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CHAPTER 1.

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to establish a guide for the growth and development of the Stayton community. The plans and policies contained in this document are an adopted statement of public policy which will serve, not only as a guide in the decision making process, but also to communicate an understanding of the community’s growth policies to the general public, other agencies, and the private landowner. A better understanding of specific goals, policies, and plans contained in this comprehensive plan will help the existing and future population of Stayton anticipate the needs of the community.

It is important to understand that because this plan is intended to serve as a guide to future development, more specific actions and programs must be undertaken to implement the goals and plans. A distinction between the comprehensive plan and implementing measures such as zoning, subdivision codes, public land acquisition, taxing policies, and public improvements must be understood. Implementing measures are specific and separate actions. The plan is not a zoning ordinance but a guide to future development.

Planning Program

The adoption of this plan will strengthen the planning program in Stayton. Limited flexibility has been built into the plan; however, responsibility must be exercised in its use and maintenance. Any major deviation from the plan goals or policies should be preceded by an amendment based on need and facts to support the change. Court cases and state legislation have given more weight to the comprehensive plan, and land use decisions must be in conformance with the policies and goals of the plan.

The following goals have been formulated in cooperation with the Stayton Planning Commission, the Stayton Citizen Advisory Committee, and interested individuals and agencies. The goals of the comprehensive plan are:

A. Physical Development

1. Create an aesthetically pleasing, safe, and efficient community environment.

2. Encourage the proper use and management of the Mill Creek and Santiam flood plains.

3. Encourage the orderly and efficient growth of the community based on social, physical, and economic factors.

4. Promote a desirable balance and location of land uses based on identified needs of the community.

5. Develop an urbanization pattern consistent with local and statewide goals.
B. Commercial Development

1. Discourage strip-type commercial development along major streets.
2. Promote the continued functioning and preservation of the central business district as the primary retail area of the community.
3. Provide adequate off-street parking facilities for commercial development.
4. Encourage a pedestrian-oriented atmosphere in the central business district.

C. Industrial Development

1. Promote the continued development and expansion of quality industrial facilities.
2. Provide for the needs of the community for future development opportunities by encouraging a balanced and diversified economic base in proportion to residential needs.

D. Housing

1. Provide necessary public facilities and services to maintain safe and healthful living conditions in residential areas.
2. Foster the maintenance and development of an adequate quantity and variety of housing types to satisfy the desired lifestyles and financial capabilities of the community's population.
3. Improve housing facilities that do not provide adequate or healthful living conditions and that threaten the continued desirability of adjoining residential areas.

E. Transportation

1. Develop an efficient and sound transportation system that encourages proper land development.
2. Encourage a balanced transportation system which minimizes community disruptions and promotes efficient movement of traffic around and through the community.
3. Encourage the development of bicycle and pedestrian-oriented modes of transportation.

F. Public Facilities and Services

1. Provide adequate and attractive park, recreation, and open space facilities.
2. Encourage urban development in areas with existing services and in those areas where future extensions of those services can be provided in the most feasible, efficient, and economical manner.
3. Encourage the protection and preservation of historic sites and structures.

4. Update public facilities systems (water and sewer) and capital improvements.

G. Energy Conservation

1. Encourage the economical use of energy supplies.

2. Encourage compact urban design through comprehensive planning and zoning measures.

H. Urban Growth Management (the plan establishes seven goals to manage the urban growth boundary)

1. The existing boundaries of the city should remain relatively unchanged until a major portion of the city’s usable land has been developed for urban purposes.

2. Extension of the city’s urban growth services should be preceded by careful evaluation of the facts with major emphasis given to the overall community costs and benefits. Extension of the city’s water services outside the urban growth boundary of Stayton shall be prohibited, and extension of sewer services outside the Stayton and Sublimity urban growth boundaries shall be prohibited (Ord. 715, §1, April 1993).

3. Developments which can be served by a gravity flow sewage system should be given priority.

4. The city is the logical provider of services in the defined urban service area; therefore, development outside the city boundaries should be coordinated closely with the city.

5. All government units whose responsibilities affect the growth and development of the Stayton area should review the urban growth program for the city.

6. The physical size of the urban service area will be relative only to time and the changing needs of the community. If the criteria used to delineate the urban service area change, the city will have need to re-evaluate its urban growth program.

7. The concept of acreage residential zoning as defined in the Marion County Zoning Ordinance should be applied to areas north and east of the city. This type of zoning permit acreage residential homesites at a specific density (e.g., 2, 3, 5 acres, etc.) based on the needs and physical limitations of the area. In some cases, farm use zoning may also be appropriate, especially for the area west of the city.

I. Applicable Statewide Goals

In 1973, the 57th Legislative Assembly of Oregon adopted Senate Bill 100 (ORS Chapter 197), otherwise known as the 1973 Land Use Act. The Act provides for the coordination of local comprehensive plans through state standards and review. State land use goals were effective on January 1, 1975, and are to be used by state, county, city, and special districts in preparing, adopting, revising, and implementing comprehensive plans.
Some of the nineteen statewide goals do not apply to the Stayton area. The Stayton Planning Commission and the Citizen Advisory Committee reviewed the 1973 Stayton Comprehensive Plan and determined that the following state goals did not apply to the Stayton area: Agricultural lands; Forest lands; Willamette greenway; Estuarine resources; Coastal shore lands, Beaches, and Dunes; and Ocean Resources. All parts of all the other twelve statewide goals did apply to the Stayton area.

J. Physical Setting

The City of Stayton is located in the eastern central portion of the Willamette Valley approximately seventeen miles east of the state capitol in Salem. The city is bounded on the north by State Highway 22 and on the south by the North Santiam River. Stayton is approximately 450 feet above sea level. The Cascade Mountain Range to the east rises to elevations of over 10,000 feet.

History of Stayton

Stayton is located on the north side of the North Santiam River, seventeen miles from the state capitol in Salem, and is the largest town between Salem and the Detroit Dam. It has grown from a nucleus of one house, one shop, and one mill in 1866 to a population of over 4,000 in 1978 and almost 5,000 in 1989. Stayton is an attractive community with good schools, churches, shops, and industrial activities.

\[1\]From Mathilda Siegmund Jones (edited), Marion County Historical Society.
The first visitors to the Stayton area were impressed with its economic possibilities. Dr. W. H. Willson and Lewis Judson were members of the Methodist Mission which laid the foundation for the American settlement in Oregon territory. At the site of Stayton, they found a place to divert the water of the North Santiam River along a depression to Mill Creek, which flows into the City of Salem. The Mission Mill had been built along the Mill Creek at Salem in 1840, and had an inadequate supply of water. In 1844, Willson and Judson applied to the territorial government for the right to divert the waters of the Santiam. In 1949, they re-applied for an extension of their water rights. In 1856, the Willamette Manufacturing Company completed the project and dug the Salem Ditch to Mill Creek.

T. C. Sloper is said to have built a small grist mill and sawmill near the east end of the ditch in 1856. It was known as the “Little Red Mill” and was the first industry in the Stayton area.

The land in the Stayton area was taken in three donation land claims by James Linch, Stephen Porter, and David Kirkpatrick. In 1866, Drury Smith Stayton purchased land from James Linch (41 acres), part of which became the townsite of Stayton. Stayton built a carding mill and sawmill, which were the first industries in the original townsite. In 1870 the mill cut 500,000 board feet of lumber and dressed 20,000 board feet. The carding machine produced 10,000 rolls of wool.

In 1870, C. M. Thomas established a cabinet shop. By 1876 there was a chair factory owned by Leigh-Neff; the Stayton Mill by Queener; a sash and blind factory by Clark and Brothers; a tannery by Ritenour and Watson; wagon maker George Ritenour; and a gunsight, E. S. Burson.

Besides being a farmer, Drury Stayton was a Baptist minister, a justice of the peace, a sawmill and carding machine owner, postmaster, chairman of the Mill Creek precinct of the Democratic Convention of 1855, trustee of Sublimity College in 1858, and candidate for Representative for Marion County at the Session State Convention in 1862. Drury Stayton’s first plat was signed on September 27, 1872, and consisted of six blocks, now the business district of Stayton. Drury Stayton wanted to name the town Florence, after his youngest daughter, but there was already a town in Oregon with that name; he settled for a street named in her honor. The post office was established on May 7, 1872, with Dr. Samuel D. McCauley as postmaster.

In 1876, the ferry across the Santiam River was run by Frank Henline, who took it over from James Linch. In 1888, the first bridge was built; it was washed out in the flood of 1906.

The first newspaper was the Stayton Sun in November 1889. In 1890, the Sun was succeeded by the Stayton Times. In 1944, Horace Mann purchased the Times and changed the name to the Stayton Mail.

The first mayor was Lee Brown in 1884; however, the charter was not adopted until February 18, 1891. The Stayton Flour Mill, founded by Hobsons in the 1870s, and the Stayton Canning Company Cooperative, established in 1924, were Stayton’s major industries.

The City of Stayton is a far cry from Drury Smith Stayton’s original one house, one shop, and one mill of 1866.

### Population

Population data, especially anticipated population growth, indicate a city’s probable future needs. Projected population growth is compared to existing land use and development to assess future land use needs as well as the additional public facilities and services needed for a larger population.

#### A. Historic Population Growth
As shown in Table P-1, Stayton’s population has increased every decade since 1900, except for 1910 to 1920. The greatest growth over a decade in absolute numbers occurred from 1970 to 1980, when the city grew by 1,226 persons. There have been several 20-year periods when the city’s population approximately doubled: these include the periods from 1940 to 1960, 1950 to 1970, and 1960 to 1980.

Table P-1
History of Population Growth
City of Stayton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>PERCENT CHANGE PER PERIOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>-8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2,108</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3,170</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>5,396</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>4,530</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>4,615</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>4,715</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>4,815</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>4,785</td>
<td>-.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>4,875</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>4,945</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Population Characteristics

---

2 U.S. Census for 1900 to 1980; PUS Center for Population Research and Census for 1981 to 1988
The age distribution of Stayton’s population from 1950 to 1980 is shown in Table P-2. The median age in Stayton of 30.8 in 1950 dropped to 25.2 in 1970, and rose again to 27.9 years in 1980. Individuals 65 years and older comprised approximately 11 percent of the population in 1980. The city’s population is younger than the State of Oregon as a whole, which had a median age of 30.2 years and 11.9 percent 65 and older in 1980.

In the City of Stayton there were 1,170 families out of 1,599 households (73 percent) in 1980. The average size of all households in 1980 was 2.75 persons. The combination of a predominance of families and a relatively young population means that Stayton can expect substantial growth due to natural increase as well as in-migration in the years ahead.

Table P-2
Age Distribution³
City of Stayton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>1,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>2,108</td>
<td>3,170</td>
<td>4,396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Population Projections

Table P-3 presents the population projections for the Stayton and Sublimity area that were developed for the 208 Water Quality Management Program in 1977. These projections are a fundamental part of the public facilities planning for the Stayton urban area and have been since the 1970s. The 208 wastewater projections were used in the 1979 plan to assure its consistency with the city’s public facility planning. These projections were also used in the City of Stayton’s “Master Utilities Plan” in 1988.

Table P-3
1979 Revised Section 208 Water Quality Population Projections⁴

|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|

³U.S. Bureau of the Census

⁴Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments, 1977
Table P-4 shows a revised population projection for Stayton that was developed by the Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments (MWVCOG) in coordination with area cities and counties. The population projections for 2005 would include an estimated 205 people (75 households x 2.75 persons) who currently live between the city limits and the urban growth boundary.

The revised projections recognize the effects of the economic depression of the early 1980s that slowed, stopped, or reversed the growth of many Oregon communities. However, the City of Stayton’s population did continue to grow from 4,396 in 1980 to 4,715 in 1984. Due to the unanticipated severity of this depression, the city did not grow at the rate projected in the 1979 plan. Substantial growth in Stayton over the next 20 years is still anticipated. For this reason, Stayton is now expected to reach a population of 11,500 in 2005, rather than 2000 as was previously projected.

Table P-4
Population Projection for Stayton to the year 2005
City of Stayton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stayton</td>
<td>4,396&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4,715&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6,650&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8,270&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9,880&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>11,500&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Citizen Involvement Program**

Goal 1 of the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) requires that all cities have an adopted program to involve citizens in the planning process. The six basic functions of citizen involvement are:

- Representation
- Communication
- Opportunity
- Technical Information
- Feedback
- Financial Support

<sup>5</sup> 1980 Census (April 1, 1980)
<sup>6</sup> 1984 PSU Certified Population Estimate (July 1, 1984)
<sup>7</sup> MWVCOG Memorandum of February 19, 1985
<sup>8</sup> Ibid
<sup>9</sup> Ibid
<sup>10</sup> Ibid
The six functions should be the object of a citizen involvement program. The City of Stayton has sought and supported citizen involvement in the past and will continue to do so.

A. Representation

The mayor has appointed the planning commission which is the key mechanism to citizen involvement. The mayor will seek to appoint a diverse group of citizens to the nine-member planning commission which will form the basis of the citizen involvement program. A committee appointed by the commission chairman, the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), will help in the comprehensive plan periodic review and other special projects. Membership on the CAC is open to anyone living in or owning property in the Stayton area. Members of the CAC will attend planning commission meetings to offer their help and input.

B. Communication

The CAC will attend planning commission meetings and workshops. All city council and planning commission minutes will be available to the newspaper and will also be utilized to communicate with the community.

C. Opportunity

The city has tried to provide adequate opportunity for all persons to be involved in the planning process. All meetings will be announced in advance and scheduled on a regular basis. Notices of meetings will be published and placed in key locations throughout the community.

D. Technical Information

Information received by the city will be kept on file and made available to the public. The city administrator will call on the staff to help explain the material to the general public if the information is of a technical nature. Additional information may be obtained from the Marion County Planning Office.

E. Feedback Systems

The city relies heavily on the local newspaper and public participation and workshops to get feedback from actions taken by the city council and the planning commission. The city staff and officials are available for questions and comments.

F. Financial Support

The city has budgeted monies for planning commission and CAC for the periodic review process.

The citizen involvement process has been functioning in Stayton for many years and will continue in the years ahead.
CHAPTER 2.

Natural and Historic Resources

This element of the Stayton Comprehensive Plan discusses the natural and historic resources within the City of Stayton’s urban growth boundary (UGB). It addresses those resources covered by Statewide Planning Goal No. 5, as well as goals 6, and 7.

Environmental Issues

A. Climate

Stayton’s climate has warm, dry summers and mild, wet winters. The most notable climatic feature is the seasonal distribution of precipitation. About 60 percent of the average annual precipitation (53 inches) falls from November to March. Usually only 5 percent of annual precipitation falls from July to September. The daily low mean temperature is 33 degrees in January and the high daily mean is 82 degrees in July. The growing season is about 180 days.

B. Air Quality

The federal government requires states to establish air quality standards to protect public health and the environment under the Clean Air Act. Oregon received approval of its State Implementation Plan on May 31, 1972. Specific information on air quality standards can be obtained from the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and the regulations relating to air quality control are in the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) Chapter 340. Stayton is in a Class II area for “Prevention of Significant Deterioration” under the Clean Air Act. This allows some increases in air emissions subject to “New Source Review” under OAR 340-Division 20.

Air quality is monitored throughout Marion County, including the City of Stayton, by the Salem Regional Office of the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. Stayton has common airshed with other communities and rural areas and shares their air quality problems. The major sources of air pollution in Stayton are automotive emissions and field burning and slash burning in the surrounding rural areas. Industrial air pollution is minimal in Stayton at this time.

The pattern of land use development can have a significant effect on the need to use the automobile. More compact urban designs and proximity of jobs and services to residences are ways that land use can limit automobile pollution. The main mechanism for control of industrial air emissions is DEQ's regulations establishing ambient air quality standards and specific emission limitations in OAR 340.

C. Noise

The DEQ Noise Control Division, under OAR Chapter 340, Division 35, has adopted noise control regulations. Division 35 includes controls over new and used vehicles as well as for industrial and commercial activities. The DEQ standards are the minimum standards for the City of Stayton.
Currently no industrial or transportation related noise sources are significant problems in or near Stayton. Industrial sources will be controlled through the DEQ noise regulations. As the City of Stayton grows to the north and traffic increases on Highway 22 (the northern boundary of the UGB), the potential exists for noise levels to be a problem.

The northwest corner of the UGB contains highway oriented commercial uses and the golf course. There are a few existing houses between the golf course and Cascade Highway and the area is designated for residential development. Along the highway between Cascade Highway and Fern Ridge Road, the land is mostly in the floodplain and will not have noise sensitive development. Between Fern Ridge Road and the east end of the UGB is an area designated for residential development. A potential noise related conflict exists where residential development is planned. The noise potential is increased by the grades of the highway and the expected increase in total traffic and truck traffic volume. Several factors would serve to mitigate noise impacts in the future. These include:

1. Oregon DEQ requirements will reduce allowable noise levels for new trucks.
2. The Oregon State Highway Division can evaluate noise impacts and install noise barriers, if needed, when Highway 22 is widened from two lanes to three or four lanes.
3. The City of Stayton can evaluate potential noise impacts when development proposals near the highway are reviewed.

