

Chapter 5

Monitoring and Implementation

Chapter 1 of this plan outlined the Problem Statements, Goals, and Policies developed through this process as required by the Regional Problem Solving Statute. These Problem Statements, Goals, and Policies were used to provide guidance for decision-making throughout the development of this regional plan. Chapter 2 addressed one of the major inputs considered in defining the Regional Plan, which was Regional Growth Planning. Chapter 3 identified the methodology and process for establishing the proposed Urban Reserve Areas as well as the implications of Urban Reserve establishment. Chapter 4 then provided specifics regarding the individual cities choices for proposed Urban Reserve Areas.

This Chapter contains the remaining items produced by this regional planning process consistent with the requirement of the Regional Problem Solving statute. These items are contained in the Participants Agreement as required by the RPS statute and will be implemented through amendments to the County's and each participating cities' comprehensive plans, land use ordinances, and associated Urban Growth Management Agreements.

1. COMMUNITY BUFFER STRATEGY

1.1. Purchase of Conservation Easements

Although the community buffer designation described in Chapter 1 imposes no downzoning or increased regulation on the lands within its area, it is important to note that the members of the pCIC were not in full agreement on the issue of providing the community buffers more permanent protection from long-term development pressures. Some members thought it critical to provide a guarantee that these areas of separation would have permanence, while others considered it sufficient to preserve them for the near future and allow future generations to determine whether it was still in their best interests to preserve them. It was only later in the project, once the pCIC had fulfilled its responsibilities and disbanded, that the Technical Advisory Committee revisited the issue. Through the work of a subcommittee established specifically to address the buffer issue, the TAC recommended a long-term mechanism of preservation to the Policy Committee whereby owners of rural critical open space could voluntarily sell conservation easements, and owners of future urban lands would provide the funding for those purchases. The strategy the TAC developed to complement the original pCIC buffer concept gives cities an option to employ a mechanism for long-term critical open space preservation.

The COSA strategies recommended by the TAC and finally approved by the Policy Committee stayed close to the original concepts put forth by the pCIC, addressing three different buffering concepts – Rural, Urban, and Blended. However, although the Rural COSA strategy does provide for an option of a voluntary program of easement purchase, currently cities are under no requirement in this RPS process to adopt any part of the COSA strategy.

The three categories of COSA's are as follows:

1.1.1. Rural COSA

To provide for long-term preservation of important open space areas in the Greater Bear Creek Valley, the TAC developed a strategy to complement the original pCIC buffer concept in order to offer an option for cities to employ a mechanism for long-term critical open space preservation.

Strategy Details

Eligible lands: There are two major classes of lands under this strategy – receiving and sending. The receiving areas are those lands added to a city’s UGB (or included in an urban reserve) after January 1, 2009. At a minimum, this program would impact the acreage dedicated to residential uses, but each city could also include, at its discretion, commercial and industrial acreages.

Concept: This mechanism provides for the purchase of conservation easements from willing “senders” in designated critical open space areas of the city’s choosing. These easements would be purchased by all lands (receiving areas) added to a city UGB, or established as part of an urban reserve after January 1, 2009. Participation by the receiving areas would be a condition of annexation. Although the strategy focuses on the purchase of easements on critical open space in the county, it also provides for some flexibility by allowing for some or all of the easement requirement to be replaced by an affordable housing guarantee.

1.1.2. Urban COSA

The purpose of an Urban COSA is to provide for a recognizable transition between contiguous urbanized areas. The design standards to create the urban COSA would be applied to urban land along major transportation corridors.

Strategy Details

Eligible lands: Existing or planned contiguous areas of urban land between jurisdictions. As proposed in the Regional Plan, these are lands between Phoenix and Medford, and between Central Point and Medford.

Master Plan: To create an urban COSA, the affected jurisdictions would collaboratively identify, plan, finance, and implement the recommended design standards through a mutually adopted refinement plan addressing the urban or parkway design of the separating transportation corridors.

