



# Oregon

Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

**Department of Land Conservation and Development**

635 Capitol Street, Suite 150

Salem, OR 97301-2540

(503) 373-0050

Fax (503) 378-5518

www.lcd.state.or.us

## NOTICE OF ADOPTED AMENDMENT

December 21, 2006

TO: Subscribers to Notice of Adopted Plan  
or Land Use Regulation Amendments

FROM: Mara Ulloa, Plan Amendment Program Specialist

SUBJECT: Douglas County Plan Amendment  
DLCD File Number 015-06



The Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) received the attached notice of adoption. A copy of the adopted plan amendment is available for review at the DLCD office in Salem and the local government office.

Appeal Procedures\*

### **DLCD ACKNOWLEDGMENT or DEADLINE TO APPEAL: January 2, 2007**

This amendment was submitted to DLCD for review 45 days prior to adoption. Pursuant to ORS 197.830 (2)(b) only persons who participated in the local government proceedings leading to adoption of the amendment are eligible to appeal this decision to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).

If you wish to appeal, you must file a notice of intent to appeal with the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) no later than 21 days from the date the decision was mailed to you by the local government. If you have questions, check with the local government to determine the appeal deadline. Copies of the notice of intent to appeal must be served upon the local government and others who received written notice of the final decision from the local government. The notice of intent to appeal must be served and filed in the form and manner prescribed by LUBA, (OAR Chapter 661, Division 10). Please call LUBA at 503-373-1265, if you have questions about appeal procedures.

**\*NOTE: THE APPEAL DEADLINE IS BASED UPON THE DATE THE DECISION WAS MAILED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENT. A DECISION MAY HAVE BEEN MAILED TO YOU ON A DIFFERENT DATE THAN IT WAS MAILED TO DLCD. AS A RESULT YOUR APPEAL DEADLINE MAY BE EARLIER THAN THE ABOVE DATE SPECIFIED.**

Cc: Doug White, DLCD Community Services Specialist  
John Renz, DLCD Regional Representative  
Bob Cortright, DLCD Transportation & Growth Management Coordinator  
Christine Valentine, DLCD Natural Hazards & Floodplains Specialist  
Phil Stenbeck, Douglas County

<paa> yal

FORM 2

D L C D NOTICE OF ADOPTION

DEPT OF

This form **must be mailed** to DLCD **within 5 working days after the final decision** per ORS 197.610, OAR Chapter 660 - Division 18

DEC 14 2006

(See reverse side for submittal requirements)

LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Jurisdiction: Douglas County Local File No: None  
(if no number, use none)

Date of Adoption: December 6, 2006 Date Mailed: December 12, 2006  
(Must be filled in) (Date mailed or sent to DLCD)

Date the Notice of Proposed Amendment was mailed to DLCD: September 27, 2006

Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment     Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment  
 Land Use Regulation Amendment     Zoning Map Amendment  
 New Land Use Regulation     Other: Douglas County TSP

(Please Specify Type of Action)

Summarize the adopted amendment. Do not use technical terms. Do not write "See Attached."  
Adoption of Interchange Area Management Plan, Rural Community and Rural Residential Land Inventory, Tri City policy update, and adoption of the County Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan and Community Wildfire Protection Plan.

Describe how the adopted amendment differs from the proposed amendment. If it is the same, write "Same." If you did not give notice of the proposed amendment, write "N/A."

The original proposal included a buildable lands inventory for Tri City, which has been withdrawn, so only some minor policy updates remain.

\_\_\_\_\_ Plan Map

Changed From: N/A to N/A

Zone Map Changed From: N/A to N/A

Location: N/A Acres Involved: N/A

Specify Density: Previous: N/A New: N/A

Applicable Statewide Planning Goals: N/A

Was an Exception Adopted? Yes:  No:

DLCD File No: 015-06 (15588)



Did the Department of Land Conservation and Development **receive** a Notice of Proposed Amendment **FORTY- FIVE (45) days prior to the first evidentiary hearing?** Yes:  No:

If no, do the Statewide Planning Goals apply? Yes:  No:

If no, did The Emergency Circumstances Require immediate adoption? Yes:  No:

Affected State or Federal Agencies, Local Government or Special Districts: \_\_\_\_\_

Local Contact: Phil Stenbeck Area Code + Phone Number: (541) 440-4289

Address: Room 106, Justice Building, Douglas County Courthouse

City: Roseburg, Oregon Zip Code + 4: 97470

=====

### ADOPTION SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

This form **must be mailed** to DLCD **within 5 working days after the final decision**  
per ORS 197.610, OAR Chapter 660 - Division 18.

1. Send this Form and TWO (2) Copies of the Adopted Amendment to:

**ATTENTION: PLAN AMENDMENT SPECIALIST  
DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT  
635 CAPITOL STREET NE, SUITE 150  
SALEM, OREGON 97301-2540**

2. Submit **TWO (2) copies** of the adopted material, if copies are bounded please submit **TWO (2) complete copies** of documents and maps.
3. Please Note: Adopted materials must be sent to DLCD not later than **FIVE (5) working days** following the date of the final decision on the amendment.
4. Submittal of this Notice of Adoption must include the text of the amendment plus adopted findings and supplementary information.
5. The deadline to appeal will be extended if you submit this notice of adoption within five working days of the final decision. Appeals to LUBA may be filed within **TWENTY-ONE (21) days** of the date, the "Notice of Adoption" is sent to DLCD.
6. In addition to sending "Notice of Adoption" to DLCD, you must notify persons who participated in the local hearing and requested notice of the final decision.
7. **Need more copies?** You can copy this form on to 8½ x 11 green paper only; or call the DLCD Office at (503) 373-0050; or Fax your request to: (503) 378-5518; or email your request to [Larry.French@state.or.us](mailto:Larry.French@state.or.us) - ATTENTION: PLAN AMENDMENT SPECIALIST.