The combination of source control, noise barriers, and proper development of noise sensitive uses should avoid the creation of a noise problem in Stayton.

Water Resources

A. Water Areas and Wetlands

The North Santiam River is the southern edge of the urban growth boundary. The North Santiam River above Stayton drains approximately 695 square miles. Mill Creek drains approximately 15 square miles northeast of Stayton. Mill Creek passes through the Stayton urban growth area from a point just east of the Stayton-Sublimity Road under Highway 22, and runs westerly approximately parallel to the highway. The Salem Ditch and Stayton Power Canal (West Stayton irrigation ditch) divert water from the North Santiam and pass through the southern part of Stayton. Salem Ditch also forms part of the western edge of the UGB until its confluence with Mill Creek.

In January 1987, the city staff undertook an inventory of wetland areas. It was determined that the National Wetlands Inventory should be used to identify wetland resources within the city. That inventory is hereby incorporated as a support document to this comprehensive plan.

The following findings are made about these wetland areas:

1. Site 1 (Lucas Ditch and Mill Creek) is considered a medium to high quality natural resource. Approximately 5.6 acres of this site, out of a total of 20.8 acres, is uncultured emergent wetland with the balance having similar soil types but not being continuously saturated. The higher land is grazed by cattle. The 5.6 acre area is significant to the community as it provides a sanctuary to small birds and aquatic wildlife. The higher
ground, however, is only wet for a portion of the year. It is not considered significant as it
does not provide a wetland resource of any consequence. This land is zoned for residential
use. There is a greater need to utilize this land for this purpose, especially considering it is
surrounded by urbanized or urbanizable land, than to maintain it in essentially agricultural
use.

2. Site 2 (bounded by Pioneer Park/Salem Ditch/Power Canal [north] and the North Santiam
River [south]) is an excellent wetland resource. It is an island and is preserved as a
wilderness park. It is not threatened by pressure to change its character, but land use
changes in the vicinity will be carefully reviewed considering the wetlands in the immediate
area.

3. Site 3 (Stayton Water Supply Facility) is found to be relatively insignificant. Its small size
and manmade nature make an area that the community finds would be better put to
another use.

4. Site 4 (Stayton Industrial Park Detention Basin) is a manmade feature. It is emerging
wetland. Since it was required to be built by the city for storm drainage detention, it will
probably exist for the foreseeable future. It may be threatened, however, by activity on
nearby properties.

These four wetlands are listed as 1-b wetland resources under the Goal 5. Review procedures, since the
city does not have sufficient information available to determine whether the location, quantity, or
quality of the resource warrants designation as significant wetlands. The Division of State Lands will be
conducting a statewide inventory of significant wetlands. The city intends to coordinate wetlands
management with the Division of State Lands and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Policy NR-14 is
adopted to guide the city in consideration of development proposals in the vicinity of these sites.

B. Watershed

The watershed for the City of Stayton’s (as well as Salem’s) water supply is the North Santiam River
basin upstream from Stayton (Geren) Island. The vast majority of the land upstream is forested, and
the water quality of the North Santiam is quite good. The level of development planned in the
watershed in Linn and Marion counties is consistent with continued high water quality in the river.

Water Quality Protection

A. Surface Water

The City of Stayton operates its sewage treatment system subject to a National Pollutant Discharge
Elimination System (NPDES) permit and in compliance with DEQ rules, standards, and plans as
established in ORS 468 and ORS 340. These DEQ rules, standards and plans cover aspects of
wastewater treatment ranging from state approval of construction plans for treatment plants to effluent
standards and sludge disposal. Stayton’s NPDES permit was modified in 1985 to bring it into accord
with the DEQ Water Quality Management Plan for the river basin. The Stayton sewage treatment
discharges to the North Santiam River have consistently been within the effluent limitations of the
NPDES permit and DEQ river basin plan.

Stayton’s development ordinance requires compliance with DEQ water supply and sewage disposal
standards prior to the development of the properties within the city.
B. Ground Water

The City of Stayton does not rely to any significant degree upon groundwater for its water supply. The city wells are located near the North Santiam River and the wells induce infiltration from that surface water source. The city’s sanitary sewer system prevents groundwater contamination from adversely affecting groundwater users in rural Marion County west of Stayton. Existing and planned storm sewers will help maintain the treatment capacity of the sanitary sewer system as well as lowering seasonal high water tables in some parts of the city.

Flood Plain

The flood plain along the North Santiam River and Mill Creek is primarily in agricultural use, mostly pasture and croplands. Little residential or commercial development is located in the flood plain, although the city’s water treatment plant is in the North Santiam River flood plain. The North Santiam River has modified its course precluding most development, so that flood plain closest to the river has retained its native riparian forest. Mill Creek also retains some riparian vegetation. The higher parts of the flood plains have been cultivated as cropland along the river or used as pasture along Mill Creek.

A. Principal Flood Problems

Flooding is the significant natural hazard in the Stayton area. Major floods have been caused by rain melting a winter snowpack (as happened in 1964) or by rapid spring snowmelt. Flooding along Mill Creek has been primarily due to heavy winter rainfall, often combined with some snowmelt on saturated or frozen ground. The December 1964 flood along the North Santiam River was approximately a 75-year event, and the December 1945 flood would be rated a 160 year event, though this does not reflect the effects of current flood control storage in the basin.

B. Flood Protection Measures

The only structural flood protection measure constructed within Stayton is a revetment upstream of the city’s water treatment plant. Big Cliff Dam and Detroit Dam, constructed on the North Santiam River upstream of the City of Gates, provide flood control storage that has greatly reduced natural peak flows. Though not implemented, the U. S. Soil Conservation Service once proposed a small dam on Mill Creek upstream of Stayton that could provide flood storage. The City of Stayton prepared a study in 1982 of the Mill Creek flood plain that recommended a system of dikes and detention basins to contain floodings. The study has not been adopted by the city.

C. Flood Insurance Study Maps

The City of Stayton is a participant in the National Flood Insurance Program. A prime purpose of the National Flood Insurance Program is to encourage state and local governments to adopt sound flood plain management programs based upon study of local flooding problems.

Stayton’s Flood Insurance Study, completed in 1978, includes a flood boundary map to assist in developing sound flood plain management measures.

As a national standard, the 100-year flood was adopted by the Federal Insurance Administration as the base flood for purposes of flood plain management. For each stream studied in detail, the boundaries of the 100-year and sometimes 500-year floods have been delineated on Flood Insurance Rate Maps.
Encroachment on flood plains, such as artificial fill, reduces the flood-carrying capacity and increases flood heights, thus increasing flood hazards in areas beyond the encroachment itself. Flood plain management involves balancing the economic gain from flood plain development against the potential increase in flood hazard. The Flood Insurance Program uses the concept of a floodway as a tool to assist local communities in flood plain management.

The area of the 100-year flood is divided into floodway and a floodway fringe. In cases where the floodway and 100-year flood boundaries are close together, only the floodway boundary is shown on the Floodway and Flood Insurance Rate maps. The floodway is the channel of a stream, plus any adjacent flood plain areas, that must be kept free of encroachment in order that the 100-year flood be carried without substantial increase in flood heights. As a minimum standard, the Federal Insurance Administration limits increases in flood heights to 1.0 foot, provided that hazardous velocities are not produced.

D. Flood Plain Overlay Zone

To reduce the loss of life and property due to flooding, the city adopted the Flood Plain Overlay Zone and Flood Plain Management Regulations in 1979, and amended them in 1987 and in 1989. The Flood Plain Overlay Zone and Flood Plain Management regulations control additional development in the flood plains and regulates the use of those areas subject to periodic flooding. The overlay zone is in addition to the regular zoning and land use designation for each parcel. Boundaries of the Flood Plain Overlay Zone are shown on the comprehensive plan map and on the floodway and flood insurance maps kept at Stayton City Hall.

Land Resources

A. Topography

The City of Stayton is located on the eastern edge of the Willamette Valley between the North Santiam River and the Waldo Hills. The area in the city is relatively flat except for the western end of Fern Ridge, which is included in the northeast section of Stayton. A hill about 50 feet high at Third Avenue south of Fern Ridge Road can be followed to the east where it becomes a cliff about 70 feet high east of the city limits on the north side of East Santiam Street. At the eastern edge of the UGB the cliff merges with a hill 658 feet in elevation. This hill is about 160 feet higher than the flat land to the south.

The highest elevation within the existing city limits is 565 feet and the lowest is less than 420 feet along the North Santiam River. As discussed in the Public Facilities element, the 465-foot contour separates the city water system into a high level and low level distribution system. The highest elevation within the urban growth boundary is 658 feet; however, the reasonable limits of city water service are about 600 feet in elevation, which will require a new reservoir (see Public Facilities element).

The lowest land within the urban growth boundary is the 400 foot elevation at the confluence of Salem Ditch and Mill Creek in the northwest corner of the UGB. The sewage treatment plant in the southwest corner of the UGB is 420 feet in elevation.
B. Steep Slopes

The Marion County natural hazard inventory mapped areas of excessive slope and landslide areas. Neither of these natural hazards appears in the Stayton area on the Marion County map (Marion County, 1982). The areas that do have steep slopes of 12 to 20 percent are expected to see little or no development. Policy NR-15 is adopted to guide development in these areas.

C. Geology

Stayton lies within a geological area called the Stayton Basin. The floor of the basin consists mostly of a gravelly alluvial fan extending west from Stayton. This formation, known as Linn Gravel, was deposited by the North Santiam River and is 30 to 40 feet thick. The gravel overlies the Fern Ridge formation exposed in the hills northeast of Stayton. The Fern Ridge Tuffs are composed mostly of volcanic ash and pumice. The Fern Ridge Tuffs, in turn, lie on a formation called Stayton Lavas, which are a medium gray to dark gray basalt. The basalt is exposed on slopes where younger formations have been stripped off (Thayer, 1939).

D. Mineral and Aggregate Resources

Areas adjacent to the North Santiam River contain potential aggregate (sand and gravel) resources. The majority of the area is also suitable for agriculture and residential development. The Stayton area, northern Linn County, and eastern Marion County, currently obtain the necessary aggregate for commercial purposes from private sources outside the Stayton urban area. There are four aggregate sites near Stayton on the south side of the North Santiam River in Linn County (Gray and Throop, 1981).

A second source of aggregate is located north of East Santiam Street and slightly east of the Stayton city limits. The site, known as the Zimmerman Quarry, is owned by the State Highway Division, Oregon Department of Transportation.

The quarry is important enough to include in the Goal 5. inventory of aggregate sites. It yields rock for highway maintenance purposes and has the quantity to meet those needs over a long period of time. Moreover, it is located only a short distance away from the North Santiam Highway, so it is readily accessible for highway maintenance purposes. Zimmerman Quarry is on a rock ridge which extends from Stayton proper easterly approximately one-quarter to one-half mile beyond the highway. It is basalt intrusive with a platy structure which allows for an excellent selection of material for free-draining backfill, gabion basket construction, and good shoulder aggregate. The rock is of such a nature that very little effort is needed to stockpile and load it. It is estimated that there are approximately 1.5 million cubic yards of rock available at this site.

Since the quarry qualifies for inclusion on the plan inventory, a conflicting use analysis needs to be done. Over time, the potential for land use conflicts due to noise, dust, traffic, and aesthetics, will increase as the city grows eastward. Presently, however, only one house is located near the quarry. The surrounding area is characterized by farm uses and the city limits is located about a third of a mile away. Future conflicts must be minimized so that there would be no need to forbid residential development in the vicinity or to forbid future use of the quarry.
The Division’s use of the quarry is variable, and the amount of rock removed depends on the need; however, during any given year, the amount removed has been generally about a thousand cubic yards. Because of the platy structure of the rock, it can be excavated by a bulldozer; no blasting is necessary. A bulldozer can excavate and stockpile two to three years’ worth of the material in a day. The hauling of the excavated rock away from the quarry would occur as the material is needed, but would not require more than several days’ work each year at the quarry.

The Division owns about nineteen acres of land surrounding the quarry. The quarry itself is situated near Old Mehama Highway and is approximately centered between the east and west property lines. Therefore, the Division’s own property can provide good buffers between the quarry and surrounding uses if adequate screening is included.

If properly regulated, coexistence can occur because of the current nature of the highway division’s use of the quarry, the type of rock, the buffers provided by the Division’s ownership, and the lay of the land.

In order to protect the resource, the site is designated as Public Use on the comprehensive plan and would be zoned Public/Semi-Public upon annexation to the city. This zoning designation, coupled with the size of the property and the state’s efforts to protect the site by retaining the surrounding buffer area, will serve to protect the resource from conflicting land uses. However, this in and of itself does not constitute adequate protection to the current and future residents of the surrounding area.

It is necessary to regulate the use so that there is long term assurance that the low current level of activity is being maintained; so that there is no change in the nature of the extraction process; so that there is adequate noise, dust, and visual screening installed; and so that there is the long term assurance that an acceptable reclamation plan is in place. To this end, the AE (Aggregate Extraction) Overlay Zone has been created and applied to the property. The AE zone will protect the community from the negative effects of the resource area. By providing a framework for operation of the quarry, the AE zone also helps remove the threat that the quarry would have to be shut because of its negative impacts.

E. Soils

The USDA Soil Conservation Service, in cooperation with the OSU Agricultural Experiment Station, published the “Soil Survey of Marion County, Oregon” in 1977. The soil survey mapped soils in detail within the Stayton UGB and rated each soil according to its development limitations and resource characteristics.

The City of Stayton and urban growth area encompasses a diversity of soils that are described by 20 distinct mapping units of the soil survey. The soils of the Stayton area are generally suitable for urban development, although many lowland soils have significant limitations for septic tanks and drainfields. Detailed information about the soil present at particular sites in the Stayton area is available in the “Soil Survey of Marion County.”

F. Agricultural Lands

The soil types within the urban growth boundary are predominantly Soil Capability Classes I and IV, which are defined as agricultural lands in western Oregon by Statewide Planning Goal 3. Approximately 1,350 acres within the UGB were in agricultural use in 1985. As shown on aerial photography, this includes 460 acres of pasture, 220 acres of dry cropland, and 670 acres of irrigable cropland. It is expected that only 185 acres used by NORPAC Foods, Inc., formerly Stayton Cooperative Cannery, for spray irrigation of cannery wastes, will remain in agricultural use throughout the planning period. Other agricultural lands will be converted to urban uses in accord with the city’s urban growth program.
G. Forest Lands

There is no commercial forest land within the Stayton UGB. As shown on aerial photography, some 40 acres are planted to Christmas trees and approximately 350 acres of land support either groves of trees (oak, maple, or fir, depending upon location), or riparian forest near Mill Creek and the North Santiam River. Most of the forested lands are protected by their designations and such zones as “Public” and “Semi-Public” use. The rest is generally designated or zoned for residential uses, which favors the retention or planting of trees for their amenity value (shade, windbreak, beauty to homeowners and residents).

Open Space

The flood plains of Mill creek and the North Santiam River are open space areas. Access to and along Mill Creek and the North Santiam River can be improved to allow greater recreational use and scenic enjoyment. A bicycle and jogging path system that follows the flood plains as well as major streets would help extend access to open space for residents and visitors to the Stayton area. Parks, schools, and recreational facilities also provide open space and these are discussed in the Parks and Recreation section of the Public Facilities element.

Specific open space resources in and near Stayton include:

1. Publicly owned parkland
2. Public and parochial school land
3. Santiam Golf Club’s 18-hole course
4. The Mill Creek and North Santiam River flood plains
5. The canals (ditches) that pass through the city
6. Cemeteries

Potential conflicts with open space use are precluded by the policies and development regulations adopted by the City of Stayton and Marion County.

The parks, schools, golf course, and cemeteries are presently designated and those within the city are zoned for public use. The flood plains and the waterways are protected by a combination of public ownership and Flood Plan Overlay zoning. The subdivision section of the development ordinance requires a 5 percent set-aside or a contribution in lieu of land set-aside for parks and open space purposes.

Energy Sources

There are two renewable energy sources located within Stayton: water power and solar energy. Other renewable energy sources are not present within the UGB to any significant degree.

Hydroelectric power has been generated by Pacific Power and Light’s generator on the Stayton Power Canal for many years. The Santiam Water Control District has constructed another hydroelectric generator on the power canal that went on-line in the fall of 1985. The use of the canals that run through Stayton to generate power has proven to be a compatible land use and no conflicts with these uses are anticipated.
Solar energy is being used increasingly in Stayton for space heating and solar water heating. Incorporation of solar features is expected to become increasingly common in new construction in the Stayton area. The existing uses of solar energy appear to be compatible with other resources and surrounding uses.