1.1.3. Blended COSA

Blended COSAs provide for flexibility in situations in which neither rural nor urban COSAs would be the most appropriate choice. Although the primary focus of a blended COSA is on preservation of key open space as the predominant and driving planning focus, which is similar to the goal of the rural COSA, there is also a component of residential/commercial development significant enough to dictate the inclusion of the entire blended COSA in the city’s urban inventory. The primary advantage of the blended COSA is the ability to provide for an optimal level of residential/commercial development, while also preserving key open space values.

Strategy Details

Eligible lands: Urban reserves with key open space value, or with importance as a preservation area to facilitate regional infrastructure needs. Designated lands must be protected by a master plan that can only be approved and modified by regional agreement.

Master Plan: The blended COSA area will function as a microcosm of the rural COSA strategy. The portions of the blended COSA designated in the master plan as residential/commercial development is required to function as receiving areas to protect the sending areas within that same mixed use area. In the event that the receiving areas within the blended COSA cannot generate sufficient easements to protect the COSA’s sending areas, then the same areas eligible for use as receiving areas per the rural uses strategy would be used to protect the blended

COSA's sending areas. Within some single large properties, the sending and receiving areas may be located on the same parcel.

2. REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL BUFFERING STANDARDS

The regional agricultural buffering standards are a research-based, regionally consistent set of standards designed to mitigate negative impacts arising from the interface between rural and urban uses. These standards were developed in 2006 by the RLRC to provide adequate consideration of potential conflict between existing rural agriculturally zoned lands and proposed urban levels of development. These standards will be required to be adopted by each participating city and the County as discussed in Section 3 of this Chapter. The proposed Buffering Standards are as follows:

1. Adequate consideration of potential conflict between existing rural agriculturally zoned lands and proposed urban levels of development is necessary during development assessment. Significant conflict is assumed to be likely in all cases where urbanization is proposed within 500 feet of Class I - IV rural agricultural land. In addition, some lesser level of conflict is assumed possible within the next 500 feet from the urban/rural boundary. Agricultural buffers that are appropriate to the realities of the region will not be successful in completely negating these potential conflicts, but can lessen their severity, frequency, and negative impact on both agriculture and urban quality of life.
2. Those individuals seeking to buy, rent, or lease urban properties within 1,000 feet of rural agricultural land should be informed in writing of the consequences of being located within a "rural agricultural impact zone."
3. Local or regional long-range planning should avoid, as far as is practicable, locating urban sensitive receptors, primarily residential development, in proximity to rural agricultural land. Where urban sensitive receptors must be located near rural agricultural land, buffering mechanisms should be used to minimize potential conflicts.
4. The central concept in buffering is adequate separation between conflicting uses. There are a number of strategies for achieving this separation through planning decisions and the use of planning controls:
 - A well-designed vegetative buffering element will reduce the amount of land required for an effective buffer.
 - Man-made or natural features should be incorporated in buffers whenever possible, such as infrastructure rights-of-way, roads, non-residential structures, watercourses, wetlands, ridge lines, rock outcrops, forested areas, and steep slopes.
 - A buffer area can provide public open space or purpose-designed buffer areas (public recreational/natural areas) if the location is appropriate for satisfying a portion of the community's open space needs, the use of the buffer area as public open space is compatible with adjoining uses, the buffer area is not the community's principle provider of recreational opportunities, and the impacts from the adjoining rural agricultural use do not overly restrict the planned recreational use of the open space.
 - Existing areas of rural residential zoning can provide the required buffering if and when the rural residential lots provide a minimum of 200 ft. of separation between the urbanizing and rural agricultural land.
 - Existing small-acreage farms (5 acres or less) can provide the required buffering if and when the small acreage farms provide at least 200 ft. of separation between the nearest farmable land (including animal enclosures) on the small-acreage farm land and the nearest planned urban sensitive receptor. The owners of these small-acreage farms must agree to the use of their property as a buffering mechanism.
 - There is a publicly owned right of way that could be incorporated as part of the buffer.