DOUGLAS COUNTY OREGON  
FILED

DEC 06 2006

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF DOUGLAS COUNTY, OREGON**  
BARBARA E. NIELSEN, COUNTY CLERK

AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING )  
AMENDMENTS TO THE DOUGLAS ) **ORDINANCE NO. 2006-11-02**  
COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND )  
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN )

RECITALS

- A. Amendments to the Douglas County Comprehensive Plan and Transportation System Plan (TSP) are needed in order to update the Comprehensive Plan and integrate and adopt by reference the Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) into the TSP; and integrate and adopt by reference the Douglas County Rural Community Inventory, the Douglas County Rural Residential Land Inventory, the Tri City Area Plan updates, the Douglas County Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan (NHMP) and the Douglas County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) into the Comprehensive Plan.
- B. On November 16, 2006, the Douglas County Planning Commission held a hearing and recommended that the amendments be adopted by the Board of Commissioners.

**THE DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:**


SECTION ONE: The amendments contained and referenced in the yellow attachment titled "Amendments to the Douglas County Comprehensive Plan and the Douglas County Transportation System Plan", Final Draft, dated December 6, 2006, are ADOPTED and by reference made part of this Ordinance.


SECTION TWO: The amendments are necessary and appropriate and shall become effective on January 5, 2007.

SECTION THREE: SEVERABILITY; If any provision of this ordinance is held to be invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect the validity of any other provision of the ordinance. The ordinance shall be construed as if such invalid provision had never been included.

DATED this 6<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2006

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF DOUGLAS COUNTY, OREGON

  
Chair

  
Commissioner

**ABSENT**

Commissioner



**Amendments to the**

**DOUGLAS COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

**AND THE DOUGLAS COUNTY**

**TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN**

**FINAL DRAFT**  
**December 6, 2006**

**Planning Commission**  
**November 16, 2006**

**Board of Commissioners**  
**December 6, 2006**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. **Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP) for Exit 103, 106, 108.**  
- Douglas County Comprehensive Plan and TSP.  
Page 2 **Amendments to the Transportation System Plan integrating the IAMP for 103, 106, 108.**
  
2. **Douglas County's Rural Community Inventory.**  
- Douglas County Comprehensive Plan - Chapter 15  
Page 10 **Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan integrating the Rural Community Inventory.**
  
3. **Douglas County's Rural Residential Lands Inventory.**  
- Douglas County Comprehensive Plan - Chapter 15  
Page 15 **Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan integrating the Rural Residential Lands Inventory.**
  
4. **Tri City Area of the Myrtle Creek UGB Comprehensive Plan Update .**  
- Douglas County Comprehensive Plan - Chapter 15  
Page 20 **Selected Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan for Tri City.**
  
5. **Douglas County Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan (NHMP).**  
- Douglas County Comprehensive Plan - Chapter 5  
Page 23 **Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan integrating the Douglas County Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan (NHMP).**
  
6. **Douglas County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).**  
- Douglas County Comprehensive Plan - Chapter 2  
Page 26 **Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan integrating the Douglas County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).**

### KEY

Amendments are identified by both **BOLDING** and UNDERLINING.  
Additions to Amendments are identified by both *ITALICIZED* and UNDERLINING.



**1. INTERCHANGE AREA MANAGEMENT  
PLAN (IAMP) FOR EXIT 103 - 106 - 108  
IN DOUGLAS COUNTY**

## **1. INTERCHANGE AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN (IAMP) FOR EXIT 103 - 106 - 108 IN DOUGLAS COUNTY.**

**PURPOSE:** Provide interchanges which accommodate land uses and economic opportunity in the IAMP area consistent with the Douglas County Comprehensive Plan and the Douglas County Transportation System Plan.

**BACKGROUND:** The Southern Douglas County area has been promoted and targeted for new industrial growth by Douglas County and the State of Oregon. I-5 Interchanges 103, 106, and 108 serve the area promoted and targeted for new industrial growth. In addition they provide access to the Myrtle Creek Airport and serve the City of Myrtle Creek and Tri City urban areas to the east, as well as tribal lands, rural and resource land. Through this legislative amendment process, Douglas County will integrate the IAMP into the Douglas County Comprehensive Plan (Chapter 13 - Transportation) and the Douglas County Transportation System Plan (TSP).

