximity to the urban growth boundary would ordinarily be expected to have positive consequences relating to vehicle emissions and associated externalities, the topography isolates the area in a manner that would not be likely to promote alternative modes to automobile use. Environmental consequences would be comparatively unfavorable for this area.

- d. Energy- Accommodating urban growth in close proximity to existing boundaries is generally considered as having positive energy consequences. Intervening hills between the subarea and the downtown core could require relatively higher energy expenditures for pumping stations and vehicular fuel consumption. Energy consequences are neutral in the balance for this subarea.
4. *Compatibility of the Proposed Urban Uses with Nearby Agriculture and Forest Activities Occurring on Farm and Forest Land Outside the Urban Growth Boundary-* There are no forest lands or uses within the vicinity. Urbanization of this subarea could impact access to irrigation from Quarter Creek and the East Canal by farmland to the south and southeast. Drainage of irrigated farmland to the stream corridors may also conflict with urban development given the juxtaposition of this subarea between the natural drainage area and nearby agricultural land uses. Given the limited size of the area, compatibility would be difficult to achieve.

Based on the findings enumerated herein above, Area EP-C.x is unsuitable to provide for the City of Eagle Point's identified future urban land needs and is excluded from the suitable lands inventory.

**Area EP-D.a:**

EP-D.a is comprised of designated Agricultural Land with the dominant physical feature being Antelope Creek and its associated floodplain. Most of the bottom-land along Antelope Creek is comprised of irrigated farm lands. The lands within this area and along Highway 62 were also recommended by the pCIC as one of the region's most attractive community buffer areas to separate Eagle Point from White City.

***The Goal 14 location factors relate, in balance, to EP-D.a as follows:***

1. *Efficient Accommodation of Identified Land Needs-* EP-D.a is somewhat well suited to efficiently accommodate identified urban land needs in close proximity to existing neighborhoods and services. However, the floodplain severely affects much of the area.
2. *Orderly and Economic Provision of Public Facilities and Services-* Urban public facilities and services are available from the Alta Vista Road area to the north.
3. *ESEE Consequences-* The overall comparative ESEE consequences of an Urban Reserve boundary in this area is negative, based upon the following:
  - a. Economic- The infill potential of the subarea is limited by the floodplain and hydrology. The remaining area available to be developed would supply demand primarily for residential and institutional uses. Economic value from agriculture is in hay and pasturing.
  - b. Social- The subarea was identified as one of the Region's most attractive community buffers, important to the City's preservation of community identity. The area is highly visible from the Highway 62 corridor.
  - c. Environmental- The Antelope Creek basin through the subarea is a significant environmental feature that affects this subarea. Urban encroachment would likely have negative consequences on its value as habitat and clean water. Impacts to scenic values would also be negative.
  - d. Energy- Accommodating urban growth in close proximity to existing boundaries is generally considered as having positive energy consequences.
4. *Compatibility of the Proposed Urban Uses with Nearby Agriculture and Forest Activities Occurring on Farm and Forest Land Outside the Urban Growth Boundary-* There are no forest lands or uses within the vicinity. The subarea is contiguous with and part of a larger agricultural land-base that extends several miles along Antelope Creek. Restricting development in proximity to the shared boundaries would mitigate immediate

interface issues. However, inclusion would result in fragmentation of a large tract of contiguous farmland.

South Shasta Avenue and Alta Vista, both arterials, are nearby to the north. The area is relatively flat and close (0.2 miles) to the Trent Jones Jr. Golf Course, a significant regional attractor for the city. The street and infrastructure layouts of recent residential developments to the north, between EP-D.a and Alta Vista road, would provide for an efficient extension into EP-D.a. However, much the area is physically constrained by floodplain and is contiguous with and part of a larger agricultural land-base that extends several miles along Antelope Creek. EP-D.a is also designated as community buffer maintaining separation from nearby White City Unincorporated community. Consequently, EP-D.a is excluded from the suitable lands inventory.

**Area EP-E.a:**

EP-E.a includes 162 acres of residential and agricultural designated land situated immediately west of Highway 62 and north of West Linn Road, and is within one-quarter mile of the City's urban growth boundary. The bulk of EP-E was considered unsuitable for urban-level residential development because of potential adverse impacts on Highway 62. However, because of the close proximity to the city, subarea EP-E.a is examined in greater detail.