**Historic Site Structures and Landmarks**

Stayton's early history can still be seen at several sites in the original townsite. The City has prepared an "Historic Context Statement" describing the general history of the Stayton area and the development of the community. An inventory of historic resources in Stayton has been developed so that visitors, as well as residents of Stayton, may enjoy their value.

Inventory sheets list architectural features, historic uses, places each site or structure in context of the historical development of Stayton and indicates the significance or non-significance of each site. Sixteen sites, including twelve from the 1979 Stayton Comprehensive Plan, were evaluated and inventoried. After a determination of significance, ESEE analysis, and evaluation of conflicting uses, twelve were included on Table NR-1, the Historic Resources Inventory. One resource, the Paris Woolen Mill, is also listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Historical Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Prior/Current Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Charles Stayton House</td>
<td>784 N Third</td>
<td>Charles Stayton residence Mary E. Stayton residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Stayton Paint Shop</td>
<td>308 E Water</td>
<td>Chair factory Fred Lau residence Ernst and Lee Lau residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Gehlen/Sims Building</td>
<td>189 N Second</td>
<td>Gehlen General Store Currently storage building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Stayton Mercantile (Burmester Building)</td>
<td>429 N Third</td>
<td>Livery stable, mercantile Antique store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Buster House</td>
<td>444 E Ida</td>
<td>Uriah Whitney residence Michel Lau residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Women's Club Building</td>
<td>260 N Second</td>
<td>Women's Club Building Stayton Library Santiam Historical Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The City has adopted an historic preservation ordinance as part of the Stayton Land Use and Development Code. The ordinance governs the addition or removal of sites from the historic resource inventory and requires the issuance of an historic modification permit for the exterior alteration, demolition, or relocation of an historic resource.

Based on the economic, social, environmental and energy analysis of the sites and consideration of conflicting uses, four of the listed resources warrant special consideration.

2. Charles Stayton Home: The Charles Stayton home is located in a commercial-retail (CR) zone which may be redeveloped in the future. Due to the quality of this Queen Anne style home, conversion to a compatible commercial use or relocation of the structure is strongly encouraged.

5. Gehlen/Sims Building: The building is a rare example in Marion County of a later 19th century wood-frame commercial building. The building has very little remaining economic life remaining. It lacks a foundation, though concrete has been added for support. There is extensive sinking to the east (front) elevation of the building. Much of the floor is rotten and there is extensive dry rot. The north elevation leans about one foot at the top of the building. The rear section has been extensively damaged by fire. Due to the deterioration of the building restoration is considered unlikely. Issuance of a permit to demolish the structure is appropriate due to the condition of the structure and to allow for redevelopment of this commercial area. In order to provide an opportunity to preserve the structure, a 60 day waiting period prior to demolition is encouraged to allow the removal of a portion of the structure or to allow a historic preservation group to measure and prepare blueprints of this unique structure.

11. Salem Ditch and Stayton Power Canal: The Salem Ditch was originally constructed in the 1850s and the Stayton Power Canal in the mid-1860s. Since that time a variety of modifications have been made to each structure. In the future, state and federal water policies, and environmental and energy regulations will affect the operation of the waterways and may require modifications to each. The Santiam Water Control District has

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE No.</th>
<th>HISTORICAL NAME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>PRIOR/CURRENT USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Mountain States Hydroelectric Project</td>
<td>Power canal at Third Avenue</td>
<td>Hydroelectric turbine power generator operated by Mountain States and then Pacific Power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Thomas Y Covered Bridge (now Jordan Bridge)</td>
<td>Pioneer Park over Salem Ditch; Seventh Ave at Marion</td>
<td>Reconstructed covered bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Salem Ditch (site location only)</td>
<td>N Santiam River at Mill Creek</td>
<td>Man-made waterway to provide water to Salem woolen mills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Stayton Power Canal (site location only)</td>
<td>N Santiam River and tailrace</td>
<td>Drury Stayton ditch and tailrace, man-made waterway to provide water to early industries near Water Street, city water supply, and power generators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
informed the city modifications to fish ladders, addition of fish screens, and the construction of a bypass channel for fish passage on the Stayton Power Canal are all changes being considered. The City of Stayton and Pacific Power may desire to make adjustments to potable water and hydroelectric intake systems.

Consequently, the sites/locations of the two waterways have been designated as historic resources and not the structures. Water quality protection actions including construction and on-going maintenance and operation within the waterways shall not be regulated by the city’s historic preservation ordinance. Water quality protection actions include, but are not limited to, activities including dredging, siltation removal or transfer; maintenance of walls, channel beds, fish ladders, water intakes, hydroelectric facilities, headgates and other structures; relocation, maintenance or replacement of utility lines; chemical or biological treatment and water filtration; management of fish, water fowl and wildlife; raising or lowering of water levels; control of water flow rates including periodic, temporary or emergency stoppage or drainage; and placement of diversions, dams or minor channel modifications.

The relocation of the waterways from current location to another location will require issuance of an historic modification permit.

For new developments, the Stayton Land Use and Development Code requires the Planning Commission and City Council to consider the impacts of the development on existing historic resources and allows the city to impose appropriate conditions to preserve or enhance the resource (Ord. 713, §1, March 1993).

Fish and Wildlife Habitat

The Stayton area’s fish and wildlife habitats have been inventoried by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW)(1977) and Marion County (1982). The County Plan Inventory includes lists of fish and wildlife species typically found in the area.

The Marion County Comprehensive Plan Inventory Map shows the closest area of sensitive big game habitat to be five miles northeast of Stayton UGB. Many smaller wildlife species, such as songbirds, are compatible with urban development, especially in residential areas. Other small animals and upland game birds have habitat requirements that are met on farm and forest lands surrounding the urban area. No specific habitat protection measures are needed in Stayton to protect wildlife habitat.

Mill Creek and Salem Ditch are two streams within the Stayton UGB that were inventoried as significant to fish by ODFW and Marion County. The North Santiam River is also significant fish habitat that flows just south of the UGB. Salem Ditch is identified as a sensitive area for anadromous fish and trout. Mill Creek is identified as “headwaters” above its confluence with Salem Ditch. Headwaters are those areas that fish may not inhabit but where activities in the stream may affect water quality and fish production downstream. Land use actions in or near Mill Creek, Salem Ditch, and the North Santiam River that would adversely affect water quality or fish passage are to be considered for discretionary land use actions adjacent to these streams.

The fish habitats within these two streams and the river are significant to the community. They are threatened by development in and near the waters. There is a need to protect these habitats, which is
partially met by several existing processes. These include the permit processes required by the State Water Resources Department and the Army Corps of Engineers for any work within the waters, and the provisions of the city’s flood plain ordinance. These processes do not regulate activities outside of the flood plain boundaries, however, and activity in these areas may impact the fish habitats. Therefore, Policy NR-10 is adopted.

Other Goal 5. Resources$^{11}$

The resources listed below do not occur within the Stayton urban growth boundary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE TYPE</th>
<th>PROXIMITY TO STAYTON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecologically and scientifically significant natural areas</td>
<td>Riparian habitats, designated in the Marion County Comprehensive Plan, are seven river miles upstream and eight river miles downstream from Stayton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding scenic views and sites</td>
<td>Silver Creek Falls State Park is fifteen miles northeast of Stayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilderness Areas</td>
<td>The closest wilderness area is the Mt. Jefferson Wilderness Area fifty miles east of Stayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential and approved Oregon recreational trails</td>
<td>The proposed Indian Ridge Trail would connect Silver Falls State Park and the Pacific Crest Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential and approved federal wild and scenic waterways</td>
<td>The Little North Fork of the Santiam River and the North Santiam River from Big Cliff Dam to Mehama are potential federal and state scenic waterways. The confluence of the Little North Fork and the North Santiam River at Mehama is seven river miles upstream from Stayton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Natural Resources Policies

NR-1    Existing and future industrial and commercial activities within the Stayton UGB shall meet all Department of Environmental Quality regulations for noise, air quality, water quality, and solid waste.

NR-2    The Department of Environmental Quality noise standards shall be the minimum standards for the City of Stayton and its urban growth areas.

NR-3    The City of Stayton shall continue to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program and shall enforce the adopted flood plain regulations.

NR-4    The City of Stayton shall designate the Stayton (Zimmerman) quarry site of the Oregon State Highway Division “Public” due to its ownership. State annexation of the city’s Public/Semi-Public zone shall allow continuation of the quarrying subject to an agreement that assures

$^{11}$Marion County Comprehensive Plan, 1982; SCORP, 1983.
adequate on-site buffering for land use compatibility and future site reclamation for public and residential uses.

NR-5 The City of Stayton shall provide or protect open space resources through measures such as public ownership of parkland and open space dedication requirements in the development ordinance.

NR-6 The City of Stayton recognizes the existing uses of renewable energy sources (hydro and solar) to be compatible with other resources and surrounding uses. The city shall rely upon state and federal rules and programs (such as the hydroelectric licensing requirements) to evaluate land use compatibility and resolve resource use conflicts.

NR-7 During major plan updates, or more often as necessary, the city shall assess its energy use and the potential for energy conservation using information available from the state, federal government, and utilities.

NR-8 The City of Stayton shall, when practicable, make energy efficiency and the use of renewable resources a regular practice in its design and operation of buildings, equipment, and public facilities and services.

NR-9 The City of Stayton shall encourage local residents and businesses to conserve energy, to use renewable resources, and to recycle materials. The city will coordinate its efforts with those of local organizations, special districts, utilities, and state and federal agencies.

NR-10 The City of Stayton shall protect the historic sites by enforcement of the Historical Overlay Zone and other regulations which apply to historic sites designated by the Historic Landmarks Committee in compliance with Stayton’s Historic Preservation Ordinance.

NR-11 Vegetation along streams and rivers should be maintained in a natural state. As a buffer between urban development and fish habitat a strip of riparian vegetation should be retained along the North Santiam River and Mill Creek.

NR-12 Flood plain areas along Mill Creek and the North Santiam River that remain after flood protection measures, such as dikes or fill, are used, shall be retained as areas for open space and fish and wildlife habitat.

NR-13 The City of Stayton shall consider the effect on fish habitats when a discretionary land use action (plan and zone change, subdivision or major partition, planned unit development, conditional use, variance) is proposed on a parcel adjacent to Mill Creek, Salem Ditch, or the North Santiam River.

NR-14 Wetland Areas: The areas of Stayton with wetlands as identified in this plan and significant wetlands identified in the Statewide Division of State Lands Wetland Inventory shall be given careful consideration during the review of any development proposal on the subject properties or on any nearby property where there is the potential of negative impact on the wetland areas. Steps will be taken to mitigate any negative impact. All development on properties containing these wetlands shall be processed as a planned unit development so that densities can be transferred from wetland areas onto more suitable construction sites. The city will coordinate development/permit reviews with the Division of State Lands and the U.S. Army Corps of
Engineers to evaluate the significance of each site and any fill and removal permit requirements.

NR-15 Steep Slopes: The areas of Stayton with slopes above 15 percent are regarded as having development limitations. Due to the potential for problems with erosion, degradation of views, slippage, etc., construction in these areas shall require a geotechnical study, prepared by a qualified licensed geologist or engineer, that determines the suitability of the site for development. All development in these areas shall be processed as a planned unit development so that densities can be transferred from the steep slope areas onto more suitable construction sites.
CHAPTER 3.

Transportation

The transportation element of the Stayton Comprehensive Plan considers ways to provide a safe, convenient, efficient, and economic system of moving people and goods in, around, and through the Stayton area. The modes of transportation to be considered under the transportation goal are: 1) mass transit; 2) rail; 3) air; 4) water; 5) pipeline; 6) bicycle; 7) pedestrian; and 8) streets and highways. The transportation element also considers the transportation disadvantaged. The streets and highways section address the items required in OAR 660, Div. 11, the public facilities rule.

Transportation Facilities

A. Mass Transit

Mass transit is passenger transportation which carries members of the public on a regular and continuing basis. Buses, taxis, shuttle trains, and car pools are forms of mass transit. As the cost of travel by private automobile increases, the alternative modes of mass transit, including rail and bus facilities, become more of an economic possibility.

Oregon Bus Lines (tickets through Greyhound Bus Lines) provides bus service from Salem to Bend via Highway 22. There is currently no other bus service with the exception of school buses and church buses. It is conceivable that by the year 2000 an intracity bus system may operate between Salem and the surrounding cities. Stayton would benefit from a commuter system to and from the Salem area. An intracity bus system may also become feasible as growth continues and the cost of operating the private auto rises.

Taxi service is available from Salem; however, the cost to an individual is high. At present, there is no taxi service available in the Stayton area. This form of transportation will not be readily available until the population of the Stayton area reaches a level that can support a taxi service.

The most practical form of mass transit is sharing of an automobile. This is becoming an attractive alternative for several reasons: cost of operation, reduced traffic, and less need for parking facilities at major employment centers. The Stayton park-and-ride lot is located on State Highway Division land on the southeast corner of the intersection of Cascade Highway and Highway 22. The Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments has developed a car pool program with the State of Oregon and the City of Salem. Individuals in the Stayton area can receive a list of persons interested in sharing a ride by contacting the car pool program. The telephone number is 585-POOL.

B. Railroad

At present, there is a rail spur to Stayton from the Southern Pacific mainline in Salem. The spur terminates at NORPAC Foods, Inc., formerly the Stayton Cooperative Cannery. Wilco Farmers and Trus-Joist also maintain sidings to benefit from this spur. The other industrial areas along the spur could also become a major user of these rail facilities as the need for rapid and inexpensive movement of bulky items increases. An old railroad spur was removed that served Guerdon and Philips Industries. The removal of this line allows the future extension of Locust Street to be constructed without a grade crossing.
C. Air Transportation

The City of Stayton does not have an airport. There is not a sufficient need to support an airport at this time, nor is there a good airport site within the Stayton UGB. There is a full service commercial airport 15 miles away in Salem that provides needed service. Several small private air strips in Marion and Linn counties are within 20 miles of Stayton. A heliport at Santiam Hospital provides for recreational and medical emergencies.

D. Water Transportation

Stayton is located adjacent to the North Santiam River and has developed around the need and demands of water oriented industries. The river has not been utilized as a mode of transportation because it is fairly shallow and other modes have been more economical. It is possible to travel by water from Stayton to Jefferson and the Willamette River; however, there are more economical and timely methods of travel. The river will continue to be used for aesthetic and recreational values and protected as a source of drinking water. It is doubtful if other than small recreational craft will ever travel on the river.

E. Pipeline Facilities

The only existing pipeline facilities are the city water system and the natural gas system. The water system is discussed in detail in the Public Facilities section of this plan. In addition to Stayton, the City of Salem transmits potable water from their supply facilities on Stayton (Geren) Island via two large transmission mains. The natural gas system is discussed in the Energy section of this plan.

An additional pipeline facility may, at some future date, be located in the Stayton area. The U.S. Forest Service is issuing exploratory permits for geothermal energy drilling in the Breitenbush Hot Springs area near Detroit. If and when sufficient geothermal resources are found and developed, Stayton will become a logical site for the receipt and use of this resource as an economical energy supply.

F. Bicycle Paths and Routes

The City of Stayton has pursued a cooperative program with Marion County and Sublimity to develop a bicycle and footpath. There is now a bicycle route along three Stayton streets: 1) Cascade Highway north of Shaff Road. The bike path extends to Sublimity; 2) Shaff Road from First Avenue to Gardner; 3) Gardner from Shaff Road to Locust Street. The existing bicycle route connects Sublimity and parts of Stayton with the middle school and high schools. The bike route is in good condition and is separated from the road on Cascade Highway and on the edge of the street, as shown on the Transportation Map.

The Parks and Recreation section discusses bicycle and footpaths in connection with recreational possibilities along Mill Creek, the North Santiam River, and Salem Ditch. In addition, commuting and shopping routes can be built in some existing rights-of-way by the addition of paved shoulders, double-striped painting, and physical barriers that can provide increased safety through separation from automobile traffic. Routes serving schools, public buildings, and shopping facilities are given high priority for development. Bicycle paths are to be provided as development along new arterial and collectors occurs and in conjunction with subdivision or large tracts.
G. Pedestrian Facilities

Footpaths and sidewalks are needed in several parts of the city. A safe and convenient separation of pedestrians from traffic will enhance the desirability of the central business area. Separating traffic from school children is also essential for safety reasons. Established routes for walking to and from school should be clearly marked and improved for pedestrian traffic. As noted above, footpaths are also addressed in the Parks and Recreation section.

H. Transportation Disadvantaged

Information about the transportation needs and services available to the transportation disadvantaged can be found in the regional plan prepared by the Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments.

The City of Stayton has facilitated the transportation of the disadvantaged by the installation of curb cuts and ramps at intersections. More needs to be done in the central business district, along major arterials, and along the bicycle path system. Van service is currently available in Stayton for elderly and physically impaired persons. When a mass transit system serving the city is developed, special equipment for the transportation disadvantaged should be provided.