**AMENDMENT:** Amend the Douglas County Comprehensive Plan by modifying the County Transportation System Plan to include by reference the Interchange Area Management Plan ("IAMP") for I-5 Interchanges 103 (Riddle), 106 (Weaver Road), and 108 (Myrtle Creek) and specifically amend the TSP text to include:

**PAGE 4-27 IN THE DOUGLAS COUNTY TSP.**

### **INTERCHANGE CHANGE AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR I-5 INTERCHANGE 103, 106, AND 108 IN DOUGLAS COUNTY**

**The Douglas County Transportation System Plan (TSP) was completed in 2004 and establishes a system of transportation facilities and level of service adequate to meet the County's transportation needs. The Douglas County TSP includes a determination of future transportation needs for road, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, air, water, rail, and pipeline systems; policies and regulations for the implementation of the TSP; and a transportation funding program. The Tri City Urban Unincorporated Circulation Plan (2001) was also considered during the development of the IAMP. This circulation plan is one of three urban unincorporated circulation plans that are part of the Douglas County TSP.**

**Interchanges 103, 106, and 108 are located along I-5 in Southern Douglas County in an area that has been promoted and targeted for new industrial growth by both**



Douglas County and the State of Oregon. They provide important access between I-5 and the communities of Myrtle Creek, Tri City, and Riddle; the Myrtle Creek Airport; and the South Umpqua Industrial Park at Interchange 103. The three interchanges are deficient from a design and operational perspective. At Interchange 103, (also known as "Riddle Bypass" and "Pruner Road"), the overpass bridge is functionally obsolete and driveways and access points are located closer to the ramp terminals than allowed by current standards. Interchange 106, Weaver Road, also has access points too close to the ramp terminals, and the bridge is both functionally obsolete and does not meet vertical clearance standards. In addition, the frontage road at Interchange 106 serving the Myrtle Creek Municipal Airport between I-5 and the South Umpqua River may need to be relocated, and is constrained by proximity to the river's floodway and floodplain. Douglas County has secured funding for the construction of the Weaver Road Bridge at Interchange 106, crossing the South Umpqua River and connecting Tri City to I-5. Funding for the Weaver Road Bridge was earmarked in the federal transportation bill passed by the U.S. Congress in August 2005. Interchange 108, Myrtle Creek, has tight curves at the entrance ramps and deficient acceleration lengths. Its overpass bridge is also functionally obsolete.

The 2025 Future Operations Analysis includes a No-Build and two Build scenarios: Option 1, which assumes improvements to Interchange 103, and Option 2, which includes improvements to Interchange 103 and a new Weaver Road Bridge over the South Umpqua River. The level of service and a comparison of traffic volume demand to intersection capacity (v/c) was determined for the approach ramps for the No-build and the two Build options. In addition, a signal warrant analysis was performed for Interchanges 103 and 106, and the connection of Weaver Road at Old Pacific Highway for Build Option 2. Finally, an intersection analysis was performed for each interchange, using 2025 traffic volumes and traffic and signal/unsignalized assumptions for the No-Build and Build options. Conclusions resulting from this analysis (Build Option 2) are as follows:

The Interchange 103 ramp terminals will operate at LOS F within 20 years unless improvements are made. The planned widening of the bridge and likely signalization of the ramps will allow the intersections to operate at LOS B and C during the PM peak hour.

The ramp merge and diverge areas for all three interchanges will continue to operate at acceptable LOS within the next 20 years.

The intersection of Pruner Road and Old Pacific Highway should be redesigned with a curve between the north and west legs and removal of the stop signs for



these approaches. This would allow for the north-west traffic movements to flow freely. The east and south legs could be combined into one approach with a stop sign.

The Interchange 106 ramp terminals will be able to handle the additional traffic demand resulting from the construction of the Weaver Road Bridge without any improvements. Ramp terminals for Interchange 106 are predicted to operate at an acceptable level of service under stop control with volume to capacity ratios well below the ODOT standards even with construction of the proposed bridge.

The increase in truck volume at Interchange 106 may be problematic due to current deficiencies in the interchange geometry. There may be a need to examine heavy vehicle turning radii to make sure ramp design can accommodate heavy vehicle use when making improvements.

Multiple projects have been identified to address the identified deficiencies at the three interchanges. The 2003 OTIA III legislation includes sufficient funding to pay for bridge replacement and limited modernization for the Interchange 103 bridge. In addition, Douglas County has secured funding for construction of the Weaver Road Bridge at Interchange 106, which will cross the South Umpqua River and connect to Highway 99 in Tri City. Funding for the Weaver Road Bridge was earmarked in the federal transportation bill passed by the U.S. Congress in August 2005. ODOT has also secured OTIA III funds for Interchange 108, the Myrtle Creek Arch Bridge.

#### *Policy and Design Elements for Interchange 103*

The IAMP includes conceptual designs for Interchange 103, but not for Interchanges 106 or 108. Designs for Interchanges 106 and 108 will be developed to work with future planning efforts for the Weaver Road Bridge and any future improvements to I-5 near Interchange 108. The Interchange 108 concepts will integrate with the planning for the Myrtle Creek Arch Bridge, a current Douglas County project.

The planned improvements at Interchange 103 include reconstruction of the bridge to a 3-lane facility and a northbound on-ramp in the northeast quadrant of the interchange. These improvements constitute the "preferred alternative" (see IAMP Section 4.0, Alternatives Considered, Existing Configuration with Modified Ramp). One of two configurations containing these design elements will be implemented, either the Standard and Tight Diamond Interchange (Preferred Alternative, Option 1) or the Diamond Configuration with Two Northbound On-Ramps (Preferred Alternative, Option 2).