***The Goal 14 location factors relate, in balance, to EP-E.a as follows:***

1. *Efficient Accommodation of Identified Land Needs-* EP-E.a is unsuited to efficiently accommodate identified urban land needs due to separation by Highway 62 – a designated state expressway – from most of the City. One or more grade separated crossings to the area that would be required could not reasonably be provided.
2. *Orderly and Economic Provision of Public Facilities and Services-* Public sewer and systems are not readily available to the serve the area. Access to serve the area would require significant and unreasonable expense in a manner unsupported by ODOT, Eagle Point, and Jackson County.
3. *ESEE Consequences-* The overall comparative ESEE consequences of an Urban Reserve boundary in this area is negative, based upon the following:
  - a. *Economic-* The subarea would require a degree of public infrastructure investment that, if funded by development in the subarea, would place such development at a severe comparative disadvantage throughout the region. The Region has allocated a significant share of future growth to Eagle Point. Success will require that Eagle Point reserve lands that can be developed at reasonable cost.
  - b. *Social-* The subarea has no relationship with any established neighborhood, and would be physically separated by a major regional transportation corridor from most City services and attractors. Eagle Point has so far avoided this situation which has negatively impacted other cities in the region. The comparative social consequences are found to be negative.
  - c. *Environmental-* The subarea contains some minor creeks and tributaries, and moderate slopes. No other significant environmental constraints affect this subarea.
  - d. *Energy-* Accommodating urban growth in close proximity to existing boundaries is generally considered as having positive energy consequences. The entire subarea is within one-quarter mile of the urban growth boundary. The location opposite Highway 62 from most of the city would, however, be likely to promote more automobile use than the alternative areas to the east of the highway. Extension of sewer and water mains to the subarea would also require pumping stations and energy. The energy consequences are found to be negative.
4. *Compatibility of the Proposed Urban Uses with Nearby Agriculture and Forest Activities Occurring on Farm and Forest Land Outside the Urban Growth Boundary-* No adjacent

or nearby agricultural or forest land uses were noted or found likely to occur adjacent to this subarea.

EP-E.a primarily contains large-lot (10 acres), low density residential development abutting Highway 62. However, as discussed above under EP-E, inclusion of the area would increase the residential trips and connections to Highway 62 in a manner that would significantly impact the functionality of the Highway. In order to mitigate the potential impacts of increased traffic generated from EP-E.a if it were urbanized, connections to the highway could not be in the form of a new, signalized intersection. An east-west arterial connecting this area to the City core by way of a separated grade crossing (i.e., bridge or tunnel) would be necessary, but impracticable, given the very large cost. Consequently, although EP-E.a is in close proximity to the City, all of EP-E.a is excluded as unsuitable for urban reserve.

#### **Area EP-E.b:**

EP-E.b includes the lands situated immediately west of Highway 62, and immediately north and south of Nick Young Road. The lands south of Nick Young Road are designated Agriculture and the lands north area a mixture of Forestry/Open Space and Aggregate Removal, with a few acres of Agricultural lands. Similar to EP-E., the bulk of EP-E.b was considered unsuitable for designation as Urban Reserve for reasons primarily related to the functionality of Highway 62. However, because of close proximity to the City, the lands within one-quarter mile were analyzed in greater depth.

The largest lot within EP-E.b 36-1W-04D-200, is situated north of Nick Young Road. It is a 76 acre property designated Forestry/Open Space, and is primarily open space. This property and others in the area are very steep, and, according to the Department of Forestry, contain high potential for debris flow. The only part of EP-E.b, north of Nick Young Road not encumbered by steep slopes and high debris flow potential is a narrow strip of land immediately adjacent to the road. This area is, however, partially affected by the floodplain of Little Butte Creek, leaving very little land available for urbanization. And, because the area is situated along a curved section of an arterial, safety concerns related to access would likely result.

The portion of EP-E.b south of Nick Young Road is situated between the confluence of Little Butte Creek and Big Butte Creek. Most of the area is affected by floodplain. The southern half is part of the pCIC recommended community buffer, necessary to protect the separation between White City and Eagle Point and preserve the City's entrance. There is, however, a 56 acre parcel (36-1W-09A-100) within EP-E.b that is mostly unaffected by floodplain and is not part of the pCIC recommended buffer. The only access to this area is directly from Highway 62. The logical alternative would be to create a bridge crossing over Little Butte Creek to Nick Young Road. This would be very expensive, and would be in conflict with Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife plans to re-establish the natural meander of Little Butte Creek and Antelope Creek between Highway 62 and their combined confluence with the Rogue River approximately three miles to the west.

#### ***The Goal 14 location factors relate, in balance, to EP-E.b as follows:***

1. *Efficient Accommodation of Identified Land Needs-* EP-E.b is unsuited to efficiently accommodate identified urban land needs due to separation by Highway 62 – a designated State expressway – from most of the City. One or more grade separated crossings to the area that would be required could not reasonably be provided. Natural slope and flood hazard areas also severely constrain the subarea.
2. *Orderly and Economic Provision of Public Facilities and Services-* Public sewer and systems are not readily available to the serve the area. Access to serve the area would require significant and unreasonable expense in a manner unsupported by ODOT, Eagle Point, and Jackson County. Additional road crossings would be required to access areas separated by Little Butte Creek corridor.