Streets and Highways

A. Streets and Highways

The automobile is the primary mode of transportation in the Stayton area. Until the cost of operation and maintenance of the auto forces people to seek alternative modes, the auto will remain the dominant factor in transportation. For this reason, the street and highway system is the dominant element of the transportation plan. The plan contains several sections which classify streets according to their existing and projected uses.

B. Street Improvement Needs

The long-term street improvement needs of the City of Stayton arise in four main categories:

1. More safe and convenient access to and from Highway 22.
2. Adequate provision for increased traffic (especially trucks) to and from industrial areas.
3. An appropriate routing of traffic though the downtown commercial areas, including adequate parking areas.
4. Extension of new streets into designated residential areas to be developed within the urban growth boundary.

The City of Stayton has a Street Condition Survey for 1984-1985 sponsored by the League of Oregon Cities. The city has begun developing a street plan in conjunction with the Capital Improvement Program (see also the Public Facilities element). This revised transportation element addresses several items required by OAR 660, Division 11, on public facility planning, until an official street plan.
(including bikeways and bridges) is adopted. The Transportation Map shows a basic functional street plan for Stayton.

C. Highway 22

The Santiam Highway 22 is the major east-west traffic carrier in Marion County and carries most of the traffic to and from the Stayton area. Highway 22 was designated a highway of statewide importance in the 1984 Oregon Highway Plan and was designated an “Access Oregon” highway by the Oregon Department of Transportation in 1988. The highway functions well with respect to the present needs of the area; however, an additional two lanes will eventually be needed from the intersection of Highway 214 and Highway 22 to Mehama. Four main points of access are provided to Stayton along the highway. Table No. T-1 shows average daily traffic counts at these points. Traffic volumes are measured at various points from Lancaster Drive in Salem east to Highway 22 junction with the Stayton-Mehama Road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster Drive</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>12,900</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>16,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course Road</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayton-Sublimity Road</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>6,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fern Ridge Road</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>6,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayton-Mehama Road</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,550</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>7,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oregon Department of Transportation’s six-year plan has several projects scheduled for Highway 22 and improvements along the highway anywhere from downtown Salem to Santiam Junction are beneficial to Stayton and visitors.

A project that should be added to the state’s six-year plan is the construction of an overpass at Golf Club Road and Highway 22. This would improve the access to and from the highway for auto as well as truck traffic. Access on and off Highway 22 and the crossing of the highway are extremely hazardous. An overpass would eliminate the cross and through traffic conflict and improve safety and convenience.

D. Existing Arterials

Arterials carry large volumes of traffic through the area and provide a link between neighborhoods and rural roads. The existing two-lane arterials are designated on the transportation plan. Rights-of-way (ROW) on arterial streets should be 80 to 100 feet; however, the existing streets in Stayton generally

---

\[12\text{ODOT, State Hwy Division, Traffic Volume Tables (1985)}\]
have 60 feet of right-of-way. Arterials should be developed to the city’s standard right-of-way widths, and additional right-of-way should be acquired where possible to bring these streets up to minimum standards for arterials.

The existing designated arterials are Golf Club Road, which becomes Wilco Road; First Avenue; Washington Street; East Santiam Street, which becomes Stayton-Mehama Road; and Shaff Road/Fern Ridge Road. Existing arterials and possible future arterials are shown on the Transportation Map. The possible future routes are only approximate. They are subject to change depending on the analysis and selection of alternatives.

1. Golf Club Road: Golf Club Road runs from Highway 22 to Shaff Road. South of Shaff Road the same street is called Wilco Road within the city and this segment is in good condition. This is the major arterial that serves the industrial area on the west side of Stayton.

2. Washington Street to East Santiam: Washington Street is an east-west arterial that extends from the western city limits through downtown to Sixth Avenue. From the west city limits to Evergreen, the street is in very good condition. Segments from Douglas to First Avenue and from First Avenue to Tenth Avenue are in good condition. The other segments are fair to poor. There are four right angle turns between Washington and East Santiam Street, which becomes Stayton-Mehama Road east of town.

3. First Avenue: First Avenue is a major north-south arterial that provides the primary access to Stayton from both Highway 22 and Linn County. First Avenue is in fair condition from Ida Street to Washington Street. First Avenue is in fair to poor condition from Washington Street to the north city limits. Conflicts along First Avenue exist among through traffic, shopping traffic, parking, and pedestrians. Continuous left hand turn lanes now exist all along First except at the north end from Regis Street to Fern Ridge Road.

4. Shaff Road-Fern Ridge Road: Shaff and Fern Ridge provide an east-west bypass north of the central area and help relieve through traffic congestion. Shaff Road from Wilco Road to First Avenue is in good condition. Fern Ridge is in good condition. The two roads connect and are essentially one continuous street.

5. Collectors: Collectors serve to move traffic from one neighborhood to another and to collect traffic within the community and distribute it to major collectors or arterial streets. Seven existing two-lane streets are designated as collectors. The existing collector streets are:

   a. Gardner Avenue is in very good condition. It runs north-south between Washington and Shaff Road. Extension further south to Ida Street is blocked by the Stayton Cooperative Cannery. Extension to the north is blocked by the Stayton Middle School.

   b. Regis Street is in good condition. It runs east-west between Gardner Avenue and First Avenue and provides access to Regis High School. Extension to the east and west should be considered.

   c. Locust Street is in fair condition. It runs east-west between First Avenue and Gardner Avenue and provides access to Stayton Union High School. Extension to the east and west should be considered.
M.2 Existing Streets
d. Third Avenue is in good condition south of Washington. Three blocks north of Washington is fair; the remaining distance to Fern Ridge Road is good. It parallels First Avenue and runs north-south between Water Street and Fern Ridge Road.

e. Tenth Avenue is in poor condition. It runs north-south from Fern Ridge Road to East Jefferson Street. Santiam Memorial Hospital is located on Tenth Avenue.

f. Ida Street is in good condition. It runs east-west from the intersection of Wilco Road and Washington Street to downtown. Ida Street now carries a significant amount of through traffic, but for the long-term would function as a collector.

g. Pine Street is in fair condition. It runs east-west between Tenth and the east city limits. Pine Street provides direct access to a residential district.

6. Local Streets: Local streets provide direct access to abutting businesses and residences and a connection to collector streets and arterials. Residential streets vary in conditions and standards from graveled roadways to full street improvements (curbs, gutters, sidewalks).

The downtown commercial area served by local streets needs off-street parking to aid access to business and to improve traffic flow on the streets. Some existing streets in the older commercial area of the city could be considered for closure or vacation. This would allow additional parking space or more development.

Future Street Needs

A. Arterial

Industrial needs and truck traffic on Golf Club Road and Wilco Road can be expected to increase significantly as more industrial growth takes place. In the future it may be desirable to extend Wilco Road south and then east to First Avenue to provide a truck route bypass of downtown. There are several possible routes within the corridor for such a bypass (see Transportation Map).

First Avenue should remain a two-way street in the short-term, but could become one-way in the future if linked in a couplet with Third Avenue. Rerouting of truck traffic on a southern bypass to Wilco Road would eliminate much of the through traffic on First. A traffic signal exists on the corner of First and Washington.

An extension of Washington Street would eliminate the sharp turns between Washington and Santiam. If an extension of Washington were completed, East Santiam Street could then be reclassified as a collector and both streets would serve the easternmost part of the urban growth area.

Locust Street exists between Gardner Avenue and First Avenue. Extension west of Gardner should be considered to connect to Wilco Road. If the connection to Wilco Road is made, then Locust could become an industrial arterial to serve the cannery in place of Washington. Extension east of First Avenue to connect with East Santiam Street would be considered a viable alternative to an eastward extension of Washington Street (see Transportation Map).
B. Collector Needs

Pine Street could be extended to serve the northeast part of the urban growth area. Other collector needs east of the city are dependent upon the selection of a long-term east-west arterial route (either Locust or Washington). Collectors in the northern urban growth area will be either extensions of existing streets or connect to existing arterials. The new collectors would be extended as land is subdivided and developed.

Future local streets will be planned in conjunction with other public facilities. Most new residential streets are expected to be developed or extended through the subdivision of large parcels. Many existing streets are substandard and need to be upgraded.

C. Bridges

There are ten bridges in the City of Stayton and five more bridges in the urban growth area. Future streets in the northern part of the urban growth area will require at least two new bridge crossing on Mill Creek. One benefit of that is a bridge on a new collector near Golf Lane would provide an alternative to access onto Highway 22. A truck route bypass would also require two new bridges (see map for approximate new bridge locations).

The Fourth Avenue bridge over Salem Ditch was replaced in 1984 through the Federal Bridge Replacement Program. Bridges with sufficiency ratings below 80 are eligible for replacement under the federal program. There are currently no bridges in Stayton on the Federal Bridge Inventory with a sufficiency rating of less than 80.

Table T-2 lists the existing bridges within the City of Stayton’s urban growth boundary.

Table T-2\(^{13}\)

Public Vehicular Bridges within the City of Stayton Urban Growth Boundary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>WATERWAY</th>
<th>MAINTENANCE RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>WITHIN CITY LIMITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cascade Hwy (First)</td>
<td>Mill Creek</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascade Hwy (First)</td>
<td>Lucas Ditch</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaff Road</td>
<td>Salem Ditch</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilco Road</td>
<td>Salem Ditch</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Street</td>
<td>Salem Ditch</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Avenue</td>
<td>Salem Ditch</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Avenue</td>
<td>Salem Ditch</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Avenue</td>
<td>Salem Ditch</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{13}\)City of Stayton, 1985
D. Financing Methods

The financing methods discussed in Chapter 15. of the Master Utilities Plan address several techniques that can be used to finance transportation projects as well as water and sewer utilities. Among alternative financing methods appropriate for new streets are ad valorem taxes, systems development charges, local improvement districts, and bonding. All of the arterials are in the Federal Aid Secondary System (FAS) and are eligible for federal assistance.

The current financing for street construction and maintenance in the city is limited. The city relies upon developers to construct new roads in subdivisions and in some cases has used local improvement districts to provide funds for street projects. The city uses its share of fuel tax revenues and serial levies for street maintenance.

Additional funding is needed to do any street construction. The city relies heavily on the Marion County Road Department and the State Highway Division for construction and maintenance of major streets and bridges.

Developers are required to provide new streets in subdivisions. Bikeway funding can come either as part of projects on FAS arterial or from the 1 percent of the State Highway Fund dedicated for bikeways.

The list in Table T-3 summarizes the transportation projects needed to serve future and existing development within the Stayton urban growth boundary.

Priorities refer to progression of construction rather than to a specific time frame. Priority 1. should be constructed before priority 2. and so on. The projects are built as various subdivision developments are constructed and when the final capital improvements program is adopted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>WATERWAY</th>
<th>MAINTENANCE RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>WITHIN CITY LIMITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third Avenue</td>
<td>Salem Ditch</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Avenue</td>
<td>Salem Ditch</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature’s Way</td>
<td>W. Stayton Ditch</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Avenue</td>
<td>Power Canal Tailrace</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Street</td>
<td>Power Canal</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Avenue</td>
<td>Power Canal</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table T-3
Summary List of Transportation Projects
City of Stayton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>LENGTH (in ft)</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST (1985)</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construct existing substandard streets to standard</td>
<td>53,575</td>
<td>$6,834,400</td>
<td>1-4\textsuperscript{16}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct new standard streets in urban growth areas</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>$9,564,700</td>
<td>2-4\textsuperscript{17}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra strength (add 2' depth) for all industrial routes</td>
<td>33,200</td>
<td>$546,300</td>
<td>1-3\textsuperscript{18}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra width for arterial and collector streets</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>$951,400</td>
<td>2-4\textsuperscript{19}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic control and miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td>$730,000</td>
<td>1-3\textsuperscript{20}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures (bridges, culverts, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>2-4\textsuperscript{21}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$19,176,800</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transportation Policies

T-1 The City of Stayton shall rely on developers to provide new local streets and shall coordinate the creation of new streets and improvements of existing streets with other public facilities and adjacent land uses. This coordination shall be achieved through the review processes for street creation in the development ordinance and the adoption of a capital improvements program.

\textsuperscript{14}City of Stayton Capital Improvements Program (draft)

\textsuperscript{15}Does not include maintenance

\textsuperscript{16}The timing of these street improvements will depend upon availability of state and county funds and citizen interest in forming local improvement districts

\textsuperscript{17}The city shall rely upon developers of large tracts of land for construction of new streets in the urban growth area

\textsuperscript{18}Depends on the timing of industrial growth and expansion

\textsuperscript{19}Timing and location depends on arterial routes selected to meet long term needs

\textsuperscript{20}Traffic control structures will probably be part of larger street projects. The major traffic control need is signalization at arterial intersections. The main structures needed are bridges

\textsuperscript{21}Ibid
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T-2 The City of Stayton, Marion County, and the Oregon State Highway Division are the primary providers of bikeways, streets, and highways within the Stayton urban growth area and shall also maintain the streets for which they are responsible.

T-3 Future arterial streets shall have a minimum 80-foot right-of-way. Existing arterials should be improved to an 80-foot right-of-way.

T-4 All designated arterials shall have a 50-foot center line setback to allow for improvements and widening.

T-5 Access and parking on arterials and collectors shall be managed by eliminating driveways where possible; controlling access points on local streets; and prohibiting on-street parking where necessary.

T-6 Subdivision of blocks of land rather than partitioning of individual parcels along arterials and collectors shall be encouraged in order to promote the orderly and logical development of future streets.

T-7 All developments along arterials or collectors shall provide adequate off-street parking for customers, employees, and residents.

T-8 Future collector streets shall have a minimum 60-foot right-of-way. Existing collectors should be improved and widened to a 60-foot right-of-way.

T-9 Residential through streets shall have a minimum 60-foot right-of-way.

T-10 Residential dead end streets shall have a minimum 50-foot right-of-way and not be longer than 400 feet.

T-11 Local streets to serve non-residential and multiple unit residential uses shall have adequate off-street parking.

T-12 The City of Stayton encourages the State Highway Division to include an overpass at Golf Club Road and Highway 22 in its 6-year plan.

T-13 The City of Stayton shall evaluate local streets that could be closed or vacated while maintaining access to downtown businesses.

T-14 The City of Stayton shall compile traffic counts on major streets in order to plan for new and rerouted arterials and collectors.

T-15 The City of Stayton shall consider the possible future routes for arterials and collectors shown on the Transportation Map to be only approximate. The routes are subject to change depending upon the analysis and selection of alternatives.

T-16 A bicycle and foot path system shall be developed linking the North Santiam River flood plain, the Mill Creek flood plain, and Salem Ditch with links to bicycle/foot paths along major streets. Bicycle and foot paths shall be provided along new and widened arterials and collectors unless an alternative route away from the major street is to be provided.
T-17  Curbs shall be cut to allow bicycles and wheelchairs in the shopping areas access to the commercial outlets. Bicycle parking stands and street benches shall be placed in the central shopping areas to encourage alternative uses to the automobile and aid the transportation disadvantaged.
M.3 Transportation Plan
CHAPTER 4.

Public Facilities and Services

The Public Facilities element of the Stayton Comprehensive Plan describes water, sanitary sewers, and storm sewer systems based upon the City of Stayton’s master utilities plan as required by ORS 660, Division 11. Other public facilities are either provided by the city or need to be considered as new developments are proposed.

Master Utilities

The City of Stayton developed a master utilities plan in December 1980 after the adoption and acknowledgment of the Stayton Comprehensive Plan in April 1980. The master utilities plan evaluates the city’s water system, sanitary sewer system, and storm sewer system. Since 1981, the city has utilized the computer programs developed for the master utilities plan to refine the service needs for new industry and other development. The master utilities plan includes chapters on financing methods and phased implementations.

The City of Stayton is preparing a Capital Improvements Program (CIP) based on the master utilities plan. A few projects noted in the master utilities plan have been completed; however, many projects remain to be completed. Most of the projects are needed to support the development of a city with a population of 11,500, although many projects are needed to better serve the current population.

Municipal Water System

The City of Stayton owns and operates a municipal water system serving most of the area within the present city limits. The major water system facilities and the service areas are shown on the Public Facilities Map. The city built a new water treatment plant in 1971 with a supply capacity of 8.5 million gallons per day. The city also owns and maintains three infiltration wells which draw water from the gravel strata adjacent to the river. Altogether, the wells would produce approximately two million additional gallons per day. Only one of these wells is used on a regular basis, but all three wells can be used if needed.

The majority of Stayton’s water is provided through a contract with the Santiam Water Control District. The district agrees to provide continuous 24-hour a day service of up to 40 cubic feet per second. For greater fire flows and better system reliability, the city also maintains a connection with the City of Salem’s main transmission line. This connection and related facilities, known as Schedule M, consists of a 1 million gallon reservoir and booster pump facilities.

