

Periodic Review Work Task #7
Natural Resources, Open Space
and Recreation

7. Natural Resources, Open Space and Recreation

A. *inventory and classify all parks and open space areas within the City and within the UGB and all county, state, and federal parks and recreation facilities that regularly serve the population of the city (sphere of influence or within 5 miles of the city limits).*

The city used the geographic information system (GIS) resources of the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) to prepare the above-referenced parks and open space classification and inventory. This effort was coordinated between LCOG, Florence, and Lane County staff. Area estimates are based on Lane County Assessor's records for individual tax lots. The resulting inventory is provided as Table 1. on the following page.

B. *using demographic data compiled in earlier tasks, determine the amount and categories of parks and open spaces needed during the planning period.*

Based on results of this inventory, Florence has many active and passive recreational opportunities within city limits and within a short driving distance in almost any direction for its residents and visitors. These opportunities are provided through local, state, federal, and private sector interests. In fact, the Florence area is blessed with incredibly scenic and protected natural resources compared to many other suburban and rural areas of Oregon and across the country. As indicated in the city's periodic review task 1 report - urban growth boundary, the current number of active recreational parks and other play facilities within city limits were found adequate for the planning period. In addition to the city's developed parks, two vacant city blocks in the 9th Street area in city ownership are reserved for future city park development.

In reality, any proposals to add other active parklands to the city's current inventory would most likely not be supported by local officials or many of its residents. The City Council and its budget committee decided as part of the 1996-97 operating budget to drop funding of the city's parks and recreation program. This decision was based on serious shortfalls on general fund dollars due to the city's inability to increase its tax base, and Ballot Measure 50, which rolled back property tax rates to those of 1995. Other city programs simply out-competed this program for available funds. There was not significant public outcry over this decision, although the effects of such decision will be felt by all over time.

Assuming the city will continue to incorporate lands within its urban growth boundary, staff was concerned at the outset of this task with the lack of land reserved outside city limits for parks and recreation facilities. During development of the UGB task study, 40 acres of potential parkland was

Table 1. Inventory and Classification of Florence Area Parks and Open Space Areas

Recreational Facilities Outside the UGB but within 5 miles of City Limits		
<u>Type of Recreational Facility</u>	<u>Ownership</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
Camping and Picnicking Areas	Federal (USFS)	429.0
Camping and Picnicking Areas	State (Honeyman)	479.6
Other Parks	State (Darlingtonia)	18.2
Golf Courses (public)	Private	39.2*
Boat Ramps or Landings	Federal (Sutton Lake)	2.7
Boat Ramps or Landings	State	1.4
Open Space, Natural Areas	Federal	6,951.2
Open Space, Natural Areas	State	55.0
Open Space, Natural Areas	Lane County	344.0

(* part of Ocean Dunes G.C. in Lane County as of March, 1997)

Parks and Open Spaces inside the UGB		
<u>Type of Recreational Facility</u>	<u>Ownership</u>	<u>Acreage</u>
City Parks	City	48.5
Other Parks (County)	County	13.6
Cemetery	Private	0.1
School Grounds	School District	102.9
Golf Courses (public)	Private	277.1
Open Space, Natural Areas	Unknown	9.9
Open Space, Natural Areas	Federal	39.4
Open Space, Natural Areas	State	270.6
Open Space, Natural Areas	Lane County	186.7
Open Space, Natural Areas	City	111.1

(Source: Lane Council of Governments, GIS files, June, 1997)

**FLORENCE LOCAL WETLANDS INVENTORY
AFFECTED STATEWIDE PLANNING GOAL**

Wetland Numer	Size (acres)	Affected Goal	Notes
AIR-1A	1.42	Not Significant	created for stormwater control
AIR-1B	0.54	17	
AIR-1C	1.18	17	
AIR-1D	1.24	16	
AIR-2	0.12	5	
AIR-3	2.72	17	
HB-1A	0.73	17	
HB-1B	0.35	17	
HB-2	0.82	17	
HB-3A	0.66	17	
HB-3B	1.05	17	
HB-4A	6.68	17	part in UGB
HB-4B	3.19	17	part in UGB
HB-4C	0.53	17	
MC-1A	3.96	5	part in UGB
MC-1C	0.11	5	
MC-1D	0.14	5	
MC-1E	0.07	5	
MC-1F	0.05	5	
MC-1G	0.02	5	
MC-2	0.08	5	
MC-3A	31.74	5	
MC-3B	1.19	5	
MC-3C	0.54	5	
MC-3D	0.37	5	
MC-4A	0.46	5	
MC-4B	0.26	Not Significant	created for stormwater control
MC-5A	19.88	5	all within UGB except part of D
MC-5B	0.73	?	
MC-5C	0.68		
MC-5D	1.32		part in UGB
MC-5E	0.15		part in UGB
MC-6	10.95	5	only part of A within UGB
MC-8	6.29	17	not in UGB
MC-13	11.31	5	part in UGB
MC-14	20.55	5	part in UGB
NJ-1	0.53	5	isolated, groundwater connection
NS-1A	5.26	5	
NS-1B	3.45	5	
NS-1C	1.11	5	
NS-2A	26.33	5	part in UGB
NS-2B	2.55	5	part in UGB
NS-3	7.32	5	part in UGB
NS-4	4.93	5	part in UGB
OT-1	2.13	16	estuary wetland