3. *ESEE Consequences-* The overall comparative ESEE consequences of an Urban Reserve boundary in this area is negative, based upon the following:
  - a. *Economic-* The subarea would require a degree of public infrastructure investment that, if funded by development in the subarea, would place such development at a severe comparative disadvantage throughout the region. The Region has allocated a significant share of future growth to Eagle Point. Success will require that Eagle Point reserve lands that can be developed at reasonable cost.
  - b. *Social-* The subarea has no relationship with any established neighborhood, and would be physically separated by a major regional transportation corridor from most City services and attractors. Eagle Point has so far avoided this situation which has negatively impacted other cities in the Region. The comparative social consequences are found to be negative.
  - c. *Environmental-* The subarea contains the significant Little Butte Creek corridor and important habitat area. Steep slope disturbance would increase siltation and present a natural hazard situation for development. Environmental consequences are found to be negative.
  - d. *Energy-* Accommodating urban growth in close proximity to existing boundaries is generally considered as UGB, although portions extend out to one-half mile. The location opposite Highway 62, physically separated from most of the City would, however, be likely to promote more automobile use than the alternative areas to the east of the highway. Extension of sewer and water mains to the subarea would also require pumping stations and energy. The energy consequences are found to be negative.
4. *Compatibility of the Proposed Urban Uses with Nearby Agriculture and Forest Activities Occurring on Farm and Forest Land Outside the Urban Growth Boundary-* The subarea is contiguous with and part of a larger agricultural land-base that extends several miles along Antelope Creek. Restricting development in proximity to the shared boundaries would mitigate immediate interface issues. However, inclusion would result in fragmentation of a large tract of contiguous farmland.

Because of severe natural physical constraints and access issues, all of EP-E.b is considered unsuitable for urban reserve.

#### **4.2 Fine Filter Study Areas – Suitable**

Each of the areas identified in the accompanying Atlas as numbered Urban Reserves were evaluated for suitability considering the growth policies for Eagle Point and balance of Goal 14 boundary location factors. All of the numbered areas were found to be suitable for inclusion/protection as Urban Reserve for the detailed reasons explained herein below.

##### **Area EP-1A:**

Urban Reserve EP-1A, totaling 152 acres, is largely occupied by aggregate removal uses with an estimated aggregate supply of ten years. The area abuts the western City limits and UGB, and is accessed by the surrounding street system, including Nick Young, Linn and Hannon Roads.

Eagle Point lacks a large area of level, developable land that a light industrial center requires. The existing industrial area on Hannon Road is compromised by steep terrain, particularly where the road was relocated to accommodate the Wal-Mart Supercenter. Growth trends during the past decade have provided opportunities for the City to become a more visible commercial entity in northeastern Jackson County, and put Eagle Point on a path toward achieving its 1978 Comprehensive Plan goal of becoming a service center for the Upper Rogue region.

Providing area residents with light industrial employment opportunities will offset some of the additional traffic that Eagle Point’s projected population increase will generate.

While White City has large industrial areas, ODOT has emphasized the need to preserve Highway 62 as an expressway rather than a commuter route. The agency has also expressed its acceptance of the future growth area, if conditioned exclusively for Light Industrial development.

Linn Road and Nick Young Road continue west to Agate Road, which serves as an alternate north/south connection between White City and Highway 234. The improved extension of Linn Road, as an east-west connection through Eagle Point, will expand its importance as an integral component of the routes between Medford and White City, to Eagle Point and the Upper Rogue region. Highway 62 is readily accessible, and parallel routes to White City (south) and Highway 234 (north) are available on Agate Road.

Aggregate reserves on both sides of Linn Road are decreasing, with most active mining now confined to the area north of the road. Residential use in the area is not practical because of the ongoing aggregate activities, and the lack of soil in the depleted areas. Logical redevelopment to Light Industrial as the existing aggregate supplies are depleted is both practical and compatible with existing activities.

As noted for the proposed Phoenix South County Employment Center, the eventual location of many of the region’s new industrial uses away from the two high concentration PM10 areas, Medford and White City, would significantly benefit the region’s air quality. An employment center in Eagle Point would contribute to this benefit.

Prior lack of industrial development has been overshadowed by significant population growth during past decade, causing development focus to be placed predominantly on residential and commercial projects in Eagle Point. The depletion of aggregate mining reserves within this area, and the provision of previously unavailable public facilities (streets, water and storm drains) accompanying the construction of the Walmart Supercenter, have sparked renewed interest in opportunities to compete for light industrial growth on a local level.