Whether a diamond interchange is described as a “standard” diamond or “tight” diamond depends on the distance between the ramp terminals. A standard diamond generally has sufficient separation that left-turn lanes at the ramp terminals do not overlap. With a tight diamond, left turn lanes in opposing directions are often side-by-side on the crossroad. To provide a through lane and a left-turn lane in each direction, a standard diamond requires a bridge three lanes wide, while a tight diamond requires four lanes. Although access spacing would be improved with the tight diamond concept, it still would not meet the 1,320-foot access spacing called for in the OHP. To meet spacing standards, other local access points would need to either be closed, or re-routed to intersecting streets (see IAMP Appendix J., Access Management Plan). The widened bridge allows for new left turn lanes at the ramp terminals reducing traffic delays. It is assumed that signals will be installed at the ramp terminals.

The second option for implementing the preferred alternative includes adding a new northbound on-ramp, identified as the Diamond Configuration with Two Northbound On-Ramps in Section 4.0 of the IAMP. This design option would combine a diamond interchange with a loop ramp for the traffic from the west seeking to go north on I-5. (See IAMP Figure 8). This configuration would retain the advantage by which right turns are made by vehicles from the west seeking to travel north on I-5. It would also allow vehicles from the east to use right turns to access I-5 northbound. This configuration would require a longer span for the bridge carrying the traffic across I-5. However, the need for signalization of the northbound ramp terminals would be delayed by several years.

The configuration that is ultimately chosen will need to meet Oregon Highway Plan access management standards and current Highway Design Manual standards or an exception must be approved as part of a future implementation step. The configuration must also take into account the implications of Measure 37, and the nexus outlined in the Dolan decision pertaining to private property rights.

#### *Access Management Strategy and Access Management Plan*

The IAMP includes both an Access Management Strategy and an Access Management Plan. The Access Management Strategy identifies the location and type of approaches and any other necessary improvements to the highway (operations, medians, etc.) within the project area. The Access Management Plan includes the elements of the strategy with the addition of a comprehensive area-wide solution for local access and circulation to minimize use of state highway for local access and circulation and to preserve the functional capacity of the highway. The short-term actions are consistent with the IAMP goals and may be implemented in connection with the Interchange 103 Improvement Project and



will be the responsibility of ODOT. The Access Management Plan includes medium- and long-term actions recommended as land use changes and redevelopment occurs or in concurrence with future roadway improvement projects. Access management considerations include:

In the vicinity of Interchange 103, extending a circulation road along Parcel 4 (McDonald's, T30S R5W 7C TL 800) to provide access to the properties south of Pruner Road when Parcel 3 (T30S R5W 7C TL 900) is developed and a change of use occurs. At this time, driveway Access 4 to Parcel 4 would be closed and a new driveway connecting to the circulation road would be developed on the west side of Parcel 4.

Implementing the redesign of the intersection of Pruner Road and Old Pacific Highway to include a curve between the north and west legs and removal of the stop signs for these approaches. This would allow north-west traffic movements to flow freely. The east and south legs could be combined into one approach with a stop sign.

Working with the ODOT to relocate the intersection of Weaver Road / Aviation Drive further east from Interchange 106 in conjunction with a new Weaver Road bridge.

Closing access to Old Pacific Highway (Highway 99) for properties with alternative access points as new development occurs.

An examination of heavy vehicle turning radii to make sure the ramp design can accommodate heavy vehicle use when making improvements in the Weaver Road corridor, including Interchange 106. Modification to the existing ramp terminal geometrics or increasing the bridge width may be necessary to accommodate heavy trucks.

Coordinating with ODOT on general access management actions throughout the planning area, including encouraging redevelopment opportunities that consolidate access points, encouraging the sharing of access points between adjacent properties, providing driveway access via local roads where possible, and minimizing driveway widths.

The strategy and actions in the IAMP are based on existing land uses for each parcel. When a property is developed, redeveloped, or a change-of-use occurs, an application for a permit will be required if access is proposed from the state highway system. At that time, any existing approach and any new proposed



approach will be evaluated. The IAMP will guide ODOT and Douglas County when completing a change-of-use assessment.

The Access Management Strategy and actions presented in the IAMP are intended to improve highway conditions by moving towards meeting the appropriate ODOT access management standards, while at the same time taking into consideration the need to maintain reasonable access to existing properties and addressing safety priorities.

PAGE 4-37 IN THE DOUGLAS COUNTY TSP.

1. Douglas County recognizes the importance of Interstate 5 in the movement of people and goods to and from the region and is committed to protecting the function of interchanges 103, 106, and 108 to provide access to I-5. The function of these interchanges, as defined in the I-5 Interchange 103, 106, 108 Interchange Area Management Plan, is to safely and efficiently accommodate the future traffic demands associated with current rural and urban land uses in the planning area and the expected state and regional growth.
2. The County supports land uses in the vicinity of interchanges 103, 106, and 108 consistent with the adopted improvements in the Interchange Area Management Plan for these interchanges. Consistent with this, the County supports continued agricultural use of land in the Interchange 106 interchange study area, except where identified in the IAMP for expansion of the Myrtle Creek Urban Growth Boundary.
3. Douglas County will coordinate with ODOT in evaluating land use actions that could affect the function of interchanges 103, 106, and 108.
4. Douglas County will coordinate with ODOT prior to amending its transportation system plan or proposing transportation improvements that could affect the function of interchanges 103, 106, 108.