A. Water Distribution System

The City of Stayton’s water distribution system includes a low level system below an elevation of 465 feet and a high level system above an elevation of 465 feet in the northeast part of the city.
M.4 Existing Water Distribution System
The low level water distribution system serves most of the city. During the past 15 years, a number of improvements to the low level system have been made. Piping ranges from good to poor as to size and condition. Adequate fire flows are now available throughout some of the low level water system. Low level reservoir storage is considered inadequate.

The high level water distribution system is not in as good a condition as the low level system. Most of the piping is reasonably competent, but many pipe sizes do not handle peak water demands. The high level water system should have a storage reservoir capable of supplying water to the high level system to meet fire flows and peak domestic demand.

B. Water Service Extensions and Improvements

Water service can most easily be extended by lines going west and north from the low level water system. Extending water service from the low level water system south toward the North Santiam River is also relatively easy. In most areas, the existing water lines would need reinforcement to allow pipeline extensions outward from the areas now served.

Extending water service from the high level system will be more costly. Basic improvements to that system will be necessary before water service is fully extended.

The list of water projects in Table PF-1 is adapted from Table 8-1 in the master utilities plan. The first two projects on Table 8-1 were completed in 1981; the other projects remain to be done. The priority listing in the far right column is an estimation of the relative timing of the various projects. Priorities refer to progression of construction rather than to a specific time frame—Priority 1 should be constructed before Priority 2 and so on. The two projects for which there is no estimated cost are cases where significant alternatives in project development that would determine the project cost remain to be decided. Where cost estimates do appear, they are expressed in 1980 dollars (equivalent to an ENR construction cost index at 3200).

Table PF-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>LINE SIZE (IN INCHES)</th>
<th>LENGTH (IN FEET)</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION COST (1980 $)</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Schedule M, Wilco Rd</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>143,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Washington to Wilco Rd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Connect 16' behind cannery to Washington St</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22JMM Master Utilities Plan, 1980

23Does not include maintenance projects

24Priority 1 means should be constructed before Priority 2, and so on over the 20 years 1985 to 2005. Priorities are subject to change through revision of the Capital Improvement Program and more detailed public facility planning.

25Completed in 1981
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>LINE SIZE (IN INCHES)</th>
<th>LENGTH (IN FEET)</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION COST (1980 $)</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>5 mg Reservoir</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>High Lvl Pump Station</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Transmission Line 1, First Ave to Reservoir</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>468,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Grid Network, SE area</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>462,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Transmission Line 2, Reservoir to Wilco</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>1,071,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Grid Network, north area</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>840,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>.75 mg Elevated Reservoir</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Transmission Line 3, High Service Zone</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>288,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Line from Shaff Rd to High School</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>74,400</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>2 mg Ground Level Reservoir, Pump Station</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Treatment Plnt Expand</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Line paralleling Wilco</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>217,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>System Control, Tele-metering</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Pumping Plant Pumping Improvements</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Line from Shaff to Santiam Golf Course</td>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>288,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Grid Network, High Level Pump Station</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>252,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Connect Shaff to First</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>37,200</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**  
$6,005,000

---

26 No estimate at this time

27 Ibid
Stayton Santiam System

In 1963, the City of Stayton developed a sanitary sewage collection and treatment system that provided service to the City of Stayton. The City of Sublimity was included in the system in 1975. Both systems are working well and are currently below capacity. The Stayton population projection to the year 2005 is 11,500. Sublimity’s projection to the year 2005 is 2,900. The combined total of 14,400 will require major changes and additions to the treatment system prior to the year 2005. More trunk lines and lift stations are needed to serve all of the urban growth area.

A. Stayton-Sublimity Sewer Agreement

A June 1973 agreement between Stayton and Sublimity provided for a regionalized sanitary sewer facility. The agreement includes connection cost sharing and flow restrictions. General provisions were the adoption and enforcement of rules and regulations concerning the collection and disposal of sanitary waste.

These regulations meet current standards and practices laid out by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ).

B. Treatment System

The City of Stayton maintains a sewage treatment plant at the southwest corner of the urban growth boundary. This plant is a tertiary facility designed to handle an average flow of 1.35 million gallons per day (MGD). As of May, 1989, the average daily flow was .876 mgd. The plant has peak flow capacity equal to 4.05 million gallons per day. Effluent from the treatment plant is discharged to the North Santiam River and meets current DEQ effluent requirements.

C. Sewage Collection System

The Stayton sewage collection system was built in 1963 and has a fairly significant infiltration/inflow problem. Organized efforts to correct this have made some progress in reducing the wet weather flows.

The Sublimity sewage collection system was installed in 1975, and most homes in Sublimity were connected to the system by mid-summer 1976. All of the Sublimity sewage is pumped into the Stayton system for treatment. The Stayton sewage system was designed to expand to serve adjacent areas. The success of the infiltration/inflow reduction program will, however, determine how much additional service can ultimately be provided by the existing sewage treatment system.

Sewer Service Areas

A. Pumping Facilities

The Public Facilities Map shows the City of Stayton and the urban growth area. Within the existing Stayton sewer service area, lift stations serve areas that could not be served by gravity.

Lift Station No. 1, located on Gardner Avenue, serves the east portion of Westown and West Regis and a portion of West Shaff Road. Lift Station No. 2 is located on Fern Ridge Road just east of Tenth Avenue. This lift station has the capacity to serve approximately 100 homes. If relocated, this lift station
could serve much of the area on the north side of Fern Ridge in the eastern part of the city. Lift Station No. 3 is the Wilco Road lift station. It serves the immediate area with additional allowances for the sewage anticipated to be pumped from a future lift station located adjacent to Mill Creek near the Santiam Golf Course. Lift Station No. 4 is on Deschutes Avenue and serves the Stayton Industrial Park.

A fifth lift station pumps the sewage flows from Sublimity to Shaff Road. The sewage then flows by gravity to the Wilco Road lift station.

B. Gravity Sewers

The rest of the city is presently served by gravity sewers. Future development will generally require a combination of gravity sewers within drainage basins and lift stations to pump sewage out of the basins to the treatment plant.

The existing gravity sewer system could easily be expanded eastward within the urban growth boundary. The area along the south boundary of the city, however, will be difficult to serve. Much of this area lies in the floodplain of the Santiam River, and virtually all service would need to be provided by pumping facilities. Likewise there is another small area between the existing service and the urban growth boundary on the very west end of Shaff Road which will be difficult to serve by gravity from any of the existing or planned systems.

Much of the potential growth area for Stayton lies north of Shaff Road and in the westerly portion of the urban growth boundary. There are several options for expanded sewer service in the Mill Creek drainage north of the present sewer service area. There will probably be a need for a sewer lift station adjacent to Mill Creek near the Santiam Golf Course. Eventually gravity sewer service to that lift station might be extended all the way up Mill Creek, thereby providing sewer service to the Stayton urban growth boundary area north of the present sewer service area.

C. Sewer Extensions and Improvements

The first priority for assuring that capacity for expanded sewer service will be continued efforts to reduce infiltration and inflow into the present system. These flows of extraneous water greatly reduce the residual capacity for sewer service to new areas adjacent to the existing service areas. The flow reduction efforts should be seen as a continued maintenance effort. It should be pursued in an organized manner with some money budgeted each year for reduction.

Expanded sewer service at this time can most easily be provided in the area that would be served by gravity on the east side of the city, on the west side of the city, and within the Wilco Road service area. In each of these areas, land could be developed and served by simply extending existing sewers. The feasibility of serving the area in the east with sewers is offset, however, by the relatively greater costs of providing water service in that area.

The Lift Station No. 2 service area could allow extension of sewers where a considerable interest exists in more residential development. Extended service into the Mill Creek drainage area, with the exception of the area that can be served by the Wilco Road system, is a little more difficult. West of the Sublimity lift station the area would need to be served by a new lift station and force main. That, of course, would necessitate a considerable investment. The area east of the Sublimity lift station could be served to that lift station if arrangements with the City of Sublimity can be made.
Projects identified under “Model 1” in the Master Utilities Plan are listed in Table PF-2.

Table PF-2²⁸
Santiam Sewer System Capital Improvement Projects²⁹ ³⁰
City of Stayton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>LENGTH (INCHES)</th>
<th>SIZE (mgd)</th>
<th>COST (1980 $)</th>
<th>PRIORITY¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lift Stations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Club Road (new)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilco Rd Station Remodel (existing)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Ave Lift Station (temp.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Needed Interceptors by Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>114,400</td>
<td>1 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>483,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>136,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>136,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>129,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laterals</td>
<td>74,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,480,000</td>
<td>1 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force Mains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td>1 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>122,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,399,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁸JMM Master Utilities Plan, 1980

²⁹Does not include maintenance projects

³⁰Priority 1 means should be constructed before Priority 2, and so on, over the 20 years 1985 to 2005. Priorities are subject to change through the revision of the Capital Improvements Program and more detailed public facility planning.
Chapter 4. Public Facilities and Services

Storm Sewer System

The Master Utilities Plan also evaluated design criteria, quantity of storm runoff, and hydraulic considerations for new storm drains. New facilities were then proposed based upon 10-year storm events. New facilities would be either in the eastern part of the urban growth boundary or in the northern area drained by Mill Creek. The city completed a study of Mill Creek floodplain to plan the location of dikes, drains, and detention basins in 1982. The rough cost estimate for the last item in Table PF-3 is derived from the Mill Creek study. The Mill Creek study has not been adopted by the city council.

Table PF-3
Storm Sewer System Capital Improvement Projects
City of Stayton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>LINE SIZE (INCHES)</th>
<th>LENGTH (FEET)</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION (1980 $)</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Drainage Basins 3, 4, 5, 6, 9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>Drainage Basin 2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>144,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Existing Trouble Spots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Eastern</td>
<td>Trunks</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>810,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Lateral s</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>204,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Northern</td>
<td>Open Channel</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Trunks</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>256,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Trunks</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Trunks</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>98,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Lateral s</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>204,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Lateral s</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Modify South Mill Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Rechannel Mill Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,780,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 Master Utilities Plan, 1980; Mill Creek Floodplain Study

32 Does not include maintenance projects

33 Codes refer to Figure 14-1 in Master Utilities Plan

34 Priority 1 means should be constructed before Priority 2 and so on over the 20 years, 1985 to 2005. Priorities are subject to change through the revision of Capital Improvements Program and more detailed public facilities planning.
M.8 Existing Storm Sewer Collection System
M.9 Storm Sewer Proposed Improvements
Fire Service

The Stayton Rural Fire Protection District is a volunteer department, with a full time paid chief, which serves both the city and adjacent rural areas due to the 1985 annexation of the city into the rural district. The new fire station opened in 1988 and is located on West Ida Street near Wilco Road. Information on equipment, insurance rating, and fire incidents and service calls is included in the State Fire Marshal’s annual report.

Expansion of the city will necessitate at least one additional fire station. The fire chief has recommended the area of Tenth Avenue and Santiam Street as a possible east side location.

In addition to fire fighting functions, the fire station provides first aid, communications, and public education on fire safety.

Police Service

Police services are provided by a professional force on a 24-hour per day basis. The police department occupies the old city hall building and was remodeled in 1988 and is located on Third Avenue.

Support services are provided the department by a complement of police reserves (adults) and cadets (ages 15 to 21), who provide support services and perform traffic and crowd control at special events. A comprehensive training program is required of all personnel.

The department maintains lock-up facilities for detention of arrestees. Currently two holding cells are provided in this facility.

Stayton police will need increased staffing in order to maintain current service levels as the city grows. Guidelines to meet growth needs include: 1) One patrol person for each 500 additional people; 2) One new vehicle for each four to five new patrol persons is a minimal standard; 3) Standard support equipment for each new patrol person; and 4) Modification and/or replacement of communications equipment for a five-year basis.

Schools

Stayton has a complementary group of schools that is unique among Oregon small towns. Both public and private schools enroll a significant number of children from grades kindergarten through twelfth grade.

School District 77J is a public elementary district that primarily serves Stayton and the surrounding area. The district includes Stayton Grade School and a small rural school at Mehama. Stayton Grade School had a 1989-1990 enrollment of 479 in grades kindergarten through fourth. Kindergarten was added in the 1984-1985 school year. The grade school has a student capacity of 550.

The Stayton Middle School had a 1989-1990 enrollment of 407 students in grades fifth through eighth. Its capacity is 400 students. The middle school occupies a 68½ acre site; however, some of it is not developable.

St. Mary’s School had an enrollment of 292 in 1989-1990 in grades first through eighth. The facilities and its seven acre site are adequate for current and anticipated enrollment.

Regis High School had an enrollment of 206 in 1989-1990 in grades ninth through twelfth. The building has a capacity of 250 with room for expansion on a 30-acre site.

The Stayton Union High School district includes Stayton and Sublimity areas. The enrollment at Stayton Union High School reached a peak at 620 in 1979. In the early 1980s, enrollment declined somewhat to a range of 500 to 560. The 1989-1990 enrollment was 536. The school facilities and the 38-acre site are adequate for the foreseeable future.

The primary land use need of the schools in Stayton is for elementary school sites. One site is needed to permit the relocation of the Stayton grade school from its present downtown site. A second elementary school may be needed to accommodate the planned growth of the city to a population of 11,500 by 2005. A desirable site for a new elementary school would be next to the middle school.

**Solid Waste**

Currently solid waste in Stayton is collected by the Stayton Sanitary Service. The solid waste collected at Fern Ridge Transfer Station is located east of Stayton. Waste collected here is transferred to the Marion County Solid Waste Energy facility in Brooks.

Stayton is within the area covered by the Chemeketa Region Solid Waste Management Plan. Marion County is the primary local agency responsible for implementing the solid waste management plan. The Oregon DEQ is responsible for enforcing state and federal law related to solid waste. A recent state law, ORS 340.60, adopted in December 1984, requires curbside pickup of recyclable materials must be available at least monthly in cities of 4,000 or more and within the urban growth boundaries as of July 1, 1986. The City of Stayton, in its role as franchiser, is working in cooperation with the Marion County Solid Waste Division to implement this recycling bill.

**Parks and Recreation**

The City of Stayton has four developed park facilities: Northslope Park, Pioneer Park, Westown Park, and the Community Center Park. Pioneer Park contains a tennis court, swings, slide, and picnicking facilities. Northslope and Westown parks are one-acre parks containing swings, slides, and other playground equipment. The Community Center Park area is located on First Avenue and contains tennis courts, swimming pool, and play equipment as well as the community center and public library.

Through the cooperation of the Regional Park and Recreation Agency and Marion County, a 55-acre site immediately east of Pioneer Park is available to Stayton residents as a wilderness and natural trails area.

In addition to publicly owned parks, there is the Santiam Golf Club’s 18-hole golf course located at Golf Club Road and Highway 22 which is open to the public. Additional neighborhood parks and recreation facilities are needed. Those present and future needs are in the process of being addresses by the Stayton Parks and Recreation Board.
The existing school sites provide play fields and playground equipment for the present population. However, funding for additional facilities is limited. The subdivision section of the development ordinance requires a 5 percent land set-aside, or a contribution in lieu of a land set-aside, for parks and open space purposes. Assistance from the state and federal governments may be needed for the development of some new parks.

Several opportunities exist in the Stayton area to improve parks and meet recreation needs. The Salem Ditch, which travels through the heart of the city, provides an opportunity to develop a scenic waterway and bicycle and jogging paths to link existing park areas with the central shopping area and the North Santiam River. The Santiam and Mill Creek flood plains are also areas where recreational uses could be developed. The restrictions on development in the floodplain prevent many other uses. The flood plains are well suited to open spaces, parks, bicycle and foot paths, and limited facilities. A bicycle/foot path system could ultimately be developed that would provide a complete loop system among Stayton’s parks and schools as well as the existing link to Sublimity.

Library

The Stayton Public Library is supported by city funds, membership dues, book fines, and private donations. The library operates with a full time librarian, part time staff, and volunteer aides from a citizen group, “Friends of the Library.” The new library on First Avenue was recently constructed through city and volunteer assistance. It opened in December, 1989.

The Stayton library is a member of the Chemeketa Cooperative Regional Library Service (CCRLS), which allows access to materials from all participating libraries and the state library. As the population increases, expanded library services will be needed.

Hospital

Santiam Memorial Hospital, located on Tenth Avenue, is a 40-bed short-stay facility. Three medical clinics are located nearby. Santiam Memorial Hospital is a community controlled, self-supporting facility that provides medical services to an area with approximately 15,000 people. The hospital maintains a helicopter pad for emergencies and leases an ambulance to the fire district for emergency services.

The Western Oregon Health Systems Agency lists Santiam Memorial in a group of small community hospitals in Oregon that have an overall high priority for renovation. As Stayton grows, the hospital will need to expand on its present site.