Most important, however, is the adverse transportation effect of residential uses west of Highway 62. Light industrial uses generate lower traffic volumes, and are more compatible with industrial land uses in the vicinity. At the same time, the proximity of the area to Highway 62 and other transportation routes to the west accessing Agate Road, permit efficient movement of goods through non-residential areas.

**Figure EP.4**

EP-1A Urban Reserve By Existing and Potential Land-Use Type						
Gross Acres: 152	Reasonably Developable: 146	Residential	Aggregate	Resource	Open Space / Parks	Employment Land
Existing Plan			79%	21%		
Proposed Uses						100%

**This area was found to be suitable due to the following Goal 14 boundary location factors and resource land use impacts:**

1. *Efficient Accommodation of Identified Land Needs-* The area currently contains significant acreage devoted to aggregate removal use, and is located adjacent to existing industrial and business development. The aggregate removal site would be subject to a State reclamation plan in order to provide for future industrial uses. The use of this existing extraction site to serve future urban development, adjacent to an existing urban industrial area, is an efficient accommodation for the identified employment land need.
2. *Orderly and Economic Provision of Public Facilities and Services-* By the time the land is brought into the City, all public infrastructure will be located within a short distance of

the properties. Public services and facilities are currently available in the adjacent industrial and business district within the City limits. Concerns related to turning movements affecting the expressway function of Highway 62 would be mitigated by limiting use of the area as industrial land

3. *ESEE Consequences-* The overall comparative ESEE consequences of an Urban Reserve boundary in this area is positive, based upon the following:
  - a. *Economic-* The comparative economic consequence of selecting these lands is positive. Only ten acres of industrial land is now available within the UGB. The EP-1A area will provide economic and employment opportunities, enhance the jobs-to-house housing ratio, and provide tax revenues for the City. Creation of jobs in basic sector industries will have obvious positive social consequences.
  - b. *Social-* The comparative social consequences are expected to be positively correlated with accompanying economic consequences. An employment center in Eagle Point will promote the community's sense of identity and provide opportunities for residents to work near home – a positive consequence for families.
  - c. *Environmental-* The comparative environmental consequences are expected to be positive. An aggregate mining site will be reclaimed for beneficial use by the community. Light industrial uses will produce less noise and dust than mining, but will still provide for basic sector jobs.
  - d. *Energy-* The comparative energy consequences are expected to be positive given the proximity to the existing UGB and use of land that currently supports significant freight traffic (aggregate material).
4. *Compatibility of the Proposed Urban Uses with Nearby Agriculture and Forest Activities Occurring on Farm and Forest Land Outside the Urban Growth Boundary-* EP-1A is intended to provide for industrial uses within a reclaimed aggregate mining site. The site is a granite pit that will provide a well insulated environment from surrounding land uses. Industrial uses are generally compatible with most resource land activities. Traffic from the site would not require travel through intervening resource lands, nor are any resource land activities found to occur near the site. Consequently, it is concluded that future urban uses will be compatible with nearby agriculture and forest activities.

#### **Area EP-2:**

Urban Reserve EP-2 has approximately 397 gross acres which lay north and east of Eagle Point's current UGB. EP-2 originally included 91 additional acres, since excluded as commercial agricultural land (subarea EP-B.a), pursuant to recommendation by the RLRC.

The EP-2 area represents the northernmost limit of Eagle Point's planned growth. Environmentally sensitive vernal pools, directly to the north, prevent the City from expanding further in that direction. Barton Road defines a portion of its southern boundary, as does the agricultural land and irrigation ditch north of Reese Creek. The area's western edge is defined by Highway 62, limiting growth to the west. ODOT has expressed concern about development patterns that would increase the amount of circulation back and forth across the highway. Limiting residential development west of Highway 62 will alleviate this potential conflict.

Including this area would also help the City address a number of internal circulation issues. Reese Creek Road, which bisects the area, is becoming an extremely important, highly trafficked north/south collector route. It currently serves Eagle Point Middle School and Eagle Rock Elementary School, as well as much of the Butte Crest Subdivision, containing over 600 residential units. It provides direct connectivity to Ball Road and Butte Falls Highway, both of which intersect Highway 62, north of town. This road, currently under County jurisdiction, is developed to a rural farm to market road standard. It has open bar ditches and no sidewalks or bike paths. This makes it a very marginal facility for its current traffic levels, particularly school busses and pedestrian/bike traffic.

Crystal Drive and Barton Road are also both important east/west collectors, as there are no alternative routes providing safe and practical connectivity between the incorporated area and the areas to the east. The City plans to extend these two roadways eastward, and has classified both routes as major collectors in their Transportation System Plan.