5. Douglas County will not rely on interchanges 103, 106, or 108 for providing additional capacity to support future land use actions in the County that are not consistent with the planned improvements to these interchanges.
6. Consistent with County policies that seek to ensure the balance between land use and transportation, the IAMP contains policies that outline the steps that define ODOT's role in protecting the function of the interchanges. The IAMP also provides policy language that describes under what circumstances the State and County will need to undertake amendments to the IAMP in order to ensure that land use changes do not impact the planned capacity at Interchange 103.
7. If future County initiated changes to the land use designations or uses allowed in the IAMP Planning Area result in the need for additional capacity at the interchange, Douglas County will prepare amendments to the IAMP. Proposed IAMP amendments shall be coordinated with ODOT staff and the revised IAMP and funding plan shall be submitted to the OTC for approval.
8. Douglas County, subject to applicable law, the standards of the Dolan Decision and the limitations of Measure 37, will assist ODOT in achieving the following access management objectives of the IAMP:
  - Encourage redevelopment opportunities that consolidate access points.
  - Encourage sharing of access points between adjacent properties.
  - Use access management spacing standards to the extent possible to offset driveways at proper distances to minimize the number of conflict points between traffic using the driveways and through-traffic.
  - Minimize driveway widths and provide driveway access via local roads where possible.
  - Interconnect traffic signals with adjacent signals to create a coordinated timing system.
9. The IAMP for Exit's 103, 106, and 108 is a part of Douglas County's TSP and by reference adopted as a support document to the Comprehensive Plan.



## **2. RURAL COMMUNITY INVENTORY**

## 2. RURAL COMMUNITY INVENTORY

**PURPOSE:** Provide current information on undeveloped parcels in Douglas County's Rural Communities for the Douglas County Comprehensive Plan and develop policy to foster appropriate levels of community and neighborhood developments that are appropriate for and meet the needs of each of the communities and neighborhoods.

*The policies for Rural Residential land in Rural Communities is designed to provide guidance to owners, applicants and the County on the desired level of rural development opportunities in Douglas County. They are designed to serve as a guide for future plan amendments or updates, whether quasi-judicial or legislative, and to support and encourage applications that are reviewed through the required goal and rule process.*

*These plan provisions do not, in themselves, justify a plan amendment but can be considered and used in future applications reviewed by Douglas County.*

**BACKGROUND:** The Rural Community Inventory developed in 2006 analyzed Rural Residential Lands within Douglas County's seventeen Rural Communities. The information gathered is being integrated into the Douglas County Comprehensive Plan, making the information in the Comprehensive Plan contemporary.

**AMENDMENT:** Through this legislative amendment process, Douglas County will integrate the Rural Community Inventory into the Douglas County Comprehensive Plan. These amendments have implications for Chapter 15 (Land Use) of the Douglas County Comprehensive Plan. *The last amendment will be language added to Page 2 of the Rural Community Inventory.*



PAGE 15-39

POLICIES:

7. Develop and maintain an inventory of Residential, Industrial, and Commercial lands in each Rural Community to address any needed land supplies that may be identified in future updates and changes to the County Comprehensive Plan. Providing for other commercial and industrial uses within or near existing Rural Communities is also important to each of the Rural Communities and the economy of Douglas County.

PAGE 15-40

POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

4. RURAL RESIDENTIAL INFILL: Douglas County has a history of steady population growth in its Rural Communities. The Rural Residential home sites provided for in Rural Communities, are important to Douglas County's economy due to their close proximity to resource lands and jobs located in rural Douglas County. Douglas County's economy in large part is resource related. Rural Communities provide home opportunities which proved shorter travel distances to resource related jobs, which reduces transportation infrastructure costs, and provides housing which is often times made affordable by reducing the trip length to and from jobs. The social fabric of these Rural Communities are also a long standing important part of Douglas County's culture. When Rural Residential lands within a Rural Community reach a level of infill development which reduces the Rural Residential land inventory below a 10 year land supply, the County will consider adding lands with lower resource potential, to the Rural Community based on reasons and identified local need. This level of Rural Residential land inventory is needed to accommodate the resource related job base in Douglas County, and to maintain Douglas County's historic social fabric.
5. RURAL RESIDENTIAL NEW PARCEL INVENTORY: When the potential Rural Community Rural Residential new parcel inventory falls short of what

is needed to maintain a 10 year inventory, the County will consider adding lands with lower resource potential, to the Rural Community based on reasons and the identified local need.

Page 15-48 Add finding number (18.) as follows:

18. Rural Community's in Douglas County have seen considerable infill development since their creation. Douglas County's population growth rate is projected at an average 1.38% annually. When this population growth rate is applied to the existing and potential buildable lands in Douglas County's Rural Communities, it appears that 12 of Douglas County's 17 Rural Communities are or will soon be without new homesite opportunities.