Public Facility Policies

PF-1 The City of Stayton shall be the ultimate provider of the following urban services within the Stayton urban growth boundary: 1) municipal water supply; 2) sanitary sewage collection and treatment; 3) storm sewers; 4) police protection; 5) parks and recreational facilities; and 6) library services.
The City of Stayton shall use its Master Utilities Plan and Capital Improvement Program to direct the provision of public facilities within the urban growth boundary.

The City of Stayton shall require adequate provision for utility easements through its development ordinance. This includes water, sewer, and storm drainage as well as energy and community utilities.

The Stayton Fire District shall be the provider of fire service in the City of Stayton and Stayton urban growth area.

In order to facilitate open and direct communication between schools and the City of Stayton, the city administrator shall appoint a member of his staff as a liaison officer to coordinate and communicate city plans with the schools. In addition, the schools shall be asked to appoint a liaison officer to coordinate with the city.

The City of Stayton shall maintain regular contact with the Marion County Solid Waste Division and Oregon DEQ to ensure that solid waste planning and implementation is coordinated.

Standards and guidelines shall be adopted for the development and use of the recreational facilities in Stayton. The Regional Park and Recreation Agency standards shall be the minimum standards until city standards are developed.

Areas along the waterways should be preserved for the passive enjoyment of the scenic and natural sites. The fish ladder near the City of Salem water works and on the power canal should have controlled public access.

Addition to local recreation resources shall be required as a condition of approval of subdivision developments. Either land dedication or payment to a development fund shall be a requirement in the development ordinances.
CHAPTER 5.

Land Use

This element of the comprehensive plan considers the various land uses within the City of Stayton and its urban growth area. Both existing and planned land uses are discussed in terms of the land use designations and zones on the Stayton Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map, which appears at the end of this section. The discussion deals with land use needs under LCDC Goals 9 (Economy), 10 (Housing), and 14 (Urbanization).

Annexation, Rezoning, UGB Amendments from 1979 to 1989

Annexations to the City of Stayton between January 1979 and January 1989 added 158.5 acres of land, for a total of 1,554.49 acres within the city limits. Some 150 acres in four parcels were designated for low density residential use and are now zoned accordingly. Several small parcels were annexed with commercial or industrial zoning. The different zones within the city are listed in Table LU-1. The net effect of the annexations as well as zone changes within the city until January, 1985 was to add 152.85 acres to the Low Density Residential (LD) zone; add 20.5 acres to the Light Industrial (IL) zone; and add 0.46 acres to the Commercial Retail (CR) zone within the city. The land zoned for Medium Density Residential (MD) use declined by 3.08 acres, while land zoned for High Density (HD) declined by 12.23 acres. These changes are reflected in Table LU-2, which shows existing land use designations and zoning in Stayton.

There were also three annexations to the Stayton urban growth boundary from 1979 to the first half of 1989. Each parcel was included in the UGB after documentation that similar parcels were not available elsewhere within the Stayton UGB.

The additions to the UGB were: 1) the Santiam Golf Club’s 18-hole golf course; 2) a 3-acre parcel of industrial land (which was also annexed to the city); and 3) three (two already developed) parcels at the intersection of Golf Club Road and Highway 22 that are zoned from Interchange Development (ID) by Marion County. The findings to support each UGB amendment are included in an appendix to the comprehensive plan. The UGB amendments are also reflected in Table LU-3.

Summary of Land Use Designations and Zoning

The City of Stayton Comprehensive Plan has ten land use designations for the area within the urban growth boundary. The designations are all currently existing zones of land within the city. The land use designations, zoning abbreviations, and the primary purposes of the designations are summarized in Table LU-1 (Ord. 743, §1, May 1995).
Table LU-1
Land Use and Zoning Within the UGB
City of Stayton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE DESIGNATION</th>
<th>ZONING ABBREVIATION</th>
<th>PRIMARY PURPOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>To provide areas for single family residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>To provide areas for single family residences, duplexes, tri-plexes, and manufactured home parks at densities up to 12 units per acre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>HD</td>
<td>To provide for multi-family units with a minimum density of 13 units per acre and no upper limit to the maximum allowable dwelling density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Retail</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>To provide for retail commercial activities in the downtown area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial General</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td>To provide for a wide range of commercial uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Commercial</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>To provide a mix of compatible commercial and industrial uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interchange Development</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>To allow highway oriented use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (Light)</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>To provide for industrial uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (Agriculture)</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>To allow agriculturally related industrial uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Semi-Public</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>To provide for uses that serve the public on land owned by government and non-profit organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1979 the City of Stayton adopted a combined Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Zoning Map. Therefore, plan designations and zoning districts always coincide within the city limits. While city plan designations do not always coincide with zones in the urban growth area between the city limits and the UGB, the city plan designations are consistent with the underlying county zoning. The Marion County zoning applied to the urban growth area is primarily EFU (as a holding zone), although some parcels are zoned Public (P), Light Industrial (IL), or Interchange Development (ID).

A. Planning Land Uses Within City Limits

Table LU-2 covers the area within the Stayton city limits as of April 1985, especially for those land use zones that are intended to support new growth and development. The total area in each zone in broken out into four categories: land currently developed; development limitations; existing rights-of-way; and the land area to be developed. “Development limitations” includes areas within a flood plain, on steep slopes, or crossed by a waterway. The area to be developed is buildable land that needs additional rights-of-way on larger parcels.

The IA zone is almost entirely the area used by NORPAC Foods, Inc. for spray irrigation of cannery wastes. The P zone is primarily land use for parks, schools, and churches. Some of the land in either zone could be considered developable in terms of physical characteristics. The IA and P zones are
compared to the residential, commercial, and industrial zones because the current uses are expected to continue indefinitely.

B. Land Uses Planned for Local Urban Growth Areas

In addition to the existing city limits, the Stayton Comprehensive Plan also addresses the urban growth area, which is the land between the city limits and the urban growth boundary. Table LU-3 presents the land use designations for the urban growth area as Table LU-2 did for the city limits. However, the area to be developed includes rights-of-way for the urban growth area.

Three zones that are applied within the city are not planned for the urban growth area. The High Density (HD) residential zone is only applied within the city where services are currently available. The Commercial Retail (CR) zone is only applied in the downtown business area. The Industrial Commercial (IC) zone is for serviced “business park” development.

The land to be developed in the urban growth area is primarily designated for low and medium density residential use.

Table LU-2
Land Use Planned Within City Limits (in acres, as of April 1985)
City of Stayton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designations and Zones</th>
<th>Currently Developed</th>
<th>Development Limitations</th>
<th>Existing Rights-of-Way</th>
<th>Areas to be Developed</th>
<th>Total Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>304.25</td>
<td>81.48</td>
<td>121.20</td>
<td>185.34</td>
<td>692.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>83.98</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>63.41</td>
<td>169.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD</td>
<td>19.84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>34.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>26.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>54.34</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>18.63</td>
<td>24.46</td>
<td>98.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>19.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not in city limits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>144.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.83</td>
<td>97.25</td>
<td>264.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>622.33</td>
<td>89.41</td>
<td>196.19</td>
<td>397.56</td>
<td>1,305.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not comparable to other zones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not comparable to other zones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,154.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table LU-3

35 Includes 2.60 acres of railroad right-of-way
Land Uses Planned for Urban Growth Area Outside City Limits  
(in acres as of April 1985)  
City of Stayton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designations and Zones</th>
<th>Currently Developed</th>
<th>Development Limitations</th>
<th>Area to be Developed (Including Rights-of-Way)</th>
<th>Total Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>204.50</td>
<td>191.79</td>
<td>509.67</td>
<td>905.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>81.74</td>
<td>56.71</td>
<td>143.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD</td>
<td>Not outside city limits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Not outside city limits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Not outside city limits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>13.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46.40</td>
<td>46.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>218.34</td>
<td>273.53</td>
<td>620.84</td>
<td>1,112.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA&lt;sup&gt;42&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Not comparable with other designations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&lt;sup&gt;43&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Not comparable with other designations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>230.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,478.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>36</sup> There are 47 existing structures on this land  
<sup>37</sup> Includes 21.64 acres of existing right-of-way  
<sup>38</sup> There are two structures on this land  
<sup>39</sup> Includes a 6.33 acre parcel being developed  
<sup>40</sup> All existing rights-of-way  
<sup>41</sup> Includes 29.07 acres of existing right-of-way  
<sup>42</sup> The IA and P designations are not comparable to other designations because current uses are expected to continue indefinitely  
<sup>43</sup> Ibid
C. Land Use Within UGB by 2005

Table LU-4 summarizes the land uses planned by the area within the urban growth boundary by 2005. The table corresponds to the Land Use and Zoning Map at the end of this element. The totals by category from Table LU-2 and Table LU-3 are summed, and the percent of the total UGB area designated for each type of use is given. Residential, commercial, industrial, and public land uses are discussed further in the following sections.

Table LU-4
Land Uses Planned Within Urban Growth Boundary by 2005 (in acres)
City of Stayton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designations and Zones</th>
<th>April 1985 City Limits</th>
<th>Urban Growth Area</th>
<th>Total Area</th>
<th>Percent of Total Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>692.27</td>
<td>905.96</td>
<td>1,598.73</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>169.60</td>
<td>143.05</td>
<td>312.65</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD</td>
<td>34.66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34.66</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>26.91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26.91</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>98.35</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>101.79</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>19.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19.01</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.86</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>264.69</td>
<td>46.40</td>
<td>311.09</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>51.04</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>186.04</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>107.96</td>
<td>230.83</td>
<td>428.79</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,544.49</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,478.54</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,033.03</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residential Land Use and Housing

A. Housing

Housing was identified as a significant problem in Stayton in the 1979 Comprehensive Plan due to the rising cost of labor and building materials. Since that time, high interest rates have become the major

\[44\] From Table LU-2  
\[45\] Ibid
factor affecting housing. Housing demand could increase soon in Stayton if anticipated industrial expansion occurs and interest rates continue to fall.

There is limited recent data on the income levels of households in Stayton. The 1980 census reported that per capita, household, and family incomes in Stayton were higher than for Marion County as a whole. Likewise, the percent of persons and households below the poverty level was less in Stayton than for the county. This would tend to indicate less need for lower cost forms of housing. However, the City of Stayton has had a relatively young population with more families and fewer elderly people than Marion County or the state as a whole. Stayton has therefore been a community of largely single-family, detached, owner-occupied homes. Economic and social pressures over the last decade have increased the number of medium and high density housing units. It is expected that this trend will continue as the number of elderly increases and as job growth allows more young adults to remain or return to the community.

B. Government-Assisted Housing

A considerable amount of housing in the City of Stayton has been built with government assistance. The most common type of government assistance is a subsidized mortgage through various state and federal programs, although figures are not available for the number of houses in Stayton financed through these programs. Government assisted housing is also provided through subsidies for apartments for low and moderate income people. Government-assisted housing in apartments is listed in Table LU-5. The amount of government assisted housing in Stayton is consistent with the “fair share” allocation in the “Regional Housing Element” (MWVCOB, 1978:107).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME AND ADDRESS</th>
<th>ASSISTED UNITS</th>
<th>TYPE OF UNIT</th>
<th>ASSISTING AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Braidwood Apartments</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>FmHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1091 N First Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister Apartments</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>SHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315 Hollister Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Park Village</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>FmHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth and Santiam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table LU-5
Government-Assisted Housing
City of Stayton

46 State Housing Division, 1984
47 State Housing Division
48 State Housing Division
C. Housing Types Available

A diverse mix of housing types needed to promote affordable housing exists within the City of Stayton, and continued diversity is planned. The City of Stayton, after considerable public input and debate, decided in 1979 that multi-family housing should be distributed throughout the community as well as be located in and near the commercial core of the city. The residential land use designations and zones within the City of Stayton allow housing types that include single-family dwellings, duplexes, manufactured homes, and apartments. All of these housing types are available at a range of price and rent levels. As discussed below in the housing needs projection, the comprehensive plan provides for a wider diversity of housing types in the future.

D. Housing Needs Projection

The needed housing within the Stayton urban growth boundary to the year 2005 is estimated in Table LU-6, based upon the projected population of 11,500. Several assumptions were made about the number of persons per housing unit, the vacancy rate, and housing densities. Overall, the assumptions reflect a continuation of recent trends.

The housing needs projection in Table LU-6 presents existing units, units needed, units to be built, and net acres needed for four housing types by density. The single-family dwelling category is provided for by the Low Density (LD) plan designation and zone. The duplex and manufactured home categories correspond to the uses allowed outright in the Medium Density (MD) zone. Four-plexes and larger apartments are outright uses in the High Density (HD) zone.

The existing units listed in Table LU-6 include dwellings outside the city limits but within the UGB and dwellings in non-residential zones. The existing housing unit totals shown in Table LU-6 represent an overall net increase of 226 housing units between June 1979 and April 1985. Some 96 building permits were issued for single-family dwellings. There was a net increase of 89 single-family dwellings because of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME AND ADDRESS</th>
<th>ASSISTED UNITS</th>
<th>TYPE OF UNIT</th>
<th>ASSISTING AGENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stayton Manor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>HUD\textsuperscript{49}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third and Jefferson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Northridge</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>FmHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1663 N Third Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Apartments</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>FmHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>965 N. Gardner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treehouse Apartments</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>MCHA\textsuperscript{50}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 Block, W. Locust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL UNITS</strong></td>
<td><strong>148</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{49} Department of Housing and Urban Development

\textsuperscript{50} Marion County Housing Authority
seven demolitions. During the same period, 46 duplex units, 60 apartment units, and 31 manufactured homes were added to Stayton’s housing stock.

The number of units needed is based upon the same 60/25/15 split among low/medium/high density zones that was used in 1979. The existing split for all housing within the UGB is 69.3 percent single family dwellings; 8.5 percent duplex units; 8.5 percent manufactured homes; and 136 percent four-plexes and apartment units. However, the number of persons per occupied housing unit anticipated in the 1979 plan had already occurred by April 1980 when the census was taken. Therefore, the number of units needed was increased slightly due to the somewhat small projected household size. The number of “units to be built” in Table LU-6 is the difference between needed and existing units.

Table LU-6
Housing Needs Projection
City of Stayton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House Type by Density</th>
<th>Existing Units(^{52})</th>
<th>Units Needed(^{53})</th>
<th>Housing Units to Be Built</th>
<th>Acres Needed(^{54})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwellings</td>
<td>1,310(^{55})</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>363(^{56})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>52(^{57})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured Home</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>52(^{58})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-plex and larger apartments</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>27(^{59})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,891</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,709</strong></td>
<td><strong>493</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The projection of acres needed is based upon the anticipated number of housing units per acre for the LD, MD, and HD zones. The acreage per unit is the net amount after subtracting the rights-of-way. The

\(^{51}\) Based upon 11,500 population within the UGB by 2005

\(^{52}\) As of April 1985, includes 122 units in commercial and industrial zones

\(^{53}\) Assumes 2.5 persons per housing unit on the average, which is equivalent to 2.63 persons per occupied housing unit at a 5 percent vacancy rate. The units needed also assume a 60/25/15 split among housing types

\(^{54}\) Acres needed refers to net acres plus right-of-way

\(^{55}\) Includes 75 units outside city limits

\(^{56}\) At density of 4.0 units per net acre in LD zone

\(^{57}\) At density of 8.0 units per net acre in MD zone

\(^{58}\) Ibid

\(^{59}\) At density of 16.0 units per acre in HD zone
LD zone is projected to have 4.0 units per acre for new development compared to an existing density of 3.09 units per acre. The MD zone is projected to have 8.0 units per acre for new development compared to an existing density of 4.35 units per acre. The HD zone is projected to have 16.0 units per acre for new development compared to an existing density of 12.65 units per acre. There is adequate area designated for low and medium density housing as can be seen by comparing Table LU-6 with Table LU-4.

During periodic review it was determined that more land (about 18.77 acres) is needed for high density residential use. The high density development should occur primarily in the central shopping area along major transportation corridors and facilities and adjacent to schools and parks. Multi-family development in the core area should not be restricted to a single story, since multi-storied apartments can use the available land more economically. Higher densities are desirable in and near the developed areas of the city in order to conserve available land, provide direct access to shopping and transportation facilities, conserve energy, and separate less intense uses from commercial uses. To assure an adequate supply of land for the needed high density housing units, the parcels to be rezoned should be mostly vacant and of one to five acres in size within the existing city water and sewer service area.

Buildable Lands Inventory

The Buildable Lands Inventory applies to residential uses within the city. Where conflicts occur with the April 1985 inventory, the updated January 1994 inventory shall apply. This residential inventory shall be continually updated and the new inventory figures shall automatically become a part of the Stayton Comprehensive Plan (see Appendix A for annual updates) (Ord. 743, §4, May 1995).