Finally, Rolling Hills Drive, within the northern portion of EP-2, is one of the most important links between Highway 62 and areas to the east. It currently has a semi-improved, unsignalized, four-way intersection at Highway 62. The extension of Rolling Hills Drive will complete the Major Collector extensions from the west to east, and will facilitate additional north-south connections in the future.

EP-2 can easily be served with new infrastructure. All properties in this area can access utilities, and the City’s sewer system is designed to handle its growth over the planning horizon. The City is also upgrading its water system, with \$5.5 million of improvements to accommodate both the existing City, and the allocated future growth. With large parcels of flat ground, lands east of Reese Creek Road will be easily served by the new system. A small portion of this Urban Reserve already has City water service, which residents acquired in the 1940s when the Medford Water Commission extended the main transmission line through Eagle Point. Other City services are also located on adjacent properties to the south and southwest.

The Jackson County School District #9 has identified a need for two additional schools. The City has identified the area east of Reese Creek Road as a good candidate for the schools, as large tracts of land are difficult to assemble in developed areas. The area’s larger parcel sizes will also allow the City to plan for mixed use housing, with commercial nodes serving as local neighborhood centers, as well as conservation buffers to protect adjoining lands from the effects of development.

**Figure EP.5**

EP-2 Urban Reserve By Existing and Potential Land-Use Type						
Gross Acres: 397	Reasonably Developable: 339	Residential	Aggregate	Resource	Open Space / Parks	Employment Land
Existing Plan		35%		65%		
Proposed Uses		44%			21%	35%

**The Goal 14 location factors relate, in balance, to EP-2 as follows:**

1. *Efficient Accommodation of Identified Land Needs-* EP-2 is comparatively well suited to efficiently accommodate identified urban land needs in close proximity to existing neighborhoods and schools. The level topography and existing pattern of development would accommodate a full street grid and all public utilities with minimal constraints. As discussed herein above, future urban improvements to this area would also improve the efficiency of the current urban area.
2. *Orderly and Economic Provision of Public Facilities and Services-* All necessary urban public facilities and services are available west of Reese Creek Road and adjacent to the area.
3. *ESEE Consequences-* The overall comparative ESEE consequences of an Urban Reserve boundary in this area is positive, based upon the following:
  - a. *Economic-* The subarea has significant infill potential and could be developed to supply demand primarily for residential and institutional uses. Its value as resource land is severely limited as it is comprised of rural residential land and non-irrigated agricultural land with soils generally unsuitable for agriculture.
  - b. *Social-* Urban use of the area would provide for neighborhoods within walking distance to existing schools, and in proximity to the urban core. Loss of open space may have negative consequences. However, the area is sufficiently sized

and configured in a manner that would be conducive to the provision of park/open space through a master plan concept.

- c. Environmental- Vernal pools and other wetlands are located within EP-2, primarily along the north boundary. Impacts to these resources would be negative, but could be mitigated through master planning that preserves natural and open space values.
- d. Energy- Accommodating urban growth in close proximity to existing boundaries is generally considered as having positive energy consequences.

4. *Compatibility of the Proposed Urban Uses with Nearby Agriculture and Forest Activities Occurring on Farm and Forest Land Outside the Urban Growth Boundary-* There are no forest lands or uses within the vicinity. Agricultural land uses to the north are very limited due to severe vernal pool and wetland constraints. Farmland to the east is in pasture use. The land immediately south of EP-2 is the split out portion of Tax Lot 500 located south of the irrigation canal in EP-B.a. Subarea EP-B.a is 91 acres in total, including ten whole parcels and part of an eleventh parcel. Agricultural use is pasturing, non-intensive livestock levels and some hay production. Setbacks and vegetative buffering would be used to mitigate conflicts at the interface. Urban levels of residential traffic already exist and will increase over time, especially along Reese Creek Road.

**Area EP-3:**

EP-3, approximately 430 acres, is suitable for development, with much of the topography sloped hillsides. A portion of the area provides opportunities for the construction of new water reservoirs, if needed. Its location further enhances the City’s urban form, and keeps development east of Highway 62.

This area is designated Agricultural Land, but RLRC did not recommend it as commercial agricultural land.

About 40 acres of this area is developed as the National Cemetery, owned by the US government. It is further expected that the cemetery will expand by at least another 40 acres during the RPS planning period.

The area has good transportation connectivity to north/south routes other than Highway 62, including Riley, Alta Vista, Bigham Brown and Meridian Roads.