**RURAL COMMUNITY INFILL DEVELOPMENT DATA**

<u>Community</u>	<u>Existing Housing Units</u>	<u>% infill of Rural Com.</u>	<u>Potential New Housing Units adjusted for Natural Hazards</u>	<u>Total Housing Units</u>
<u>Azalea</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>81%</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>58</u>
<u>Camas Valley</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>92%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>38</u>
<u>Clarks Branch</u>	<u>122</u>	<u>95%</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>129</u>
<u>Curtin</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>25</u>
<u>Days Creek</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>88%</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>67</u>
<u>Dixonville</u>	<u>151</u>	<u>76%</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>199</u>
<u>Glendale Junction</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>Lookingglass</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>96%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>78</u>
<u>Melrose</u>	<u>173</u>	<u>80%</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>216</u>
<u>Milo</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>64</u>
<u>Quines Creek</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>90%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>20</u>
<u>Rice Hill</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>68%</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>25</u>
<u>Riversdale</u>	<u>492</u>	<u>91%</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>541</u>
<u>Scottsburg</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>Tenmile/Porter Creek</u>	<u>225</u>	<u>91%</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>248</u>
<u>Tiller</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>64%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11</u>
<u>Wells Creek</u>	<u>142</u>	<u>98%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>145</u>
<u>All RC'S combined</u>	<u>1698</u>	<u>89%</u>	<u>212</u>	<u>1910</u>



**RURAL COMMUNITY NEW PARCEL DEVELOPMENT DATA**

<u>Community</u>	<u>Potential New</u>		
	<u>Adjusted for</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>Natural Hazards</u>	<u>Parcels</u>	<u>Parcels</u>
<u>Azalea</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>19%</u>	<u>58</u>
<u>Camas Valley</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8%</u>	<u>38</u>
<u>Clarks Branch</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>129</u>
<u>Curtin</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>25</u>
<u>Days Creek</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>12%</u>	<u>67</u>
<u>Dixonville</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>24%</u>	<u>199</u>
<u>Glendale Junction</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>Lookingglass</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>78</u>
<u>Melrose</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>216</u>
<u>Milo</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>64</u>
<u>Quines Creek</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>10%</u>	<u>20</u>
<u>Rice Hill</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>32%</u>	<u>25</u>
<u>Riversdale</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>541</u>
<u>Scottsburg</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>Tenmile/Porter Creek</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>248</u>
<u>Tiller</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>36%</u>	<u>11</u>
<u>Wells Creek</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>145</u>
<u>All RC'S combined</u>	<u>212</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>1910</u>

19. Growth Rates vary in Douglas County's Rural Communities. Rural Community growth may be provided through Rural Community infill and/or redevelopment or future expansion of Douglas County's Rural Communities.

**Rural Community Inventory - Page 2 - Add as follows:**

STATEWIDE PLANNING GOALS, OREGON ADMINISTRATIVE RULES, AND OREGON REVISED STATUTE

Expansion of Rural Communities is governed by provisions of the Oregon Statewide Planning Goals (SWPG), and implementing rules. The process requires specific information and justification as part of the review. This Comprehensive Plan information is provided to assist owners, applicants and the County in evaluating applications for expansion of a rural community. The information may be used to address a part of the applicable review standards.

### **3. RURAL RESIDENTIAL LANDS INVENTORY**



### 3. RURAL RESIDENTIAL LANDS INVENTORY

**PURPOSE:** Provide current information on the number of undeveloped parcels in Douglas County's Rural Residential lands, and develop policy to encourage infill of the existing appropriate levels of rural residential, commercial, and industrial development or other economic activity requiring a location in a rural area.

*The policies for Rural Residential areas are designed to provide guidance to owners, applicants and the County on the desired level of rural development opportunities in Douglas County. They are designed to serve as a guide for future plan amendments or updates, whether quasi-judicial or legislative, and to support and encourage applications that are reviewed through the required goal and rule process.*

*These plan provisions do not, in themselves, justify a plan amendment but can be considered and used in future applications reviewed by Douglas County.*

**BACKGROUND:** The Rural Residential Lands Inventory developed in 2006 analyzed Rural Residential Lands throughout Douglas County. The information gathered will be integrated into the Douglas County Comprehensive Plan, making the information in the Comprehensive Plan contemporary.

**AMENDMENT:** Through this legislative amendment process, Douglas County will integrate the Rural Residential Lands Inventory into the Douglas County Comprehensive Plan. These amendments have implications for Chapter 15 (Land Use) of the Douglas County Comprehensive Plan. *The last amendment will be language added to Page 1 of the Rural Residential Land Inventory.*

PAGE 15-39

POLICIES:

8. Maintain a Rural Residential Land Inventory which is adequate to provide for rural home site opportunities in each Planning Advisory Committee area.
9. Where it is demonstrated infill development has reached a 65% level of built or committed use, support the addition of additional rural residential land through both the Quasi-Judicial and Legislative Plan Amendment process.

PAGE 15-40

POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

5. When Rural Residential lands within a Planning Advisory Committee boundary exceed a dwelling infill development level of 65%, the County will consider adding resource lands with lower resource potential, to the Rural Residential land inventory based on reasons.
6. Five Planning Advisory Committee Areas, which are at or near the infill rate, warrant consideration of additional lands.