Wetland Numer	Size (acres)	Affected Goal	Notes
OT-2	0.49	16	estuary wetland
OT-3	0.98	16	estuary wetland
OT-4A	0.06	17	
OT-4B	0.02	17	
OT-5	31	16	estuary wetland
RH-1	2.39	17	
RH-2	1	Not Significant	excavated pond on golf course
SP-1	17.69	17	part in UGB
SP-2	0.05	Not Significant	created small wetland, groundwater connection
SP-5	19.39	17	part in UGB
SP-6A	0.65	17	isolated, groundwater connection
SP-6B	0.03	17	isolated, groundwater connection
SP-7A	48.16	17	part in UGB
SP-7B		17	
SP-12	16.02	17	part in UGB
SP-13	0.88	17	
SP-14	0.99	17	
SP-15	0.51	17	
SP-17A	0.09	17	
SP-17B	0.91	Not Significant	part in UGB
SP-18	2.99	17	part in UGB
SP-19	2.02	17	
SP-20A	1.2	5	
SP-20B	0.03	5	small near highway 101
SP-20C	0.02	5	small near highway 101
SP-20D	0.04	5	small near highway 101
SP-21	0.62	5	excavated pond, mitigation site
SP-22A	0.84	5	
SP-22B	0.49	5	
SP-22C	0.14	5	
SP-32A	31.49	17	
SP-32B	0.53	5	
SP-33A	1.09	5	small, isolated
SP-33B	0.99	17	
SP-34	4.64	17	
SP-35A	22.18	17	
SP-35B	0.26	17	
SP-36A	0.07	Not Significant	
SP-36B	0.37	Not Significant	
SP-37	0.26	5	excavated mitigation site
SP-38A	1.42	Not Significant	
SP-38B	0.19	Not Significant	
SP-38C	2.05	Not Significant	
SP-39A	3.92	17	
SP-39B	0.25	17	
SP-40	6.65	17	
SP-41	0.63	5	mitigation site
SP-42A	0.07	17	See approved SandPines Delineation

Wetland Numer	Size (acres)	Affected Goal	Notes
SP-42B	0.16	17	See approved SandPines Delineation
SP-42C	0.12	17	See approved SandPines Delineation
SP-42D	0.25	17	See approved SandPines Delineation
SP-42E	3.81	17	See approved SandPines Delineation
SP-42F	6.59	17	See approved SandPines Delineation
SP-45A	1.22	5	See approved SandPines Delineation
SP-45B	0.16	5	isolated, near road
SP-46	0.53	5	small, isolated, near road
			small isolated, near road

discovered north of city limits. This 40 acres is currently in Lane County ownership, and is strategically located in the middle of several relatively dense, suburban-like, residential subdivisions. Street access to this tract has been provided, although the 40 acres is currently unimproved. It is not constrained by wetlands, steep slopes, or other environmentally sensitive features, and therefore appears suitable for active and passive parkland development. City staff discussed with County ultimately converting the ownership of this land to the City for parks and recreation purposes, and received favorable support.

C. develop a plan to meet any shortages projected during the planning period.

As part of the UGB Plan amendment, the city and Lane County will propose the adoption of a new land use plan which depicts the 40-acre county tract as "public", and text will be added to the Plan indicating that such tract is reserved for future city parkland. In addition, the city will pursue the transfer of ownership of this tract.

In an effort to address the city's parks maintenance issue, in early 1997, the City of Florence Parks and Recreation Commission proposed to its Council the creation of an "adopt-a-park" program to continue basic maintenance of city parks. The Council endorsed that program and all city parks were formally adopted by service organizations in June, 1997. According to the city's public works director, this basic maintenance will not adequately cover long-term facility needs. For example, capital costs for infrastructure repair and replacement (irrigation, fencing, pavement, etc.) will not be addressed by these adoptees. Capital costs for replacing worn swings, jungle-gyms, etc. will not be provided by these adoptees. At some point, the City Council will be faced with meeting capital replacement demands or closing parks.

In an effort to address the city's parks and recreation program shortfall, a local chapter of the national Boys and Girls Club of America was formed in mid-1997. This decision was made after reviewing the very successful efforts of the Coos Bay/North Bend chapter. The Florence chapter developed a comprehensive summer and after-school program for meeting the recreational and social needs of Florence area youth. Although funding support is provided through the national organization, funds are supplemented through local fund-raising campaigns.