**Figure EP.6**

EP-3 Urban Reserve By Existing and Potential Land-Use Type						
Gross Acres: 430	Reasonably Developable: 399	Residential	Aggregate	Resource	Open Space / Parks	Employment Land
Existing Plan				100%		
Proposed Uses		37%			14%	49%

**This area was found to be suitable due to the following Goal 14 boundary location factors and resource land use impacts:**

1. *Efficient Accommodation of Identified Land Needs-* The site will provide area to accommodate future residential and institutional land needs, including a planned expansion of the National Cemetery and future city water reservoirs. Use of this area will provide a means to keep residential development east of Highway 62 and in proximity to the urban core.
2. *Orderly and Economic Provision of Public Facilities and Services-* The area will provide for future city water reservoirs. Hillside topography is moderate but developable in this area. The area has good transportation connectivity to north/south routes other than

Highway 62, including Riley, Alta Vista, Bigham Brown and Meridian Roads. All connect to Highway 140, on the eastern side of White City.

3. *ESEE Consequences*- The overall comparative ESEE consequences of an Urban Reserve boundary in this area is positive, based upon the following:
  - a. Economic- The comparative economic consequence of selecting these lands is positive. It will provide sites for future water reservoirs vital to the function – and economy – of the City. Expansion area for the National Cemetery will also have positive economic consequences.
  - b. Social- The comparative social consequences are expected to be positively correlated with positive economic consequences.
  - c. Environmental- The comparative environmental consequences are neutral. There are no significant environmental features, but the area is moderately sloped for the most part and steeply sloped in small part. Erosion would need to be considered as a consequence of development. Location in proximity to the urban core would likely have positive consequences.
  - d. Energy- Location in proximity to the urban core will have positive energy consequences. Southwesterly aspects would be conducive to solar access.
4. *Compatibility of the Proposed Urban Uses with Nearby Agriculture and Forest Activities Occurring on Farm and Forest Land Outside the Urban Growth Boundary*- There are no forest resource land activities found to occur or likely to occur near the site. The Jackson County Soils Survey shows the area to be less productive agricultural soils relative to other surrounding Agricultural land, and the larger parcels on the eastern boundary provide excellent buffer opportunities. Consequently, it is concluded that future urban uses will be compatible with nearby agriculture and forest activities.

**Area EP-4:**

EP-4 is about 284 acres, and is located on the southern edge of Eagle Point, adjacent to Alta Vista, Bigham Brown and Riley Roads. City services are available from adjoining development on Alta Vista Road. It is mostly flat to gently sloped, and is a prime candidate for a master planning, possibly as a mixed development. The area encompassing a small hill has been discussed by the City as possible site for needed parkland/open space. This area is designated Agricultural, but the RLRC has not recommended this area as commercial agricultural land. EP-4 is, to some extent bordered, on the south by the Antelope Creek floodplain. The creek corridor would provide a good buffer from nearby agricultural practices to the south.

This area has good transportation connectivity to north/south connections as alternatives to Highway 62. It also responds to ODOT concerns by keeping development east of Highway 62. Urbanizing this area will also allow adjoining Jackson County street systems to become part of the City’s transportation system under future annexation.

The City envisions Bigham Brown, Riley and, ultimately, Meridian Roads becoming the primary north/south transportation facilities from Eagle Point to the south. In particular, the improved connection of Bigham Brown Road to Kershaw and Foothills Roads will create a direct link to Medford, and a viable, alternative route to the use of Highway 62.

**Figure EP.7**

EP-4 Urban Reserve By Existing and Potential Land-Use Type						
Gross Acres: 284	Reasonably Developable: 270	Residential	Aggregate	Resource	Open Space / Parks	Employment Land
Existing Plan				100%		
Proposed Uses		68%			9%	23%

This area was found to be suitable due to the following Goal 14 boundary location factors and resource land use impacts:

1. *Efficient Accommodation of Identified Land Needs*- The area is flat to gently sloped and is well suited to provide for master-planned, mixed-use development.
2. *Orderly and Economic Provision of Public Facilities and Services*- City services are available from adjoining development on Alta Vista Road.
3. *ESEE Consequences*- The overall comparative ESEE consequences of an Urban Reserve boundary in this area is positive, based upon the following:
  - a. *Economic*- The comparative economic consequence of selecting these lands is positive. The EP-4 area will provide residential and employment opportunities, enhance the jobs-to-house housing ratio, and provide tax revenues for the City.
  - b. *Social*- The comparative social consequences are expected to be positively correlated with accompanying economic consequences. An attractive park is also planned as part of this area.
  - c. *Environmental*- Impacts to Antelope Creek could have negative consequences. However, the creek interface with the EP-4 area is limited to the southern most area and impacts can feasibly be mitigated to neutralize negative consequences.
  - d. *Energy*- The comparative energy consequences are expected to be neutral.
4. *Compatibility of the Proposed Urban Uses with Nearby Agriculture and Forest Activities Occurring on Farm and Forest Land Outside the Urban Growth Boundary*- There are no forest land activities occurring or likely to occur nearby. Nearby agricultural lands would be generally south of EP-4 and across Antelope Creek. The configuration and size of EP-4 is adequate to accommodate deep setbacks and the creek provides a natural vegetative screen.