Page 15-48 Add finding number (19.) as follows:

19. Rural Residential lands in Douglas County have seen considerable infill development since their creation. Douglas County's population growth rate is projected at an average 1.38% annually. When this population growth rate is applied to the existing and potential buildable lands in Douglas County's Rural Residential Lands, in each of Douglas County's Planning Advisory Committee boundary areas, the infill rate appears to exceed the 65% infill rate.
20. Growth rates differ in Douglas County's Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) areas and additional Rural Residential lands considerations may



differ. In some PAC's Rural Residential growth may be accommodated by infill and new development in existing Rural Residential areas while in other PAC areas Douglas County may consider new or expanded Rural Residential lands based on applicable criteria and the guidance of the Comprehensive Plan.

- 21. Douglas County has a history of steady population growth in its Rural Residential lands. The Rural Residential home sites provided for by the Rural Residential lands, are important to Douglas County's economy due to there close proximity to resource lands and jobs located in rural Douglas County. Douglas County's economy in large part is resource related. The Rural Residential lands provide home opportunities which require shorter travel distances to resource related jobs, which reduces transportation infrastructure costs, and provides housing which is often times made affordable by reducing the trip length to and from jobs. Available Rural Residential lands are appropriate to accommodate the resource related job base in Douglas County, and to maintain Douglas County's historic social fabric.**

**RURAL RESIDENTIAL LANDS INVENTORY DATA**

<u>PAC</u>	<u>Existing Housing Units</u>	<u>% PAC is infilled</u>	<u>Potential New Housing Units adjusted for Natural Hazards</u>	<u>Total Housing Units adjusted for Natural Hazard</u>
<u>Calapooya</u>	<u>563</u>	<u>72%</u>	<u>217</u>	<u>780</u>
<u>Callahan</u>	<u>1581</u>	<u>70%</u>	<u>693</u>	<u>2274</u>
<u>Coastal</u>	<u>157</u>	<u>56%</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>278</u>
<u>Cow Creek</u>	<u>246</u>	<u>50%</u>	<u>243</u>	<u>489</u>
<u>Douglas</u>	<u>409</u>	<u>67%</u>	<u>203</u>	<u>612</u>
<u>Elk Creek</u>	<u>309</u>	<u>63%</u>	<u>180</u>	<u>489</u>
<u>North Umpqua</u>	<u>713</u>	<u>57%</u>	<u>526</u>	<u>1239</u>
<u>Roseburg/Green</u>	<u>592</u>	<u>52%</u>	<u>555</u>	<u>1147</u>
<u>South Umpqua</u>	<u>621</u>	<u>76%</u>	<u>197</u>	<u>818</u>

**Rural Residential Inventory - Page 1 - Add as follows:**

STATEWIDE PLANNING GOALS, OREGON ADMINISTRATIVE RULES, AND  
OREGON REVISED STATUTE

Conversion of resource lands to rural residential lands is governed by provisions of the Oregon Statewide Planning Goals (SWPG), and implementing rules. The process requires specific information and justification as part of the review. This Comprehensive Plan information is provided to assist owners, applicants and the County in evaluating applications for conversion of resource land to rural residential land. The information may be used to address a part of the applicable review standards.

**Page ix in the Comprehensive Plan Add as follows:**

**INTRODUCTION**

**Important Reference Material**

"In 2006, Douglas County published the Rural Community and Rural Residential Inventories which are a part of the Plan by reference. The data in these documents assesses current levels of rural development. Douglas County's Inventories provide specific information which may assist Douglas County or applicants in evaluating applications. The inventory data may be used as part of the needed information to address applicable review standards of the Statewide Planning Goals and implementing rules."



**4. TRI CITY AREA OF THE MYRTLE CREEK  
UGB COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**

#### **4. TRI CITY AREA OF THE MYRTLE CREEK UGB COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE .**

**PURPOSE:** Update selected findings and policies of the Comprehensive Plan about Tri City, which is within the City of Myrtle Creek's Urban Growth Boundary.

**BACKGROUND:** The Tri City area of the Myrtle Creek Urban Growth Boundary has seen significant development infill. This infill requires close coordination between the County and the City, and will require continued coordination flowing from the County's proposed adoption of the IAMP for interchanges 103, 106, and 108.

**AMENDMENT:** Through this legislative amendment process, Douglas County will add the following findings and policies.

##### **ON PAGE 15-108 ADD:**

##### *Residential FINDING:*

**61. The Tri City area of the Myrtle Creek Urban Growth Boundary has seen substantial development of the existing residential lands. There are approximately 1,634 dwellings in Tri City, which would give it a population of 4,330 persons when using the County's estimated household size number of 2.65. The recent growth has created a need for additional residential lands to meet the twenty year development needs of Tri City.**

##### *Commercial FINDING:*

**63. The infill development of the Tri City area of the Myrtle Creek Urban Growth Boundary residential lands has created a need for additional commercial lands.**



*Industrial FINDING:*

- 64. The growth of Tri City residential lands, of the Myrtle Creek Airport, and development of the County Industrial park site at Pruner Road have created a need for additional industrial lands.**

**ON PAGE 15-162 ADD:**

*Residential POLICY:*

- 3. Encourage a residential land supply that is sufficient to accommodate the twenty year residential land supply needs of Tri City.**

**ON PAGE 15-161 ADD:**

*Commercial POLICY:*

- 12. Establish a highway related Commercial Center for Tri City at the intersection of Weaver Road and Old Pacific Highway.**