5. It is unreasonable for new urban uses to require a modification of rural agricultural activities practiced according to recognized industry standards, especially if those modifications would hamper efficient rural agricultural operations. The existing use has precedence.
6. Buffering mechanisms should be provided/funded by the proponent of the urban development. The buffering mechanisms will be physically located entirely on the urbanized property, unless:
 - there is a publicly owned right of way that could be incorporated as part of the buffer;
 - there is a naturally occurring area on the rural agricultural land that is permanently incapable of being farmed (rock formation, riparian area, etc.), is of sufficient depth, and is contiguous with the border of the urbanizing land or a publicly owned right of way;
 - the proponent of development purchases from the farm owner an easement on agricultural land of the appropriate length and depth, and pays for the establishment of whatever vegetative buffer, fencing, or irrigation system that would have been required on the urbanizing land; or
 - title to the area providing the physical portion of the buffer is transferred to the farm being buffered. If a vegetative buffer is indicated, it is installed by the developer. Whether a vegetative buffer is installed or not, the buffer is henceforth the responsibility of the farmer, and must be maintained as a buffer as long as the property remains zoned for resource use.
7. The buffering mechanisms must be included in the development application and must be approved by the city **before or concurrent with** final approval for the development project.
8. The city is responsible for enforcing compliance with all matters pertaining to the implementation of planned and approved buffering plans. The city shall permit developers flexibility in scheduling the establishment of the approved buffering mechanisms due to factors such as water availability, weather, and general logistics, although the buffer plan shall establish a sequencing of buffer mechanism implementation that demonstrates completion prior to either final plat sign off or—for larger lot buffers and in the event no land division occurs—final building inspection.
9. Although flexibility in the nature and design of buffering mechanisms can be provided for in the event of significant localized circumstances, customized (flexed) buffer designs must be at least as effective as the buffering options established herein. Proposed flexed buffer designs must be clearly justified, with the burden of proof being on the proponent of urban development to show that the flexed buffer design will not reduce the intended level of protection.
10. Class I – IV rural agricultural land is presumed to be of “high potential impact” due to the fact that it can be and often is used for a wide variety of different rural agricultural uses, and because new and as yet unforeseen uses and practices are likely to surface in the future. Therefore, these rural agricultural lands are assumed to require buffering mechanisms that mitigate the most likely high impact rural agricultural land use, regardless of present use. The only exception to this would be those Class I – IV rural agricultural lands that have a long and essentially unbroken history of rural agricultural inactivity or grazing use. These, as well as all Class VI rural agricultural lands, would be considered of “low potential impact”.
11. To mitigate a reduction of overall residential densities resulting from urban land dedicated to buffering mechanisms, a city shall permit the proponent of urban development to maintain planned densities through lot size averaging, clustering, planned development criteria, or similar techniques. The objective is to maintain minimum density across the development.
12. Where conflicts already exist between rural agricultural and urban land uses, mechanisms including mediation, source controls, and public outreach are encouraged.

The complete document containing the standards is located in Volume II, Appendix III of this Plan—*Agricultural Buffering Standards – Establishing Effective Buffers Between Rural Agricultural and Urban Uses (June 6, 2006)*.

3. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Ongoing monitoring of progress following the signing of the Participants' Agreement will take place on a number of performance indicators to determine the level of compliance with this plan or the need to refine or amend it. The measurable performance indicators listed below are those identified as appropriate for monitoring the adopted Plan.