## 5. PRIORITIZATION OF SUITABLE LANDS

The inventory of identified suitable lands was next sorted according to the priorities of OAR 660-021-0030(3), as follows:

- (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 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.

The following tables summarize the results of the Priority analysis of the suitable lands inventory for the City of Eagle Point. The tables identify the amount of suitable lands by priority type able to accommodate future urban supply. The column headings are explained here:

<Lots> includes the number of tax lots within the given category.

<Acres> provides the gross acres of the lots, minus existing right-of-way.

<Dwellings> identifies the number of dwellings already occupying the given set of properties.

<Natural Constraints> calculates the net acres severely constrained by steep slopes over 22 percent, intact and weak vernal pools, floodway, wetlands, and stream corridors.

<Built> is the total acreage dedicated to existing dwellings or other substantial improvement.

<Suitable & Developable> refers to the amount of reasonably developable land within the inventory once built areas and naturally constrained acres have been subtracted from the gross acres.

<Remaining Deficiency> indicates whether suitable lands within the given priority sufficiently meet the projected need.

**Atlas Map 37 (Suitable Lots by Priority – Eagle Point)** identifies the location of suitable lots by priority. The following tables are placed in the order which they were analyzed consistent with the Urban Reserve Rule, and are intended to illustrate the ‘running total’ of land deficiency within each priority level.

**5.1 Priority (a) – Exception and Nonresource Lands**

The County’s Comprehensive Plan map was used to identify exception and non-resource lands, which include all those lands designated for Commercial, Industrial, Limited Use, Aggregate Removal, Rural Residential, and Urban Residential. Exception or non-resource lands adjacent (abutting) or near (wholly or partly within one-quarter mile of the existing growth boundary are designated for this review as “(a)1” sites.

**Figure EP.8**

Priority (a)1 Lands Results (LOW DENSITY)							
Priority	No. of Lots	Gross Acres	Built	Natural Constraints	Suitable & Reasonably Developable	Calculated Need	Remaining Deficiency
(a)1	26	257	4	4	248	1,424	(1,176)

  

Priority (a)1 Lands Results (HIGH DENSITY)							
Priority	No. of Lots	Gross Acres	Built	Natural Constraints	Suitable & Reasonably Developable	Calculated Need	Remaining Deficiency
(a)1	26	257	4	4	248	1,294	(1,046)

Priority (a) Lands within the Suitable Lands Inventory would not accommodate all of the identified land need for the planning period. No (a)2 lands were identified in Eagle Point. A deficiency of between 1046-1176 acres of developable land would still exist after all Priority (a) lands are designated as Urban Reserve.

**5.2 Priority (b) – Marginal Lands Results**

Jackson County is not a marginal lands county pursuant to former ORS 197.247 (1991 edition), nor were marginal lands ever designated by Jackson County pursuant to that statute. Because there is an inadequate supply of Priority (a) and there are no Priority (b) lands available, the analysis must proceed to evaluate Priority (c) Resource lands.

**5.3 Priority (c) – Resource Lands Results**

The County’s Comprehensive Plan map was used to identify Priority (c) Resource Lands, which include designated Agricultural Land and Forestry/Open Space Land. These Resource Lands are ranked by hierarchy within the Priority (c) category based on soil capability classification. Because no forest uses exist within the study area, the NRCS Agricultural Capability Classification System was utilized to identify the level of priority under Priority (c). Lands comprised of lowest capability soils are included as the highest priority resource lands for inclusion- Priority (c)1. Lands comprised of middle capability soils are included as second priority resource lands for inclusion- Priority (c)2. Lands comprised of the highest capability soils are classified as the lowest priority resource lands for inclusion- Priority (c)3. Only when land supply of the higher priority is inadequate may the lower priority lands be included in urban reserves consistent with OAR 660-21-0030(3)(c).

**Figure EP.9**

Priority (c)1 Lands Results (LOW DENSITY)							
Priority	No. of Lots	Gross Acres	Built	Natural Constraints	Suitable & Reasonably Developable	Remaining Need	Remaining Deficiency
(c)1	0	0	0	0	0	1,176	(1,176)

  

Priority (c)1 Lands Results (HIGH DENSITY)							
Priority	No. of Lots	Gross Acres	Built	Natural Constraints	Suitable & Reasonably Developable	Remaining Need	Remaining Deficiency
(c)1	0	0	0	0	0	1,046	(1,046)

There are no priority (c)1 lands within the suitable pool of study lots surrounding Eagle Point. Thus, the Priority Lands Rule requires the study to extend to Priority (c)2 Resource Lands.