Table LU-7
High Density Residential
(As of January 1994)
City of Stayton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowed Uses:</th>
<th>Apartments (16+ units/acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured home parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Centers, multi-family residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average Density: | 16 units/acre |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL GROSS AREA</th>
<th>DEVELOPED</th>
<th>LIMITATIONS OR UNBUILDABLE</th>
<th>RIGHT-OF-WAY</th>
<th>NET ACRES BUILDABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-City</td>
<td>40.99</td>
<td>35.99</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside city</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table LU-8
Medium Density Residential
(As of January 1994)
City of Stayton

Allowed Uses: Single family, manufactured homes, duplexes
Triplexes (12 units/acre)
Manufactured home parks and subdivisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL GROSS AREA</th>
<th>DEVELOPED</th>
<th>LIMITATIONS OR UNBUILDABLE</th>
<th>RIGHT-OF-WAY</th>
<th>NET ACRES BUILDABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-City</td>
<td>165.27</td>
<td>113.22</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside city</td>
<td>138.15</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>33.74</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>79.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>303.42</td>
<td>118.03</td>
<td>46.50</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>117.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table LU-9
Low Density Residential
(As of January 1994)

Allowed Uses: Single family, manufactured homes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL GROSS AREA</th>
<th>DEVELOPED</th>
<th>LIMITATIONS OR UNBUILDABLE</th>
<th>RIGHT-OF-WAY</th>
<th>NET ACRES BUILDABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-City</td>
<td>718.11</td>
<td>387.56</td>
<td>130.09</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>180.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside city</td>
<td>893.03</td>
<td>41.31</td>
<td>178.17</td>
<td>165.60</td>
<td>496.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1558.97</td>
<td>428.87</td>
<td>196.20</td>
<td>185.20</td>
<td>676.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table LU-10
Housing Needs Projection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXISTING HOUSING UNITS</th>
<th>PROJECT UNITS</th>
<th>UNITS NEEDED</th>
<th>UNITS BY ZONE</th>
<th>ACRES NEEDED</th>
<th>DENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>1422</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>1200 LD</td>
<td>300 acre</td>
<td>4 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120 MD</td>
<td>30 acre</td>
<td>4 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured Homes</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>134 LD</td>
<td>34 acre</td>
<td>4 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120 MD</td>
<td>15 acre</td>
<td>8 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplexes</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>494 MD</td>
<td>62 acre</td>
<td>8 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family, Apartments</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>224 HD</td>
<td>14 acre</td>
<td>16 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110 MD</td>
<td>10 acre</td>
<td>12 acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table LU-11

**Acreage Needs Projection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Single Family</th>
<th>Manufactured</th>
<th>Duplexes</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Needed</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>+/- &amp; UGB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>180 City</td>
<td>-154 City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>490 UGB</td>
<td>+336 Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>670 Total</td>
<td>City/UGB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>38 City</td>
<td>-70 City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80 UGB</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>118 Total</td>
<td>City/UGB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4 City</td>
<td>-10 City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 UGB</td>
<td>-10 Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Total</td>
<td>City/UGB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commercial Land Use

There are approximately 55 acres of commercially zoned land with existing commercial uses within the City of Stayton. There is another 13 acres of land with residential uses in the commercial zone. Without inclusion of a publicly zoned parcel in the downtown area or residences in commercial zones, there is a total of 41 acres vacant developable land zoned to allow commercial uses in the City of Stayton. The total amount of land designated for commercial use (CR, CG, IC, ID) in Stayton UGB is 160 acres, or 5 percent of the total area within the UGB (see Table LU-4).

First Avenue has the greatest concentration of commercial activity. The central business area has been defined as follows: From Regis Street south to Water Street; west of First Avenue approximately 200 feet; east of First Avenue to the center of the block; between First and Fourth avenues south of Washington to Water Street.

A commercial corridor, 100 feet in depth on the north and south side of Washington Street between the cannery and First Avenue, has been designated for a mixing of residential and commercial uses.

A third commercial use area, clustered around the intersection of Wilco Road and Washington Street, is designated as an industrial/commercial area and is intended to provide an area for heavy commercial uses and light industrial uses, warehousing, and storage.

A fourth commercial area is at the intersection of Shaff and Wilco roads. This area is designated for a general commercial use. It is expected that as residential development occurs to the north and west of the planning area, retail and service facilities will be needed in this area.

Retail trade is an important part of Stayton’s economy. Local merchants provide basic shopping needs for the area including Aumsville, Sublimity, Mehama, Lyons, Scio, and Marion. The development of a large
shopping mall and other retail facilities in East Salem has affected Stayton; however, the increase in population of the North Santiam corridor will lead to an increased need for commercial services in Stayton.

More intensive commercial use of the downtown business district is expected over time. The continued conversion of houses and residential lots in the commercial zones will allow for new business locations. Commercial development and visual improvements will also have the effect of attracting new types of residential development to the downtown. This will likely take shape as apartment units above first floor commercial development or the development of multi-family units adjacent to the Stayton Power Canal and the Salem Ditch between North First Avenue and North Fourth Avenue (Ord. 743, §3, May 1995).

### Industrial Land Use

The City of Stayton has approximately 145 acres of developed industrial lands that include some area for the expansion of existing industry. The total designated acreage of industrial land (IL, IC, IA) is over 500 acres. Most industrial land is along Wilco Road between Shaff Road and Washington Street. Stayton’s industrial area has grown over the last 20 years and includes such industries as Guerdon, Philips, and Alumax. In the last ten years, Wenco and Trus Joist have located in Stayton. An extensive amount of vacant land, the lack of land use conflicts, and direct access to rail and highway facilities and city services have helped to make the Wilco Road industrial area attractive for industrial developments.

The properties owned by NORPAC Foods, Inc. Have been designed as industrial to provide a buffer around the cannery. An Industrial/Agricultural (IA) designation allows NORPAC to continue to spray irrigate its cannery wastes on 185 acres southwest of the city.

Developable industrial land includes 15 acres (zoned IC) in a business park setting within the city and 97 acres zoned IL within the city.

An additional 46 acres designated IL is adjacent to the city limits. Most of Stayton’s industrial land is either served by public facilities or is in proximity to existing facilities.

### Public Land Uses

The land designated for various public uses within the UGB is 14 percent of the total area. All of this land is owned by government or not-for-profit organizations. Future public land needed for a school site can be met through means such as exchange or disposal of surplus land and reacquisition of a needed site. Also, more neighborhood parks and playgrounds are needed. The total amount of land designated for public and semi-public uses within the UGB is adequate for the City of Stayton’s projected growth to the year 2005.

### Land Uses Policies

**LU-1**
Land use designations and zoning shall be consistent.

**LU-2**
Zoning shall follow property lines and include entire rights-of-way as much as practicable.

**LU-3**
The City of Stayton’s development regulations shall adopt the Uniform Building Code.
LU-4 The development regulations shall include clear and objective standards for the review of conditional uses or variances within zoning districts.

LU-5 The availability and quality of public services shall be considered in approval or denial of commercial, residential, and industrial developments.

LU-6 The development regulations shall provide for residential zones at several densities and for a variety of commercial and industrial uses.

LU-7 High density residential uses combined with commercial uses shall be allowed in the core area within the Commercial Retail (CR) and Commercial General (CG) zones. High density residential development shall be allowed on Commercial Retail and Commercial General zoned property located along the Stayton Power Canal and Salem Ditch, between North First Avenue and North Fourth Avenue (Ord. 743, §2, May 1995).

LU-8 Land for medium density residential development shall be designated on the periphery of the central business area and in each sector of the city and urban growth area.

LU-9 Planned unit developments shall be allowed in all zones in order to encourage better use of large or unique sites.

LU-10 State and federal programs to improve housing affordability and rehabilitate substandard housing are encouraged.

LU-11 The central business area of Stayton shall continue to be the primary retail business area of the community.

LU-12 The development regulations shall contain specific requirements for off-street parking needed for commercial, industrial, public, and residential developments.

LU-13 A pedestrian-oriented atmosphere in the downtown area shall be provided through requirements for commercial uses that include curb cuts, sidewalks, and street hardware for pedestrians and the disabled.

LU-14 Strip-type commercial development along major streets (arterials and collectors) shall be discouraged.

LU-15 The city shall encourage modern, well-designed industrial facilities that will provide employment for the area while neither detracting from the area's environmental quality nor consuming excessive amounts of energy.

LU-16 The city shall encourage an industrial park-like atmosphere along Wilco Road through active support and cooperation with the business and industrial sectors of the community.

LU-17 The city shall promote the development of the designated industrial area along Wilco Road through active support and cooperation with the business and industrial sectors of the community.
| LU-18 | The development regulations shall reference state and federal noise and pollution control standards and shall require buffers for uses in industrial zones when needed to assure land use compatibility. |
| LU-19 | The city shall zone land (exclusive of rights-of-way) owned and used by government agencies and not-for-profit organizations in a Public/Semi-public zone. |
| LU-20 | The development regulations shall allow utility facilities necessary for public service to all zones. Utility facilities shall include, but not be limited to, water lines, sewer lines, storm drains, streets, power lines, telephone lines, natural gas lines, and the like. |
CHAPTER 6.

Economy

The economy of the Stayton area is based on several types of industries. The largest employer in the area is NORPAC Foods, Inc., frozen foods processor. The cannery employs 463 people on a full-time basis, and up to 1,629 seasonal workers during the peak processing period.

The cannery has a major impact on the economy of the area. Besides direct employment, there are several related businesses and services that depend on the cannery business and payroll to survive. The future of the cannery is dependent on the preservation and protection of the agricultural lands that produce its products, and the protection of the cannery property itself from encroachment by residential and other incompatible uses. The land use plan of Stayton has been designed to enhance and protect the cannery from conflicting uses.

The second largest industry in the area is mobile home manufacturing, which includes Philips and Guerdon industries. They employed 223 people as of September 1, 1989. They project a total employment of 250 persons by the year 2000.

The mobile home industry is growing rapidly. As the cost of conventional housing continues to rise, the demand for manufactured housing will increase. Philips and Guerdon should continue to grow and expand with the local and state economy. There are several related businesses and small industries in Stayton that provide parts and services to the mobile home industry. The entire mobile home industry and related businesses can expect to take a large role in the provision of housing in the future. This growth will be of benefit to the economy of the Stayton area.

The public and private school systems in Stayton employ over 150 full-time and 25 part-time employees. In addition, the telephone company, electric company, natural gas company, and the hospital employ an additional 110 people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>NO. OF EMPLOYEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORPAC Foods, Inc.</td>
<td>Food processing</td>
<td>463 year-round, 1,629 seasonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philips Industries</td>
<td>Mobile home components</td>
<td>160+ year-round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trus Joist</td>
<td>Building materials</td>
<td>155+ year-round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenco of Oregon</td>
<td>Windows, patio doors</td>
<td>93+ year-round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiam Memorial Hospital</td>
<td>Accredited hospital</td>
<td>65 year-round</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Stayton area is growing at a steady rate. Economic activity should continue at its present pace. The addition of an industry that employs a large number of persons could change the economic character of the area and create a need to re-evaluate the long range plans of the city and county.

Several of the elements of the comprehensive plan revised and updated in 1985 related to the economy of Stayton. The projection made in the population element was adjusted due to slower than expected population growth, which in turn was caused by slower than expected growth of the state and local economy over the past years. However, the economy and population of Stayton did continue to grow and the City of Stayton’s economic policies below remain valid and therefore have not been changed.

Economic Implementation Policy 5., “Housing, transportation, and public facilities plans shall be coordinated with the economic plan,” was followed throughout the periodic review process, especially in updating of the land use, transportation, and public facilities elements. Another example of economic policy implementation is where the city engineering staff, with the aid of the computer program developed for the Master Utilities Plan, was able to confirm in less than one day that adequate fire flows could be provided to the new Trus Joist plant built in 1984. This fire flow information was a key factor in that company’s decision to locate in Stayton.

The reviewed Land Use element also indicates Stayton’s capability to provide for economic development. An extensive amount of vacant land, the lack of land use conflicts, direct access to rail and highway facilities, and city services, have helped to make the Wilco Road industrial area attractive for industrial development. Developable industrial land includes 15 acres (zoned IC) in a business park setting within the city plus 100 acres zoned light industrial (IL) adjacent to the city limits. All of Stayton’s industrial land is either served by public facilities or is in proximity to existing facilities.

Table E-2
Municipal Statistics
City of Stayton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>4,875</td>
<td>4,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Valuation</td>
<td>$128,881,610</td>
<td>$135,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Property</td>
<td>$117,085,660</td>
<td>$118,130,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>$5,169,480</td>
<td>$5,426,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Utilities</td>
<td>$5,172,420</td>
<td>$5,069,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Homes</td>
<td>$1,454,050</td>
<td>$1,404,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District Tax Rate</td>
<td>$1.7900</td>
<td>$2.4394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Tax Rate</td>
<td>$4.4400</td>
<td>$4.6130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Tax Rate</td>
<td>$15.6900</td>
<td>$16.1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Tax Rate</td>
<td>$3.2300</td>
<td>$4.6608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TAXES</td>
<td>$25.1500</td>
<td>$27.9427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/Sewer Hook-ups</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td>31 Full-time 11 Seasonal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E-3
Building Activity
City of Stayton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NO. OF PERMITS</th>
<th>TOTAL VALUE</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL VALUE</th>
<th>COMMERCIAL VALUE</th>
<th>ALL OTHER VALUES*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$572,222</td>
<td>$332,940</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$231,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$923,700</td>
<td>$190,580</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$603,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$3,423,458</td>
<td>$963,264</td>
<td>$2,132,406</td>
<td>$316,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>$834,307</td>
<td>$177,600</td>
<td>$297,638</td>
<td>$359,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>$939,706</td>
<td>$544,320</td>
<td></td>
<td>$385,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$1,511,109</td>
<td>$199,268</td>
<td>$565,140</td>
<td>$746,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$2,321,971</td>
<td>$198,850</td>
<td>$605,100</td>
<td>$1,517,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$2,048,105</td>
<td>$421,890</td>
<td>$632,501</td>
<td>$993,714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All Other Values* includes garages; public, private, and commercial remodeling jobs, and other miscellaneous structures.
Economic Development

Economic Goal: Provide for the future commercial, industrial, and social needs of the community with a balanced mix of economic and social units.

Economic Policies

E-1 The central business area shall be preserved and maintained as the major shopping area of the community.

E-2 Commercial development outside the central business area in the IC zone shall be limited to convenience facilities and heavy commercial uses as defined in the zoning code.

E-3 Commercial development at Highway 22 shall be discouraged.

E-4 The development of the industrial park area, with light industries having a low energy demand and non-polluting, is encouraged.

E-5 The diversification of the economic base is encouraged.

E-6 State and federal programs and grants for economic development will be reviewed and sought to improve the economy of the area.

Implementation

1. The zoning ordinance and the comprehensive plan shall be consistent with each other.

2. The zoning ordinance shall provide for a variety of commercial and industrial designations and uses.

3. The zoning ordinance shall contain performance standards consistent with state requirements.

4. Community development block grants, economic development administration programs, small business administration loans and grants, and other county, state, and federal programs will be considered in the development of the capital improvement program and city budget.

5. Housing, transportation, and public facilities plans shall be coordinated with the economic plan.
CHAPTER 7.

Energy

Energy consumption has steadily increased along with residential and industrial growth. For the years 1962 to 1973, the average rate of growth in total energy consumption was 5.5 percent. In 1974, the economic recession and the embargo combined to reduce total consumption in Oregon by 4.7 percent. This decline continued through 1975. From 1962 through 1972, residential consumption rose at a rate of 3.5 percent annually. During 1973 and 1974, residential consumption declined 3.6 percent and 5.2 percent respectively. In 1975, residential consumption increased 2 percent. Residential uses now account for approximately 19 percent of the total energy usage. Space and water heating account for 65 percent of the energy needed to operate a typical electrically heated home. Cooking, refrigeration, and lighting comprise about 15 percent.

A revised State Residential Building Code on energy conservation went into effect in June, 1974. The code requires that all new single family and multi-family structures must have specific energy conserving features such as floor, ceiling, and wall insulation as well as weatherstripping. A new code was to become effective March 1, 1978 requiring all new single and multi-family units to have double glazed windows; vapor barriers in the walls, ceilings, and floors; and a minimum of R-11 insulation on water heaters in unheated spaces. The minimum insulation factors are scheduled to be increased in January 1979. It was estimated that by 1985, 605 of the single family homes and 7 percent of the apartments will meet these requirements.

Under the federal law, 13 household appliances are targeted for energy efficiency improvements totaling a reduction in energy use of 20 percent. The association of home appliance manufacturers have issued targets which the industry expects to meet by 1980. They are as follows: Clothes washer, 10 percent; clothes dryer, 6 percent; dishwasher, 18 percent; freezer, 25 percent; refrigerator, 30 percent; ranges and ovens, 10 percent; television, 45 percent; and air conditioners, 22 percent.