1. On a regular basis, every 10 years starting in 2020, the Plan's jurisdictions may, at their discretion, participate in a process of coordinated periodic review.
2. On a regular basis, every 5 years starting in 2015, all Signatories to the Agreement will participate in the regular Regional Plan review process. Jackson County shall initiate the Regional Plan review process by providing notice of the Regional Plan review to each Signatory to this Agreement and requiring that each Signatory submit a self-evaluation monitoring report addressing compliance with the performance indicators set out in this Section to the County within 60 days after the date of the notice. Jackson County will distribute these monitoring reports to all Signatories.
3. Participating cities will incorporate the portions of the Regional Plan that are applicable to each individual city into that city's comprehensive plan and implementing ordinances, and will reference the Plan as an adopted element of Jackson County's comprehensive plan. To incorporate applicable portions of the Regional Plan into their comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances, cities will adopt at least the following:
 - a) urban reserve areas;
 - b) target residential densities (for the urban reserve areas);
 - c) agricultural buffering standards (for the urban reserve areas);
 - d) implementing ordinances (for the urban reserve areas).
4. Signatory jurisdictions will comply with the general conditions as listed in Section X of the Participants' Agreement (found in Volume 2 of this Plan) and, as appropriate, the specific conditions of approval for selected urban reserves, as described in the adopted Plan.
5. Signatory jurisdictions serving or projected to serve a designated urban reserve will adopt an Urban Reserve Management Agreement (URMA).
6. Urban reserves identified in the adopted Plan are the first priority lands used for UGB expansions by participating cities.
7. Cities, when applying urban designations and zones to urban reserve land included in UGB expansions, will achieve, on average, at least the "higher land need" residential densities as described in the adopted Regional Plan.
8. Cities, when applying urban designations and zones to urban reserve land included in a UGB expansion, will be guided by the general distribution of land uses proposed in the adopted Regional Plan, especially where a specific set of land uses were part of a compelling urban-based rationale for designating RLRC land as part of a city's set of urban reserves.
9. Conceptual plans for urban reserves will be developed in sufficient detail to allow the Region to determine the sizing and location of regionally significant transportation infrastructure. This information should be determined early enough in the planning and development cycle that the identified regionally significant transportation corridors can be protected as cost-effectively as possible by available strategies and funding. Conceptual

plans for an urban reserve in the Regional Plan are not required to be completed at the time of adoption of a comprehensive plan amendment incorporating urban reserves into a city or county comprehensive plan.

10. The county's population element is updated per statute to be consistent with the gradual implementation of the adopted Plan.

4. INCENTIVES AND DISINCENTIVES

The state requires that participants in an RPS process delineate the factors, mechanisms, or outcomes that constitute the most compelling reasons for participants to comply with the regional plan over the identified planning horizon.

Participants have listed the major incentives for adhering to the plan as follows:

1. Continued regional cooperation through the 10-year review process and coordinated periodic review may improve the region's ability to respond to challenges and opportunities more effectively than it does presently.
2. Adherence to the adopted Plan may provide the region with a competitive advantage, increase the attractiveness of the region to long-term investment, and improve southern Oregon's profile in the state.
3. Adherence to the adopted Plan may produce significant reductions in transportation infrastructure costs by minimizing future right-of-way acquisition costs and by improving the overall long-range coordination of transportation and land use planning.
4. Adherence to the adopted Plan will provide participating jurisdictions with population allocations that are predictable, transparent, and based on the relative strengths of the different participating jurisdictions.
5. The adopted Plan will offer compelling regional justifications and state agency support for Tolo and the South Valley Employment Center that may not have been available to an individual city proposal.
6. Adherence to the adopted Plan will permit jurisdictions to implement the flexibility provided by the concept of the "Regional Community", in which cities, in the role of "regional neighborhoods", enjoy a wide latitude in their particular mix, concentration, and intensity of land uses, as long as the sum of the regional parts contributes to a viable balance of land uses that is functional and attractive to residents and employers and in compliance with statewide goals.

The disincentives to not adhering to the regional plan largely mirror the incentives:

1. Cities that choose to expand their UGBs into land not designated as urban reserve will be required to go through the Regional Plan minor or major amendment process prior to or concurrent with any other process.
2. The region's failure to adhere to the adopted Plan may damage its competitive advantage, the attractiveness of the region to long-term investment, and southern Oregon's profile in the state.
3. Adherence to the Regional plan may be a rating factor for MPO Transportation Funding. Transportation projects of Jurisdictions not adhering to the adopted Plan may be assigned a lower priority by the MPO when considered for funding.
4. Jackson County may reconsider the population allocations of jurisdictions signatory to the Agreement not adhering to the adopted Plan.

5. Jurisdictions signatory to the Agreement not adhering to the adopted Plan may face issues over failing to observe their comprehensive plans, or may find it difficult to make modifications to their comprehensive plans that deviate from the adopted Plan.
6. Jurisdictions signatory to the Agreement failure to adhere to the adopted Plan will compromise its ability to implement the concept of the “Regional Community”, and will not provide the participating cities with as wide a latitude in their desired individual mix, concentration, and intensity of land uses.