Staff believes that the city needs to explore alternative funding methods for acquisition, development, and maintenance of both active and passive recreational areas. For example, the city is currently developing a systems development charge (SDC) for parks, as provided for by State law. Creating such will be subject to public hearing, and will compete with the city's increases to sewer rates and systems development charges for expanding the

city's sewage treatment plant and sewage collection system. Although the Florence residents soundly defeated a recent tax base increase measure to address projected general fund shortfalls, perhaps with sufficient promotion these same residents might support a special purpose levy to address maintaining the city's parks, or developing new facilities at the city's reserved park near 9th Street.

Although many scenic resources in federal and state control are protected, the city benefits from other scenic resources, such as the Siuslaw River estuary, the Siuslaw River Bridge, open dunes along Highway 101 north, and Munsel Creek. These unprotected resources are important for many reasons - quality of life, tourism, and environmental, and can be protected through regulatory methods (overlay zoning), voluntary measures (gift/dedication, scenic or conservation easements), or acquisition (fee-simple, discount value, or market value). Between 1997 and 1999, staff will seek supporting grant funds and propose to its Council and community the task of exploring ways in which to support parks maintenance and acquisition, and also identifying and preserving scenic viewsheds.

D. review NWI maps and review ordinance and development review procedures to ensure that wetland protection measures are effectively implemented, including notification of the Division of State Lands of any land use action in areas identified on the maps as wetlands. Coordinate with DSL and ACE on wetland inventory.

In 1996, LCOG was the recipient of a State grant to prepare two local wetland inventories - Dunes City and Florence. Florence's local wetland inventory was conducted from May through September, 1996 and included all UGB lands and some outside where UGB expansion was anticipated. In January, 1997, the Division of State Lands officially accepted the Florence Local Wetland Inventory (LWI), replacing the NWI maps for identifying such resources in the Florence area.

Also, after the city's periodic review work program was approved in November, 1995, the State adopted amendments to Statewide Planning Goal 5. These amendments included the LWI requirement, and a requirement for the city to make determinations of local significance for identified wetland resources. Although "optional" according to DLCDC, the city has chosen to follow the 1996 Goal 5 amendments for this periodic review task.

LCOG and city staff reviewed the list of identified wetlands of the LWI and made the preliminary determinations. The results of this effort are summarized in Table 2. on the following page. It should also be noted that the city's inventory of vacant lands under the UGB task included accounting for "unbuildable lands" determined as wetlands (regardless of Goals 9, 16, or 17) by the LWI.

The city's 1988 Comprehensive Plan does not contain goals, policies, objectives, or implementation measures specific to wetlands. The city co-adopted regulatory ordinances in 1991 to implement amendments to Lane County's Coastal Resources Management Plan (CRMP). These amendments added wetlands within the Florence UGB as Statewide Planning Goal 17 protected resources. The city failed to co-adopt the CRMP amendments, and is now doing so as part of periodic review, task 6 - coastal resources.

City staff has identified the appropriate sections in part 1 of its comprehensive plan for policies specific to wetlands, and in part 2 for the technical inventory information. Suggested wording of these appropriate policies is provided at the back of this report. These policies will be evaluated by the city's planning commission and citizen's advisory committee as part of periodic review work sessions, and subject to council approval, incorporated into the planning document.

Localities are provided two planning options for protection of wetlands, in addition of course to current state and federal regulations. Florence may use the "safe harbors" provisions of OAR 660-23-100(4)(b). By adopting a safe harbors ordinance, a no-build designation would be applied to all locally significant wetlands. A variance procedure could be included based on specific situations defined by OAR 660-23-100(4)(b)(B).

Or, by conducting an economic, social, environmental and energy (ESEE) analysis, Florence may further refine its wetland protection program by allowing, limiting, or prohibiting conflicting uses of wetland resources depending on those analyses. The ESEE process is relatively intensive, especially in Florence's case, where 270 wetlands, totaling 572.25 acres were identified by the LWI.

While it may be desirable for Florence to conduct an ESEE analysis for its significant wetland resources in the future, staff has identified sufficient "buildable lands" within the existing UGB to meet the city's residential, commercial, and industrial land needs. As such, the path of least resistance at this point is adoption of a safe harbors ordinance by the city and Lane County. Staff will be recommending such action to its planning commission and citizen's advisory committee, and following up with Lane County staff on a similar recommendation to their planning commission. A review of the city's ordinances shows chapter 7 of Florence city code, Special Development Standards. Staff believes this chapter can be readily modified to provide the "safe harbors" provisions of OAR 660. A copy of this chapter, as modified, is provided at the back of this report.

E. inventory riparian areas within the UGB; develop and implement an effective riparian management system based on Goal 5 or Goal 17 requirements (see "F" below).