**Figure EP.10**

Priority (c)2 Lands Results (LOW DENSITY)							
Priority	No. of Lots	Gross Acres	Built	Natural Constraints	Suitable & Reasonably Developable	Remaining Need	Remaining Deficiency
(c)2	67	1,006	17	85	905	1,176	(270)

  

Priority (c)2 Lands Results (HIGH DENSITY)							
Priority	No. of Lots	Gross Acres	Built	Natural Constraints	Suitable & Reasonably Developable	Remaining Need	Remaining Deficiency
(c)2	67	1,006	17	85	905	1,046	(140)

A deficiency of between 140-270 acres of developable land would still exist after all Priority (c)2 lands are designated as Urban Reserve. Due to a demonstrably inadequate supply of suitable Priority (c)2 Lands, as demonstrated in the above table, the Priority Lands Rule requires the study to extend to Priority (c)3 Resource Lands for examination of potential supply.

Figure EP.11

Priority (c)3 Lands Results (LOW DENSITY)							
Priority	No. of Lots	Gross Acres	Built	Natural Constraints	Suitable & Reasonably Developable	Remaining Need	Remaining Deficiency
(c)3	0	0	0	0	0	270	(270)

  

Priority (c)3 Lands Results (HIGH DENSITY)							
Priority	No. of Lots	Gross Acres	Built	Natural Constraints	Suitable & Reasonably Developable	Remaining Need	Remaining Deficiency
(c)3	0	0	0	0	0	140	(140)

There are no priority (c)1 lands within the suitable pool of study lots surrounding Eagle Point. Consequently, there remains a supply deficiency of 140-270 acres after all lands within the compiled Suitable Lands Inventory are exhausted, as compared to the estimated land needed to accommodate growth over the 50 year planning horizon of this plan.

Figure EP.12

EAGLE POINT SUITABLE LANDS BY PRIORITY						
Priority	Lots	Gross Acres	Built Acres	Naturally Constrained	Reasonably Developable	Percent of Total
(a)1	26	257	4	4	248	20%
(c)2	67	1,006	17	85	905	80%
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>1,263</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>1,154</b>	<b>100%</b>

**6. EAGLE POINT URBAN RESERVE CONCLUSIONS**

The table at Figure EP.13 reiterates the projected needs by land-use type for City of Eagle Point over the designated planning period.

Figure EP.13

EAGLE POINT URBAN RESERVE LAND DEMAND SUMMARY (LOW DENSITY)							
	Residential		Employment		Urban Parks		Total Demand (acres)
	Population	Land (acres)	Jobs	Land (acres)	Developed (acres)	Open Space (acres)	
Allocated Regional Share	18,048	1,058	5,376	575			1,633
Planned Inside UGB	4,502	307	495	53			360
Urban Reserve Land Demand	<b>13,546</b>	<b>751</b>	<b>4,881</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,424</b>

<b>EAGLE POINT URBAN RESERVE LAND DEMAND SUMMARY (HIGH DENSITY)</b>							
	<b>Residential</b>		<b>Employment</b>		<b>Urban Parks</b>		<b>Total Demand (acres)</b>
	Population	Land (acres)	Jobs	Land (acres)	Developed (acres)	Open Space (acres)	
Allocated Regional Share	18,048	928	5,376	575			1,503
Planned Inside UGB	4,502	307	495	53			360
<b>Urban Reserve Land Demand</b>	<b>13,546</b>	<b>621</b>	<b>4,881</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,294</b>

The table at Figure EP.14 summarizes the supply of land within each Urban Reserve designated for the City of Eagle Point.

**Figure EP.14**

<b>SUMMARY OF SUITABLE LANDS</b>						
<b>Fine Study Area</b>	<b>Lots</b>	<b>Existing Dwellings</b>	<b>Gross Acres</b>	<b>Physically Constrained</b>	<b>Built</b>	<b>Generally Unconstrained</b>
EP-1A	7	3	152	3	3	146
EP-2	35	29	397	52	6	339
EP-3	40	23	430	21	11	399
EP-4	11	13	284	13	1	270
<b>Totals</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>1,263</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1,154</b>

The analysis pursuant to the Division 21 rule indicates that there are still 140-270 acres of remaining land need after all the Urban Reserve areas designated for the City of Eagle Point have been brought into the City over the planning period. The base populations and needs determinations are based upon several factors and layers of assumptions including: a County-adopted 2007 Population Element; City of Eagle Point Buildable Lands Inventory, projected densities, a forecasted growth rate, and target future time period. All these factors are reasonable, based upon best available information, and are extrapolated using sound methodologies.