5. MONITORING AND PLAN ADJUSTMENTS

Participating jurisdictions will maintain a monitoring system to ensure compliance with this plan and future amendments. Specific standards against which performance will be judged are listed in Section IV of the Participants’ Agreement (found in Volume 2 of this Plan). The regular monitoring system will consist of reports submitted by the participating jurisdictions every five years, starting in 2015. The reports will include descriptions of their jurisdiction’s activities pertinent to this plan for the preceding ten-year period, analysis as to whether and how well those activities meet performance standards in Section IV of the Participant’s Agreement, and a projection of activities for the next five-year period. Monitoring to ensure compliance with the adopted Plan will be a shared responsibility. Each city will be responsible for monitoring its adherence to the portion of the adopted Plan that is incorporated into its comprehensive plan. Jackson County, which will have the full adopted Plan incorporated into its comprehensive plan, will be responsible for overall monitoring.

Processing amendments to the adopted Plan will be the responsibility of Jackson County, and can only be proposed by the governing authority of a signatory jurisdiction. In acknowledgement of the collaborative process by which the adopted Plan was created, Jackson County will have available the assistance of the signatory entities to this Agreement through a Technical Advisory Committee and Policy Committee. Both committees serve on an as-needed basis, and both serve in an advisory capacity to Jackson County.

- **Technical Advisory Committee**

The TAC will be comprised of planners and senior-level staff from signatory jurisdictions and agencies, and each signatory will have one vote, irrespective of the number of participating representatives. Recommendations to the Policy Committee or directly to Jackson County will be made by at least a supermajority vote (simple majority plus one) of attending signatory jurisdictions and agencies.

- **Policy Committee**

The Policy Committee will be comprised of elected officials or executive staff from signatory jurisdictions and agencies. Each signatory jurisdiction will designate a voting and alternate voting member, and each signatory jurisdiction will have one vote. Recommendations to Jackson County will be made by at least a supermajority vote (simple majority plus one) of attending jurisdictions. State agencies, the MPO, and Rogue Valley Sewer Services, while Signatories, will not be voting members of the Policy Committee.

When an amendment to the adopted Regional Plan is proposed, Jackson County will make a preliminary determination regarding whether the proposed amendment is a Minor Amendment or Major Amendment, as defined below, will notify signatory jurisdictions and affected agencies (see exhibit 6-1) of the County’s preliminary determination, and will solicit input. Based on its preliminary determination, Jackson County will review the proposed amendment according to the procedures for Minor Amendments or Major Amendments set out below.

Proposed amendments to the adopted Plan will adhere to the following provisions:

A) **Minor Amendment**

A minor amendment is defined as any request for an amendment to the adopted Plan that:

- a) does not conflict with the general conditions listed in Section X of the Participants' Agreement or specific conditions of approval described in the adopted Regional Plan; and
 - b) does not propose an addition of more than 50 acres to a city's urban reserves established for a city in the adopted Regional Plan or more than a 50-acre expansion of the UGB into non-urban reserve rural land.
- In the case of Ashland, which did not establish urban reserves during the development of the Plan process, a proposal to establish an urban reserve or expand its UGB of not more than 50 acres will be considered a minor amendment.
 - Should a city exceed its limit of 50 acres for adding to its urban reserves during the term of the Agreement, it may not use the minor amendment process for further alterations to its urban reserves. Should a city exceed its limit of 50 acres for expanding its UGB into non-urban reserve rural land during the planning horizon, it may not use the minor amendment process for further expansions of its UGB into non-urban reserve land.
 - Any participant jurisdiction may initiate a minor amendment to the adopted Plan. The proposing jurisdiction must clearly identify the nature of the minor amendment, and specify whether the minor amendment would require any other signatory jurisdiction to amend its comprehensive plan. Should any signatory jurisdiction other than the proposing jurisdiction and Jackson County be required to amend their comprehensive plans as a result of the proposed minor amendment, the affected signatory jurisdiction will be a party to the minor amendment proceeding.
 - Jackson County's process, and the proposing jurisdiction's process, for a minor amendment to the Plan will be equivalent to the state and local required processes for a comprehensive plan amendment.
 - Signatories and agencies shall be provided with notice of the County's and proposing jurisdiction's final decision on each minor amendment request within five working days of the adoption of the final decision.