The city's LWI also included a riparian area inventory. The process for this inventory was slightly different than that recommended in Goal 5, as the consultant's "riparian boundary" definition was different than that of OAR 660-23-090(1)(c). Nevertheless, the city believes this difference is not significant in Florence's case, as it only comes into play for streams with an average annual stream flow greater than 1,000 cubic feet per second, of which Florence has none.

While it may also be desirable for Florence to conduct an ESEE analysis for its significant riparian areas in the future, staff has identified sufficient "buildable lands" within the existing UGB to meet the city's residential, commercial, and industrial land needs. As such, the path of least resistance at this point is adoption of a safe harbors ordinance by the city and Lane County. Staff will be recommending such action to its planning commission and citizen's advisory committee, and following up with Lane County staff on a similar recommendation to their planning commission. A review of the city's ordinances, chapter 7 of Florence city code, Special Development Standards, indicates the existence of a riparian setback provision for Munsel Creek and other drainageways. Staff believes this chapter can be readily modified to provide the "safe harbors" provisions of OAR 660. A copy of this chapter, as modified, is provided at the back of this report.

F. identify which resources are Goal 5 and which are Goal 17 resources (resources within the "coastal planning area" are Goal 17 resources rather than Goal 5 resources).

Table 3. immediately following provides the results of an "affected statewide planning goal" analysis of significant wetlands within the Florence UGB. Wetlands identified outside the UGB have been excluded from Table 3. Not all wetlands on the west side of Highway 101 were identified as Goal 17 resources. According to draft criteria received from Emily Toby of DLCD - Coastal Programs, the city evaluated these wetlands as follows:

- identify those significant wetlands that are within the "coastal shorelands planning area";
- determine which of the significant wetlands within the coastal shorelands planning area have habitat quality which is primarily derived from or related to the association with the adjacent coastal water body and which do not;

- those significant wetlands whose habitat quality is primarily derived from or related to the association with the adjacent water body must be included within the coastal shorelands boundary. Local governments have the discretion to also include within the coastal shorelands boundary those significant wetlands in the planning area whose habitat quality is not derived from, or related to an adjacent coastal water body.

In certain cases, and based on the draft criteria above, the city chose to designate wetlands as Goal 5 resources rather than Goal 17 resources which were within the coastal shorelands boundary.

G. update the plan's inventory and protection programs for sensitive fish and wildlife sites, wetlands and other Goal 5 resources; update, if necessary, other Goal 5 inventories, including mineral and energy resources, and geologic hazards, and incorporate implementation measures as necessary.

As indicated in our report on task 1 of periodic review, information was provided to the city from the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) on pigeon springs and heron and raptor nest sites and have learned that no such sites were identified within the UGB. ODFW also provided Wildlife Habitat maps listing Goal 5 resources. Two sites, one near the Old Town area and one near Heceta Beach, were identified as Oregon Natural Heritage sites and will be included in the city's inventory. In addition, an area is noted as "Deer and elk winter range" is identified surrounding the Heceta Beach area north of the city limits in the city's urban growth area. All of these sites are included in the Lane County Comprehensive Plan and will be included in the city's updated plan. No other Goal 5 resources are shown within the city's UGB.

The current Comprehensive Plan identifies the Pacific Coast Bike Trail and Hiking Trail as passing through Florence. The bike trail follows Highway 101. The hiking trail was only a proposal at that time, and was to follow the beach south to North Jetty Road, then south along Rhododendron Drive where it crossed the Siuslaw River Bridge. OAR 660-23-150 requires that local jurisdictions recognize any recreation trail designated by the Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission. Recognition of these trails will be maintained in the Plan update.

The current Comprehensive Plan identifies the Siuslaw River estuary as a significant natural area according to the Oregon Natural Heritage Program. This estuary has been recognized consistent with OAR 660-23-160. Recognition of this feature will be maintained in the Plan update.

discovered north of city limits. This 40 acres is currently in Lane County ownership, and is strategically located in the middle of several relatively dense, suburban-like, residential subdivisions. Street access to this tract has been provided, although the 40 acres is currently unimproved. It is not constrained by wetlands, steep slopes, or other environmentally sensitive features, and therefore appears suitable for active and passive parkland development. City staff discussed with County ultimately converting the ownership of this land to the City for parks and recreation purposes, and received favorable support.

C. develop a plan to meet any shortages projected during the planning period.

As part of the UGB Plan amendment, the city and Lane County will propose the adoption of a new land use plan which depicts the 40-acre county tract as "public", and text will be added to the Plan indicating that such tract is reserved for future city parkland. In addition, the city will pursue the transfer of ownership of this tract.