Based on the revised building codes, appliance improvements, and cost of energy consumption is projected to increase 11.9 percent annually through the year 1997. Approximately 70 percent of the new living units would use electricity for heating. Natural gas consumption is expected to increase 1.3 percent annually, and 25 percent of the new living units would utilize natural gas for heating. The use of petroleum (fuel oil) is projected to decline to 14 percent of the total energy for residential uses, with only 1 percent of the new living units utilizing fuel oil for heating.

### Table EN-1

**Natural Gas Consumption**

City of Stayton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units Consumption</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>361,528</td>
<td>474,495</td>
<td>183,463</td>
<td>1,094,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>318,811</td>
<td>427,331</td>
<td>143,729</td>
<td>889,871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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The use of solar energy for heating is projected to increase to 2 percent of the residential energy requirements. Other fuel (wood, coal, bottled gas) is projected to stabilize at about 8 percent of the total with 4 percent of the new living units using these fuels for heating.

### Industrial Use

At present, the industrial sector consumes approximately 28 percent of the total energy produced. Industrial energy usage increased 7.1 percent annually from 1962 to 1973, and declined 4 percent in 1974 and 20 percent in 1975. This decline was a result of a shortage, high cost, conservation, and a conversion to electricity. In the future, petroleum is expected to show major increases as industrial use of natural gas declines.

### Transportation Use

Transportation accounts for the largest amount of energy consumed by any one economic sector. From 1962 to 1973, energy used for transportation grew at an average annual rate of 5.4 percent. Nearly all of the consumption of this sector was in the form of liquid petroleum fuels, and most of the energy (87 percent) is consumed by autos and trucks. This accounts for 37 percent of the total energy consumed.

### Energy Forecasting

As the population increases, the demand for energy will continue to rise. Several important factors appear to be developing which will have an effect on future use patterns. The increasing cost of energy will tend to improve the efficiency of energy use by eliminating waste through improved insulation, better appliances, and efficient energy practices.

Mandatory and voluntary energy conservation standards could also slow the growth of energy consumption. House Bill 2155 mandates maximum lighting standards in public buildings constructed after July 1, 1978 and voluntary standards for conservation for all existing public buildings.

The use of energy sources which are either renewable or in which more abundant supply will tend to increase over time. Buildings heated and cooled with solar energy will increase. Increasing prices, technical progress, incentives for alternate energy sources, and public recognition and acceptance of renewable energy sources is favorable.

Tables En-3, En-4, and En-5 represent the Oregon Department of Energy’s average annual rate of growth from 1975 to 1995 for the state as a whole.

---

Table En-2
Electrical Consumption
City of Stayton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987 Units Consumption</td>
<td>38,075,919</td>
<td>14,367,218</td>
<td>38,492,666</td>
<td>90,935,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988 Units Consumption</td>
<td>39,200,705</td>
<td>14,568,213</td>
<td>38,729,548</td>
<td>92,498,466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Table En-3
Electricity Demand Forecast
(million kwh)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL</th>
<th>COMMERCIAL</th>
<th>INDUSTRIAL</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table En-4
Natural Gas Demand Forecast
(million therms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL</th>
<th>COMMERCIAL</th>
<th>INDUSTRIAL</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table En-5
Petroleum Demand Forecast
(Trillion BTUs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL</th>
<th>COMMERCIAL</th>
<th>INDUSTRIAL</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>165.4</td>
<td>249.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>188.2</td>
<td>253.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>217.8</td>
<td>292.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>239.7</td>
<td>348.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>149.2</td>
<td>207.0</td>
<td>515.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Energy and Land Use

---

63 Oregon Department of Energy, 1978
Land use planning provides an effective means to direct growth in an efficient manner. Energy savings are possible when the private and public sectors focus on the energy demands of alternative land use patterns. With effective planning, development will occur where public facilities and services can be provided more economically and efficiently. A compact urban form will save energy in heating as well as transportation and the provision of services.

Integrating transportation and land use planning can result in an energy savings. The use of public transportation can be encouraged by the location of housing, employment centers, and shopping facilities.

Over one quarter of the energy is consumed by the industrial sector. The location and design of industrial units can determine the level of energy needed by that sector.

Alternative sources of energy must be developed. A recent study by the University of Oregon indicates that Oregon has sufficient year-round wind power to generate small home or commercial energy units. The waterways can also be utilized to generate small amounts of electricity. The Pacific Power and Light Company in Stayton has a small hydroelectric unit on the ditch that generates the electricity to supply their local office. Expansion of such facilities could become a major source of electric power for the Stayton area.

There are three solar heated homes in Stayton, developed under a housing and urban development and federal energy department demonstration grant. The use of solar space heating and water heating in the Stayton area appears to be a realistic alternative to conventional energy sources. Care must be exercised in developing building codes and zoning requirements that protect the solar rights of individual property owners.

### Energy Policies

**En-1** Development shall be encouraged in the most energy efficient manner possible.

**En-2** Residential development shall be located in areas where it is more cost effective to provide public facilities and services.

**En-3** Housing shall be located near commercial and industrial uses to reduce the amount of energy needed for transportation to and from the home.

**En-4** Vacant lands within the corporate city limits shall be developed rather than leap-frogging to areas outside the city.

**En-5** Building siting and design shall be considered in relation to possible energy savings.

**En-6** Recycling facilities are encouraged to help reduce the energy needed for the development of finished products.

**En-7** Transportation facilities shall be developed in such a manner as to encourage the use of alternative modes.

**En-8** Mass transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities are encouraged in order to reduce the dependence on the automobile.

**En-9** Energy intensive industry and commercial uses are discouraged in favor of lower energy uses.
CHAPTER 8.

Justification for Urban Growth Boundary

LCDC Goal 14., “Urbanization,” requires that the city develop a mutually agreeable urban growth boundary based upon the seven factors listed in the goal. Stayton has given due consideration to each of the factors in relation to projected population growth, land needs, ability to finance and provide public services, protection of the environment, and wise use of our natural resources and land supply.

The original urban growth boundary was developed by the City of Stayton in 1972-1973 through contracted planning services with the Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments. The urban growth boundary contains 3,089 acres, of which 486 are in flood plains and 1,107 acres are already developed at urban levels. The total developable gross acreage within the urban growth boundary is 1,068 acres.

The North Santiam River forms the southerly boundary and was chosen because of the physical obstacle to urban development. Much of the flood plain area is unsuitable for urban development and will provide considerable natural and open area as a buffer for the city.

State Highway 22 forms the northerly border of the urban area. The highway is also considered a physical barrier to urban development. The remaining boundaries were chosen after considerable debate, public input, and land use need considerations. The easternmost boundary was chosen because of the extensive public ownership in that area. The state owns a 28 acre parcel known as the Zimmerman Quarry adjacent to Highway 22 and Stayton-Mehama highway. The Salem Water Works and the Santiam Water Control District own other parcels between the North Santiam River and the Stayton-Mehama highway.

The westerly boundary was established along the Mill Creek drainage way and the Salem Ditch. The two waterways were used as definite boundary lines. Parcels between the waterways and the adjacent Golf Club Road have been partitioned and developed, thereby eliminating their usefulness as agricultural lands. The Santiam Golf Course property, located at the intersection of Highway 22 and Golf Club Road, was included to insure the viability and preservation of the golf course as a recreational resource. The remaining portion of the urban growth boundary in the southwestern corner was chosen because of the potential for industrial development and expansion of the existing industrial park area.

The predominante land use is and will continue to be for residential purposes. Of the 1,065 acres of available and developable land within the urban growth boundary, approximately 36 percent of the total surface area will be devoted to residential uses. Industrial uses will require about 7 percent; commercial uses about 5.5 percent; and public/semi-public uses will require an additional 7 percent. Nearly 35 percent of the total acreage is either not available for urban development or is unsuitable for development.

Population projections have been provided by the 208 Water Quality Program. The estimated population for the Stayton urban area is 11,500 by the year 2005. The original boundary was developed for a population of 6,500. The additional population will be accommodated within the original boundary by increasing residential densities allowed in the various zoning districts. Both public water and sewer systems will have to be modified and expanded when the population exceeds 6,000. The city expects to provide for additional services through expansion of the capital improvements budget. All of the urban area can be serviced by service systems; however, the eastern portion of the area is and will be the most difficult to serve. This area will most likely be the last area to be developed. The city expects that the agricultural activities in the eastern portion of the urban growth boundary will continue until the property owners are willing to pay the costs for urbanization.
The growth rate in Stayton since the development of the municipal sewer system and the 1973 Comprehensive Plan has remained steady and is expected to continue throughout the planning period. The additional 1,504 acres will be necessary to provide for the desired level of housing, commercial, industrial, and public uses to the year 2000.

Periodic Review

In order to maintain the Stayton Comprehensive Plan in a current manner, it will be necessary to review the document and implement measures every five years. The planning commission shall set aside a specific time and date to review the plan and consider suggestions and comments from affected agencies, jurisdictions, and citizens of the area. Upon completion of the review, the planning commission shall forward to the city council its proposed changes to the comprehensive plan and implementing measures. The public hearing shall be open to any agency, representative, or citizen wishing to comment on or to propose revisions to the plan.

An Urban Growth Program for Stayton, Oregon

The need for an urban growth program in American communities has become more pronounced in recent years as people have begun to realize the consequences of urban sprawl. Urban sprawl has generally led to the inefficient use of public services and an abundance of unplanned vacant land. In most cases, this is the result of the uncontrolled development of small acreage home sites adjacent to the community where public services are unavailable. When it becomes necessary to annex these areas, it often is extremely difficult to redevelop these parcels into urban size lots due to the lack of an overall redevelopment plan. The end result is an inefficient and substandard street system serving excessively large urban lots which face a proportionately larger cost per dwelling to obtain urban services. In many cases, the entire community ends up subsidizing this type of development.

An examination of the growth pattern of the Stayton area has revealed an extensive amount of vacant land. The anticipated demand for continued residential, commercial, and industrial development points to the need for an urban growth program.

A. Purpose

The purpose of an urban growth program for Stayton is to encourage the orderly and efficient development of the community based on social, physical, and economical factors. The urban growth program identifies an urban service area and is intended to provide guidance for the timely expansion and development of the community.

Because the conditions affecting growth are unique and ever-changing for each community, the urban growth program does not attempt to determine the ultimate size to which Stayton should grow. Rather, it defines a geographical area which will accommodate a given population based on the known limitations and identified needs of the community.

B. Delineation

The geographical limits of the urban growth boundary area is defined on the Official Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map. Certain criteria must be considered as valid factors in the establishment of an urban service area if it is to become part of an acceptable program. The criteria by which the initial urban service area was delineated follows:
1. The future land use needs were determined based on the 208 population projections. This gives a fairly accurate indication of the amount of land needed to accommodate a given population.

2. The physical limitations for urban development are defined (i.e., flood plains, drainage, terrain, soils, street patterns, etc.). These limitations help to identify those areas which would be either too expensive or inappropriate for development.

3. General land use considerations such as transportation facilities, natural features, location, and existing land use were used to determine the appropriateness of certain areas for development.

4. The availability and economics of providing urban services, especially sewers, was analyzed for all areas of projected urban expansion. The limitations of existing services was also considered in determining a timetable for urban expansion.

C. Implementation

Implementation of the urban growth program will primarily be dependent on the coordination and cooperation of all levels of government in the area and the successful application of the policies and proposals set forth in this document. Also important is the community’s acceptance of this program and its willingness to work within the established framework. The policies which are listed in the development code are primarily intended to provide guidance for the expansion of urban services, annexations, zone changes, and subdivision development. These policies are based on one over-riding premise: The City of Stayton has definite interest in the development of those areas which it may eventually be expected to serve.
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Appendix A.

Stayton Buildable Lands Inventory
September 1996

LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (LD)

Allowed Uses:  Single family homes
Manufactured homes
Duplexes on corner lots

Average Density:  4.0 units per acre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Gross Area</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Limitations or Unbuildable</th>
<th>Non-Conforming Development</th>
<th>Gross Area Buildable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-city</td>
<td>742.839</td>
<td>408.167</td>
<td>106.423</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>188.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside City</td>
<td>840.844</td>
<td>39.796</td>
<td>189.080</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>667.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1583.683</td>
<td>447.960</td>
<td>295.503</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>856.471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Stayton Buildable Lands Inventory
September 1996

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (MD)

Allowed Uses:  Single family homes
               Manufactured homes
               Duplexes
               Apartments, 12 units/acre
               Manufactured home parks
               Subdivisions

Average Density: 8.0 units per acre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Gross Area</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Limitations or Unbuildable</th>
<th>Non-Conforming Development</th>
<th>Gross Area Buildable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-city</td>
<td>160.909</td>
<td>116.482</td>
<td>6.395</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>34.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside City</td>
<td>138.150</td>
<td>4.808</td>
<td>31.606</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>99.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>299.059</td>
<td>121.290</td>
<td>38.001</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>134.422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (HD)

**Allowed Uses:** Apartments (12+ units/acre)  
Manufactured home parks and subdivisions  
Retirement centers and multi-family

**Average Density:** 16 units per acre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Gross Area</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Limitations or Unbuildable</th>
<th>Non-Conforming Development</th>
<th>Gross Area Buildable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-city</td>
<td>42.950</td>
<td>37.077</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside City</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42.950</td>
<td>37.077</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMERCIAL GENERAL (CG) ZONE

Allowed Uses: Retail, service, office-type commercial activities

Average Density: n/a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Gross Area</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Limitations or Unbuildable</th>
<th>Non-Conforming Development</th>
<th>Gross Area Buildable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-city</td>
<td>103.736</td>
<td>46.585</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>15.429</td>
<td>11.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside City</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103.736</td>
<td>46.585</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>15.429</td>
<td>11.962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMERCIAL RETAIL ZONE (CR)

**Allowed Uses:** Retail, Service, and Office-type commercial activities

**Average Density:** n/a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Gross Area</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Limitations or Unbuildable</th>
<th>Non-Conforming Development</th>
<th>Gross Area Buildable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-city</td>
<td>42.462</td>
<td>11.534</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>6.649</td>
<td>8.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside City</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.462</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.534</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.434</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.649</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.862</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDUSTRIAL AGRICULTURAL (IA)

**Allowed Uses:** Agricultural activities
Commercial uses associated with agriculture

**Average Density:** n/a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>TOTAL GROSS AREA</strong></th>
<th><strong>DEVELOPED</strong></th>
<th><strong>LIMITATIONS OR UNBUILDABLE</strong></th>
<th><strong>NON-CONFORMING DEVELOPMENT</strong></th>
<th><strong>GROSS AREA BUILDABLE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-city</td>
<td>58.369</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>23.204</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>31.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside City</td>
<td>158.869</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>25.784</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>158.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217.238</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>48.988</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>190.293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL (IC)**

**Allowed Uses:** Combination of commercial and industrial uses with agriculture

**Average Density:** n/a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Gross Area</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Limitations or Unbuildable</th>
<th>Non-Conforming Development</th>
<th>Gross Area Buildable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-city</td>
<td>18.413</td>
<td>8.580</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>7.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside City</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.418</td>
<td>8.580</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>7.394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERCHANGE DEVELOPMENT (ID)

**Allowed Uses:** Highway service commercial facilities and associated uses

**Average Density:** n/a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Gross Area</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Limitations or Unbuildable</th>
<th>Non-Conforming Development</th>
<th>Gross Area Buildable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-city</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside City</td>
<td>7.905</td>
<td>7.905</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>7.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.905</td>
<td>7.905</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>7.905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (IL)

**Allowed Uses:**  
Light manufacturing  
Assembly  
Storage

**Average Density:**  n/a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Total Gross Area</strong></th>
<th><strong>Developed</strong></th>
<th><strong>Limitations or Unbuildable</strong></th>
<th><strong>Non-Conforming Development</strong></th>
<th><strong>Gross Area Buildable</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-city</td>
<td>278.828</td>
<td>125.102</td>
<td>2.047</td>
<td>6.329</td>
<td>131.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside City</td>
<td>43.539</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>322.476</td>
<td>125.102</td>
<td>2.047</td>
<td>6.329</td>
<td>174.885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PUBLIC (P)**

**Allowed Uses:** Public lands, buildings, facilities

**Average Density:** n/a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Total Gross Area</strong></th>
<th><strong>Developed</strong></th>
<th><strong>Limitations or Unbuildable</strong></th>
<th><strong>Non-Conforming Development</strong></th>
<th><strong>Gross Area Buildable</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-city</td>
<td>240.844</td>
<td>84.884</td>
<td>121.653</td>
<td>30.521</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside City</td>
<td>184.523</td>
<td>3.786</td>
<td>35.912</td>
<td>128.600</td>
<td>20.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>425.367</strong></td>
<td><strong>88.670</strong></td>
<td><strong>157.565</strong></td>
<td><strong>159.121</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.011</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>