**ON PAGE 15-162 ADD:**

*Industrial POLICY:*

- 15. Encourage future heavy industrial uses to locate in the County Industrial Park.**
- 16. Encourage expansion of the Myrtle Creek UGB for Airport related industrial uses adjacent to the Airport.**

**ON PAGE 15-154 ADD:**

*Sanitary System POLICY:*

- 6. Encourage expansion of the Sanitary System across the river at the Weaver Road bridge to accommodate future expansion of the Myrtle Creek Airport and related industrial use area.**

**5. DOUGLAS COUNTY NATURAL HAZARD  
MITIGATION PLAN**



## **5. DOUGLAS COUNTY NATURAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN**

**PURPOSE:** The Douglas County Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan was written at the request of the Douglas County Board of Commissioners in an effort to protect citizens in Douglas County from the threat of natural hazards.

**BACKGROUND:** In 2003, the Douglas County Board of County Commissioners directed the County Planning Department to work with state and federal agencies, fire protection agencies and the County Emergency Manager to develop the Douglas County Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan, which would be consistent with the Stafford Pre-disaster Mitigation Act of 2000. This county wide effort was composed of two steering committees, one in central Douglas County, and a coastal committee, combined with a core team of emergency management staff from agencies in Douglas County that provide emergency management services.

**AMENDMENT:** Douglas County supports the Stafford Pre-disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 through development and implementation of the Douglas County Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan (NHMP). This legislative amendment will modify the Douglas County Comprehensive Plan with findings in the Air, Noise, and Land Resources Quality Chapter pertaining to the NHMP, and adopts by reference the Douglas County Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Page 5-8.

### **FINDINGS:**

#### **Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan (NHMP)**

**73. Douglas County has a FEMA approved Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan (NHMP), adopted by resolution by The Board of Commissioners. The NHMP**

lists nine hazard specific mitigation plans for all areas in Douglas County.

The natural hazards addressed include:

Flood

Severe Winter Storms

Earthquake

Tsunami

Windstorm

Wildfire

Landslide

Multi-hazard mitigation and "Acts of God"

74. Each hazard-specific mitigation plan includes information on hazard identification, a vulnerability assessment and risk analysis for communities located in a hazard area, lists recommended mitigation strategies to reduce natural hazard damages to communities, seek to identify funding, monitoring and staffing mitigation activities for hazard mitigation projects.
75. The NHMP recommends outreach and education programs on each hazard, and seeks to protect life and property through public awareness.
76. The NHMP recognizes the improvement of emergency service response as important to all hazard specific mitigation plans and will seek technical and financial assistance to meet this goal.
77. The NHMP is adopted as a support document to the Comprehensive Plan and is recognized by reference.

Page 5-15

POLICY:

6. Douglas County shall regularly update the NHMP as needed to address community changes and natural resource/natural hazard issues.



**6. DOUGLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY  
WILDFIRE PROTECTION PLAN**

## **6. DOUGLAS COUNTY COMMUNITY WILDFIRE PROTECTION PLAN. (CWPP)**

**PURPOSE:** The Douglas County Community Wildfire Protection Plan was written at the request of the Douglas County Board of Commissioners in an effort to protect citizens in Douglas County from the threat of wildfire.

**BACKGROUND:** In the summer of 2004, the Douglas County Board of County Commissioners directed the County Planning Department to work with state and federal agencies, fire protection agencies and the County Emergency Manager to develop Community Wildfire Protection Plans for Douglas County's at-risk communities, which are consistent with the Healthy Forest Restoration Act of 2003. This countywide effort was initiated to reduce wildfire risk to citizens, improve forest health, and quality of life within Douglas County.

The Healthy Forest Restoration Act emphasizes the need for federal agencies to work collaboratively with communities to develop hazardous fuel reduction projects. In addition, the act provides communities with an opportunity to describe how additional Federal funds may be distributed for projects on non-federal land. The mechanism for identifying these priority fuel reduction areas is the Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).

**AMENDMENT:** Douglas County supports the Healthy Forest Restoration Act through development and implementation of the Douglas County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP). This legislative amendment will modify the Douglas County Comprehensive Plan with findings in the Forest Chapter pertaining to the CWPP, and adopts by reference the Douglas County Community Wildfire Protection Plan.



**FINDINGS:**

Page 2-6

- 51. Douglas County has adopted thirty approved Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPP) in rural communities and rural areas in all nine Planning Advisory Areas of the County. Each CWPP was approved and adopted by Douglas County, The Fire District(s) serving the CWPP area, Douglas Forest Protective Association, and The US Forest Service (for communities within Forest Service lands).**
- 52. The CWPP plans for each community identifies locations of critical infrastructure, evacuation routes, and priority fuel reduction areas. The CWPP Plans for each community recommends fuel reduction methods, aiding fire fighting access during initial and extended attack, and fire protection standards.**
- 53. Each CWPP recommends outreach and education programs on fire protection, structural ignitability and survivable space adjacent to structures, and identifies technical and potential financial assistance for property owners to reduce fire danger.**
- 54. The CWPP is adopted as a support document to the Comprehensive Plan and is recognized by reference.**

Page 2-15

**POLICY:**

- 4. Douglas County shall regularly update each CWPP as needed to address community changes and natural resource/natural hazard issues.**