In an effort to address the city's parks maintenance issue, in early 1997, the City of Florence Parks and Recreation Commission proposed to its Council the creation of an "adopt-a-park" program to continue basic maintenance of city parks. The Council endorsed that program and all city parks were formally adopted by service organizations in June, 1997. According to the city's public works director, this basic maintenance will not adequately cover long-term facility needs. For example, capital costs for infrastructure repair and replacement (irrigation, fencing, pavement, etc.) will not be addressed by these adoptees. Capital costs for replacing worn swings, jungle-gyms, etc. will not be provided by these adoptees. At some point, the City Council will be faced with meeting capital replacement demands or closing parks.

In an effort to address the city's parks and recreation program shortfall, a local chapter of the national Boys and Girls Club of America was formed in mid-1997. This decision was made after reviewing the very successful efforts of the Coos Bay/North Bend chapter. The Florence chapter developed a comprehensive summer and after-school program for meeting the recreational and social needs of Florence area youth. Although funding support is provided through the national organization, funds are supplemented through local fund-raising campaigns.

Staff believes that the city needs to explore alternative funding methods for acquisition, development, and maintenance of both active and passive recreational areas. For example, the city is currently developing a systems development charge (SDC) for parks, as provided for by State law. Creating such will be subject to public hearing, and will compete with the city's increases to sewer rates and systems development charges for expanding the

city's sewage treatment plant and sewage collection system. Although the Florence residents soundly defeated a recent tax base increase measure to address projected general fund shortfalls, perhaps with sufficient promotion these same residents might support a special purpose levy to address maintaining the city's parks, or developing new facilities at the city's reserved park near 9th Street.

Although many scenic resources in federal and state control are protected, the city benefits from other scenic resources, such as the Siuslaw River estuary, the Siuslaw River Bridge, open dunes along Highway 101 north, and Munsel Creek. These unprotected resources are important for many reasons - quality of life, tourism, and environmental, and can be protected through regulatory methods (overlay zoning), voluntary measures (gift/dedication, scenic or conservation easements), or acquisition (fee-simple, discount value, or market value). Between 1997 and 1999, staff will seek supporting grant funds and propose to its Council and community the task of exploring ways in which to support parks maintenance and acquisition, and also identifying and preserving scenic viewsheds.

D. review NWI maps and review ordinance and development review procedures to ensure that wetland protection measures are effectively implemented, including notification of the Division of State Lands of any land use action in areas identified on the maps as wetlands. Coordinate with DSL and ACE on wetland inventory.

In 1996, LCOG was the recipient of a State grant to prepare two local wetland inventories - Dunes City and Florence. Florence's local wetland inventory was conducted from May through September, 1996 and included all UGB lands and some outside where UGB expansion was anticipated. In January, 1997, the Division of State Lands officially accepted the Florence Local Wetland Inventory (LWI), replacing the NWI maps for identifying such resources in the Florence area.

Also, after the city's periodic review work program was approved in November, 1995, the State adopted amendments to Statewide Planning Goal 5. These amendments included the LWI requirement, and a requirement for the city to make determinations of local significance for identified wetland resources. Although "optional" according to DLCD, the city has chosen to follow the 1996 Goal 5 amendments for this periodic review task.

LCOG and city staff reviewed the list of identified wetlands of the LWI and made the preliminary determinations. The results of this effort are summarized in Table 2. on the following page. It should also be noted that the city's inventory of vacant lands under the UGB task included accounting for "unbuildable lands" determined as wetlands (regardless of Goals 9, 16, or 17) by the LWI.

The city's 1988 Comprehensive Plan does not contain goals, policies, objectives, or implementation measures specific to wetlands. The city co-adopted regulatory ordinances in 1991 to implement amendments to Lane County's Coastal Resources Management Plan (CRMP). These amendments added wetlands within the Florence UGB as Statewide Planning Goal 17 protected resources. The city failed to co-adopt the CRMP amendments, and is now doing so as part of periodic review, task 6 - coastal resources.

City staff has identified the appropriate sections in part 1 of its comprehensive plan for policies specific to wetlands, and in part 2. for the technical inventory information. Suggested wording of these appropriate policies is provided at the back of this report. These policies will be evaluated by the city's planning commission and citizen's advisory committee as part of periodic review work sessions, and subject to council approval, incorporated into the planning document.

Localities are provided two planning options for protection of wetlands, in addition of course to current state and federal regulations. Florence may use the "safe harbors" provisions of OAR 660-23-100(4)(b). By adopting a safe harbors ordinance, a no-build designation would be applied to all locally significant wetlands. A variance procedure could be included based on specific situations defined by OAR 660-23-100(4)(b)(B).

Or, by conducting an economic, social, environmental and energy (ESEE) analysis, Florence may further refine its wetland protection program by allowing, limiting, or prohibiting conflicting uses of wetland resources depending on those analyses. The ESEE process is relatively intensive, especially in Florence's case, where 270 wetlands, totaling 572.25 acres were identified by the LWI.