B) Major Amendment

A major amendment is defined as any requested amendment to the adopted Plan that does not meet the definition of a Minor Amendment.

- If multiple signatory jurisdictions are involved in a single request for a major amendment, a lead jurisdiction will be selected by the affected jurisdictions.
- Notice containing a detailed description of the proposed change will be forwarded by Jackson County to all signatories and affected agencies (see exhibit 6-1).
- Staff from signatory jurisdictions and agencies will meet as a Technical Advisory Committee and generate a recommendation to the Policy Committee by vote of at least a supermajority of those present (simple majority plus one).
- Decision-makers from signatory jurisdictions and agencies will meet as a Policy Committee and consider the proposal and the Technical Advisory Committee recommendation. Attending jurisdictions will constitute a quorum; and the Policy Committee will generate a recommendation to Jackson County by vote of at least a supermajority of those present (simple majority plus one).
- Jackson County's process, and the proposing jurisdiction's process, for a minor or major amendment to the Plan will be equivalent to the state and local required process for a comprehensive plan amendment, in addition to the Regional Plan-specific provisions. Signatories and affected agencies shall be provided with notice of the final decision on each major or minor amendment within five working days of the adoption of the final decision. Jurisdictions or agencies shall be noticed routinely or as needed according to Figure 5.1.

Figure 5.1

JURISDICTIONS AND AGENCIES TO RECEIVE NOTIFICATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE ADOPTED PLAN		
Jurisdiction or Agency	Routine	As Needed
City of Eagle Point	X	
City of Central Point	X	
City of Medford	X	
City of Phoenix	X	
City of Talent	X	
City of Ashland	X	
Oregon Department of Transportation	X	
Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development	X	
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality	X	
Oregon Economic and Community Development Department	X	
Oregon Department of Agriculture	X	
Oregon Housing and Community Development Department	X	
Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization	X	
Rogue Valley Sewer Services	X	
Medford Water Commission	X	
Rogue Valley Council of Governments	X	
City of Jacksonville		X
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife		X
Division of State Lands		X
Rogue Valley Transit District		X
Ashland School District #5		X
Central Point School District #6		X
Jackson County School District #9		X
Medford School District 549C		X
Phoenix-Talent School District #4		X
Eagle Point Irrigation District		X
Medford Irrigation District		X
Rogue Valley Irrigation District		X
Talent Irrigation District		X
Jackson Soil and Water Conservation District		X

6. RPS IMPLEMENTATION TECHNIQUES

The Regional Problem Solving Agreement contains “Optional Implementation Techniques”. This section explains how these optional techniques are applied in or through the Regional Plan to solve the Regional Problems and achieve the Regional Goals associated thereto. Implementation techniques noted here are organized according to Section V of the Regional Problem Solving Agreement (RPSA) found in Volume 2 of this Plan. The problem statement, associated goal and implementation technique from the RPSA are recited and are followed by the techniques’ execution by or through the plan.

6.1 *Optional Implementation Techniques*

Problem No. 1. Lack of a Mechanism for Coordinated Regional Growth Planning

Goal No. 1 *Manage Future Regional Growth for the Greater Public Good*

Optional Implementation Techniques:

1) Coordinated Periodic Review. *Implementing Signatories may engage in a coordinated schedule of regular Periodic Reviews following the adoption of the plan. This regionally coordinated Periodic Review will begin in 2012, will take place every 10 years, and will coincide with the ten-year reviews of the adopted Plan. This coordinated Periodic Review will provide an opportunity to take advantage of an economy of scale in generating technical information, and to incorporate a regional perspective in the Periodic Review process, but it does not mandate a simultaneous or linked process among jurisdictions.*

This technique is given effect upon adoption of the Regional Plan. Execution of the technique, when utilized, will occur as a future action following Regional Plan adoption.

2) Ten-year RPS Review. *Implementing Signatories will abide by the review process described in Section VI of the RPSA. The review process complies with the monitoring requirement in the RPS statute, and affords participating jurisdictions flexibility in responding to changing regional and local circumstances by establishing a process and venue for amending the Plan.*

This technique is given effect upon adoption of the Regional Plan. Execution of the technique will occur as a future action following plan adoption and consistent with the procedures established in RPSA Section VI.