While it may be desirable for Florence to conduct an ESEE analysis for its significant wetland resources in the future, staff has identified sufficient "buildable lands" within the existing UGB to meet the city's residential, commercial, and industrial land needs. As such, the path of least resistance at this point is adoption of a safe harbors ordinance by the city and Lane County. Staff will be recommending such action to its planning commission and citizen's advisory committee, and following up with Lane County staff on a similar recommendation to their planning commission. A review of the city's ordinances shows chapter 7 of Florence city code, Special Development Standards. Staff believes this chapter can be readily modified to provide the "safe harbors" provisions of OAR 660. A copy of this chapter, as modified, is provided at the back of this report.

E. inventory riparian areas within the UGB; develop and implement an effective riparian management system based on Goal 5 or Goal 17 requirements (see "F" below).

The city's LWI also included a riparian area inventory. The process for this inventory was slightly different than that recommended in Goal 5, as the consultant's "riparian boundary" definition was different than that of OAR 660-23-090(1)(c). Nevertheless, the city believes this difference is not significant in Florence's case, as it only comes into play for streams with an average annual stream flow greater than 1,000 cubic feet per second, of which Florence has none.

While it may also be desirable for Florence to conduct an ESEE analysis for its significant riparian areas in the future, staff has identified sufficient "buildable lands" within the existing UGB to meet the city's residential, commercial, and industrial land needs. As such, the path of least resistance at this point is adoption of a safe harbors ordinance by the city and Lane County. Staff will be recommending such action to its planning commission and citizen's advisory committee, and following up with Lane County staff on a similar recommendation to their planning commission. A review of the city's ordinances, chapter 7 of Florence city code, Special Development Standards, indicates the existence of a riparian setback provision for Munsel Creek and other drainageways. Staff believes this chapter can be readily modified to provide the "safe harbors" provisions of OAR 660. A copy of this chapter, as modified, is provided at the back of this report.

F. identify which resources are Goal 5 and which are Goal 17 resources (resources within the "coastal planning area" are Goal 17 resources rather than Goal 5 resources).

Table 3. immediately following provides the results of an "affected statewide planning goal" analysis of significant wetlands within the Florence UGB. Wetlands identified outside the UGB have been excluded from Table 3. Not all wetlands on the west side of Highway 101 were identified as Goal 17 resources. According to draft criteria received from Emily Toby of DLCD - Coastal Programs, the city evaluated these wetlands as follows:

- identify those significant wetlands that are within the "coastal shorelands planning area";
- determine which of the significant wetlands within the coastal shorelands planning area have habitat quality which is primarily derived from or related to the association with the adjacent coastal water body and which do not;

- those significant wetlands whose habitat quality is primarily derived from or related to the association with the adjacent water body must be included within the coastal shorelands boundary. Local governments have the discretion to also include within the coastal shorelands boundary those significant wetlands in the planning area whose habitat quality is not derived from, or related to an adjacent coastal water body.

In certain cases, and based on the draft criteria above, the city chose to designate wetlands as Goal 5 resources rather than Goal 17 resources which were within the coastal shorelands boundary.

G. update the plan's inventory and protection programs for sensitive fish and wildlife sites, wetlands and other Goal 5 resources; update, if necessary, other Goal 5 inventories, including mineral and energy resources, and geologic hazards, and incorporate implementation measures as necessary.

As indicated in our report on task 1 of periodic review, information was provided to the city from the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) on pigeon springs and heron and raptor nest sites and have learned that no such sites were identified within the UGB. ODFW also provided Wildlife Habitat maps listing Goal 5 resources. Two sites, one near the Old Town area and one near Heceta Beach, were identified as Oregon Natural Heritage sites and will be included in the city's inventory. In addition, an area is noted as "Deer and elk winter range" is identified surrounding the Heceta Beach area north of the city limits in the city's urban growth area. All of these sites are included in the Lane County Comprehensive Plan and will be included in the city's updated plan. No other Goal 5 resources are shown within the city's UGB.

The current Comprehensive Plan identifies the Pacific Coast Bike Trail and Hiking Trail as passing through Florence. The bike trail follows Highway 101. The hiking trail was only a proposal at that time, and was to follow the beach south to North Jetty Road, then south along Rhododendron Drive where it crossed the Siuslaw River Bridge. OAR 660-23-150 requires that local jurisdictions recognize any recreation trail designated by the Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission. Recognition of these trails will be maintained in the Plan update.

The current Comprehensive Plan identifies the Siuslaw River estuary as a significant natural area according to the Oregon Natural Heritage Program. This estuary has been recognized consistent with OAR 660-23-160. Recognition of this feature will be maintained in the Plan update.

FLORENCE
DETERMINATION

Wetland Numer	Size (acres)	Artificially Created	OFWAM Criteria				Significant base on OFWAM (4 ecological functi
			Wildlife Habitat	Fish Habitat	Water Quality	Hydrologic Control	
AIR-1A	1.42	YES					
AIR-1B	0.54		2	1	1	1	YES
AIR-1C	1.18		1	1	1	1	YES
AIR-1D	1.24		2	2	1	2	YES
AIR-2	0.12		2	1	1	1	YES
AIR-3	2.72		2	n/a	2	1	YES
HB-1A	0.73		2	1	1	1	YES
HB-1B	0.35		2	2	2	1	YES
HB-2	0.82		1	1	2	1	YES
HB-3A	0.66		2	n/a	2	1	YES
HB-3B	1.05		2	n/a	2	1	YES
HB-4A	6.68		1	1	2	2	YES
HB-4B	3.19		1	n/a	2	1	YES
HB-4C	0.53		2	n/a	2	1	YES
MC-1A	3.96		2	n/a	2	1	YES
MC-1C	0.11		2	n/a	2	1	YES
MC-1D	0.14		2	n/a	2	1	YES
MC-1E	0.07		2	n/a	2	1	YES
MC-1F	0.05		2	n/a	2	1	YES
MC-1G	0.02		2	n/a	2	1	YES
MC-2	0.08		2	n/a	2	1	YES
MC-3A	31.74		1	1	2	1	YES
MC-3B	1.19		2	n/a	2	1	YES
MC-3C			2	n/a	2	1	YES
MC-3D			2	n/a	2	1	YES
MC-4A	0.46		2	2	2	1	YES
MC-4B		YES	2	2	2	1	YES
MC-5A	2.33		1	n/a	2	1	YES
MC-5B	0.73		1	n/a	2	1	YES
MC-5C	0.68		1	n/a	2	1	YES
MC-5D	1.32		1	n/a	2	1	YES
MC-5E	0.15		1	n/a	2	1	YES
MC-6	10.95		1	n/a	2	1	YES
MC-7A	2.09		1	1	1	1	YES
MC-8	6.29		1	1	2	1	YES
MC-13	11.31		1	n/a	2	1	YES
MC-14	20.55		1	n/a	2	1	YES
NJ-1	0.53		2	n/a	2	1	YES
NS-1A	5.26		1	n/a	2	1	YES
NS-1B			1	n/a	2	1	YES
NS-1C	1.11		1	n/a	2	1	YES
NS-2A	26.33		1	1	2	1	YES
NS-2B			1	1	2	1	YES
NS-3	7.32		2	2	2	1	YES

Wetland Numer	Size (acres)	Artificially Created	OFWAM Criteria				Significant based on OFWAM (4 ecological functio
			Wildlife Habitat	Fish Habitat	Water Quality	Hydrologic Control	
SP-40	6.65		1	1	2	1	YES
SP-41	0.63		1	n/a	2	1	YES
SP-42A	0.07		2	2	2	1	YES
SP-42B	0.16		2	2	2	1	YES
SP-42C	0.12		2	2	2	1	YES
SP-42D	0.25		2	2	2	1	YES
SP-42E	3.81		2	2	2	1	YES
SP-42F	6.59		2	2	2	1	YES
SP-45A	1.06		2	n/a	2	1	YES
SP-45B	0.16		2	n/a	2	1	YES
SP-46	0.53		2	n/a	2	1	YES

FLORENCE LOCAL WETLANDS INVENTORY
DETERMINATION OF LOCALLY SIGNIFICANT WETLANDS

Wetland Numer	Size (acres)	Artificially Created	OFWAM Criteria				Significant based on OFWAM (4 ecological functions)	Within 1/4 mile of H2O quality limited stream	One or more rare/uncommon plant communities	Contains Listed Species	Surface water connection to salmonid bearing stream & impacted quality	High Education Rating	Locally Significant
			Wildlife Habitat	Fish Habitat	Water Quality	Hydrologic Control							
AIR-1A	1.42	YES											NO
AIR-1B	0.54		2	1	1	1	YES						YES
AIR-1C	1.18		1	1	1	1	YES						YES
AIR-1D	1.24		2	2	1	2	YES						YES
AIR-2	0.12		2	1	1	1	YES						YES
AIR-3	2.72		2	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
HB-1A	0.73		2	1	1	1	YES						YES
HB-1B	0.35		2	2	2	1	YES						YES
HB-2	0.82		1	1	2	1	YES						YES
HB-3A	0.66		2	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
HB-3B	1.05		2	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
HB-4A	6.68		1	1	2	2	YES						YES
HB-4B	3.19		1	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
HB-4C	0.53		2	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
MC-1A	3.96		2	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
MC-1C	0.11		2	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
MC-1D	0.14		2	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
MC-1E	0.07		2	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
MC-1F	0.05		2	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
MC-1G	0.02		2	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
MC-2	0.08		2	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
MC-3A	31.74		1	1	2	1	YES						YES
MC-3B	1.19		2	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
MC-3C			2	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
MC-3D			2	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
MC-4A	0.46		2	2	2	1	YES						YES
MC-4B		YES	2	2	2	1	YES						NO
MC-5A	2.33		1	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
MC-5B	0.73		1	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
MC-5C	0.68		1	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
MC-5D	1.32		1	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
MC-5E	0.15		1	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
MC-6	10.95		1	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
MC-7A	2.09		1	1	1	1	YES						YES
MC-8	6.29		1	1	2	1	YES						YES
MC-13	11.31		1	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
MC-14	20.55		1	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
NJ-1	0.53		2	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
NS-1A	5.26		1	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
NS-1B			1	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
NS-1C	1.11		1	n/a	2	1	YES						YES
NS-2A	26.33		1	1	2	1	YES						YES
NS-2B			1	1	2	1	YES						YES
NS-3	7.32		2	2	2	1	YES						YES