3) Coordinated Population Allocation. *Jackson County’s allocation of future population growth, a state-mandated responsibility of the County, will reflect the Implementing Signatories’ proportional allocation of future population within the Plan and its future amendments consistent with statute.*

The Regional Plan executes this strategy by extending the existing population allocations in the Jackson County Comprehensive Plan Population Element that end in 2040 out to the RPS Planning Horizon for participating jurisdictions. This is discussed further in Chapter 2 of this Plan.

4) Greater Coordination with the MPO. *As a proven mechanism of regional collaborative planning in the region, the MPO, as the federally designated transportation planning entity, will plan and coordinate the regionally significant transportation strategies critical to the success of the Plan. Of special focus will be the development of mechanisms to preserve rights-of-way for major transportation infrastructure, and a means of creating supplemental funding for regionally significant transportation projects.*

This technique is given effect upon adoption of the Regional Plan. Execution of the planning work to be accomplished by the technique is delegated to the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). The MPO is a supporting signatory on the RPSA and an organization to which all Participants are a member.

Problem No. 2 Loss of Valuable Farm and Forest Land Caused by Urban Expansion

Goal No. 2 *Conserve resource and open space lands for their important economic, cultural, and livability benefits*

Optional Implementation Techniques:

1) Long-Range Urban Reserves. *The establishment of Urban Reserves sufficient to serve the doubling of the Region's urban population will allow long-term production decisions to be made on agricultural land not included in urban reserves.*

The Regional Plan executes this technique directly by establishing Urban Reserves for the participating jurisdictions. These reserves are discussed in Chapters 3 and 4 of this Plan.

2) Regional Agricultural Buffering Standards. *Implementing Signatories will apply the adopted Plan's set of agricultural buffering standards as a means of mitigating negative impacts arising from the rural/urban interface.*

This technique is executed after adoption of the Regional Plan through local land development ordinance amendments to be consistent with the standards in Volume 2, Appendix III of the Regional Plan.

3) Critical Open Space Area (COSA) Preservation. *The COSA strategies outlined in Appendix V of the Regional Plan are available as an option to Signatory jurisdictions interested in further accentuating or more permanently preserving areas of separation between communities (community buffers). These COSA strategies are not mandatory for any jurisdiction, and may be refined or expanded as individual jurisdictions see fit.*

This problem solving technique is supported but not independently established by the Regional Plan. The Regional Plan establishes a framework to undertake more specific open space preservation as part of future planning and acquisition efforts. The COSA strategies are outlined in this chapter above.

Problem No. 3 *Loss of Community Identity*

Goal No. 3 *Recognize and emphasize the individual identity, unique features, and relative competitive advantages and disadvantages of each community within the Region.*

Optional Implementation Techniques:

1) Community Buffers. *The establishment of Urban Reserves outside of the areas of critical open space provides for a basic level of preservation for the Region's important areas of community separation.*

The Regional Plan executes this technique directly by establishing Urban Reserves for the participating jurisdictions which do not include areas identified as critical open space.

2) Allocating to Competitive Advantages. *The Region agrees to a distribution of the calculated need of residential and employment lands among the Implementing Signatories necessary to support a regional doubling of the population. This distribution, which depends on a number of factors that relate to the comparative strengths and weaknesses of Implementing Signatories, allows each community to develop its own balance of viability and individuality within the larger regional matrix.*

This technique is implemented directly by the RPS Plan. This technique refines the regional growth planning into growth planning for population and employment for the individual participants according to the particular characteristics of the individual cities. The technique then extends this growth planning to land need for these individual growth planning activities.

3) Critical Open Space Area (COSA) Preservation. *The COSA strategies outlined in Appendix V of the Regional Plan are available as an option to Signatory jurisdictions interested in further accentuating or more permanently preserving areas of separation between communities (community buffers). These COSA strategies are not mandatory for any jurisdiction, and may be refined or expanded as individual jurisdictions see fit.*

This problem solving technique is supported but not independently established by the Regional Plan. The Regional Plan establishes a framework that participants may undertake for specific open space preservation as part of future preservation efforts. The COSA strategies are outlined above in this chapter.