Wetland Numer	Size (acres)	Artificially Created	OFWAM Criteria				Significant based on OFWAM (4 ecological functions)	Within 1/4 mile of H2O quality limited stream	One or more rare/uncommon plant communities	Contains Listed Species	Surface water connection to salmonid bearing stream & impacted quality	High Education Rating	Locally Significant
			Wildlife Habitat	Fish Habitat	Water Quality	Hydrologic Control							
NS-4	4.93		1	1	2	1						YES	
OT-1	2.13		2	2	1	2						YES	
OT-2	0.49		2	2	1	2						YES	
OT-3	0.98		2	2	1	2						YES	
OT-4A	0.06												
OT-4B	0.02												
OT-5	31		2	2	1	1						YES	
RH-1	2.39		1	2	2	2						YES	
RH-2	1	YES										NO	
SP-1	17.69		1	1	2	1						YES	
SP-2	0.05	YES										NO	
SP-5	19.39		1	1	2	1						YES	
SP-6A	0.65		2	n/a	2	1						YES	
SP-6B			2	n/a	2	1						YES	
SP-7A	48.16		1	1	2	1						YES	
SP-7B			1	1	2	1						YES	
SP-12	16.02		1	n/a	2	1						YES	
SP-13	0.88		2	n/a	2	1						YES	
SP-14	0.99		2	n/a	2	1						YES	
SP-15	0.51		2	n/a	2	1						YES	
SP-17A	0.09		2	n/a	2	1						YES	
SP-17B	0.91		2	2	2	2	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	
SP-18	2.99		1	2	2	2						YES	
SP-19	2.02		2	n/a	2	1						YES	
SP-20A	1.2		2	n/a	2	1						YES	
SP-20B			2	n/a	2	1						YES	
SP-20C			2	n/a	2	1						YES	
SP-20D			2	n/a	2	1						YES	
SP-21	0.62		2	2	2	1						YES	
SP-22A	0.84		2	n/a	2	1						YES	
SP-22B	0.49		2	n/a	2	1						YES	
SP-22C	0.14		2	n/a	2	1						YES	
SP-32A	31.49		1	1	2	1						YES	
SP-32B	0.53		2	n/a	2	1						YES	
SP-33A	0.10		2	n/a	2	1						YES	
SP-33B	0.99		2	n/a	2	1						YES	
SP-34	4.64		1	1	2	2						YES	
SP-35A	22.18		1	1	2	1						YES	
SP-35B	0.26		2	n/a	2	1						YES	
SP-36A	0.07	YES										NO	
SP-36B	0.37	YES										NO	
SP-37	0.26		2	2	2	1						YES	
SP-38A	1.42	YES										NO	
SP-38B	0.19	YES										NO	
SP-38C	2.05	YES										NO	
SP-39A	3.92		1	1	2	1						YES	
SP-39B	0.25		1	1	2	1						YES	

Wetland Numer	Size (acres)	Artificially Created	OFWAM Criteria				Significant based on OFWAM (4 ecological functions)	Within 1/4 mile of H2O quality limited stream	One or more rare/uncommon plant communities	Contains Listed Species	Surface water connection to salmonid bearing stream & impacted quality	High Education Rating	Locally Significant
			Wildlife Habitat	Fish Habitat	Water Quality	Hydrologic Control							
SP-40	6.65		1	1	2	1	YES					YES	
SP-41	0.63		1	n/a	2	1	YES					YES	
SP-42A	0.07		2	2	2	1	YES					YES	
SP-42B	0.16		2	2	2	1	YES					YES	
SP-42C	0.12		2	2	2	1	YES					YES	
SP-42D	0.25		2	2	2	1	YES					YES	
SP-42E	3.81		2	2	2	1	YES					YES	
SP-42F	6.59		2	2	2	1	YES					YES	
SP-45A	1.06		2	n/a	2	1	YES					YES	
SP-45B	0.16		2	n/a	2	1	YES					YES	
SP-46	0.53		2	n/a	2	1	YES					YES	

