

FILE NO: LRP2009-00010 **APPLICANT:** Jackson County – RPS

HEARING DATE: 1-28-2010 **HEARING BODY:** J.C. Planning Commission

TIME: 9:00 AM COURTHOUSE AUDITORIUM, 10 SOUTH OAKDALE, MEDFORD, OREGON

EXHIBIT SCHEDULE

EXHIBIT NO.	NATURE OF EXHIBIT
1 Page 1	Memo and attachments to JCPC from staff dated 1-15-2010.
2 Page 24	Letter submitted by John Renz, DLCD, dated 11-17-2010.
3 Page 25	Written testimony submitted by Antone Pedersen dated 1-18-2010.
4 Page 26	Notary Packet.
5 Page 135	Memo and attachments to JCPC from staff dated 1-22-2010.
6 Page 160	Written testimony submitted by Larry Martin dated 1-21-2010.
7 Page 161	Written testimony submitted by Clyde & June Brock dated 1-21-2010.
8 Page 162	Written testimony submitted by Katy Mallams dated 1-24-2010.
*****	JCPC Public Hearing 1-28-2010.
9 Page 164	PowerPoint Presentation slides submitted by staff dated 1-28-2010.
10 Page 171	Written testimony submitted by Mike Arnold dated 1-28-2010.
11 Page 177	Written testimony submitted by Laz Ayala dated 1-24-2010.
12 Page 178	Written testimony submitted by Porter Lombard dated 1-28-2010.
13 Page 180	Draft Regional Plan, Volumes 1-3 submitted by staff 2-17-2010.
*****	JCPC Continued Public Hearing 2-25-2010
14 Page 181	Presentation slides submitted by staff, 2-25-2010.
15 Page 186	Presentation slides submitted by staff, 3-11-2010.
16 Page 191	Presentation slides submitted by Vicki Guarino, RVMPO, 3-11-2010.
17 Page 207	RPS Bear Creek Valley Regional Land Needs Simulator documents submitted by staff dated 3-25-2010.
18 Page 230	Memo to RPS Contract Oversight Committee from Jay Harland dated 1-20-2010.
19 Page 233	Memo to Raul Woerner from Mike Savage dated 1-21-2010.
20 Page 236	Written Testimony Submitted by Greg Holmes, dated 3-31-10.

RPS Bear Creek Valley Regional Land Needs Simulator

HIGHER LAND NEEDS (updated 12/21/09)

CSA Planning additions and changes described in blue

This workbook contains a land needs simulator for the Bear Creek Valley. It is organized as follows:

- Assumptions: includes all the input assumptions for the land needs model. Adjustments to the assumptions will affect the output. **When delivered to CSA this statement was only theoretically true. This worksheet is now actually an assumptions sheet and contains the hard input assumptions in the analysis with respect to densities and people per household.**
- Summary: A summary of all land needs compared to supply. **This worksheet has now been deleted from the spreadsheet. It created irreconcilable circular references. All critical aspects of this worksheet had either already been supplanted by the 'population allocation sheet' when CSA received it and continue to be or are now captured in the individual summary tables and associated sheets.**
- Employment Need: Analysis of land needed and available for employment. **There was previously no land need established for employment lands for individual communities.**
- Housing Need: Analysis of land needed for housing. **This worksheet was retained but is at the end of the list and provides no useful information in our opinion. The worksheets that matter are the 'population allocation' worksheet and the residential land demand worksheet'.**
- Other Need: Analysis of land needed for other uses (e.g. parks, schools, churches, etc.) **CSA has just relied upon existing assumptions for these needs.**
- UGB Capacity Sum: Analysis of development capacity within UGBs. **Only significant changes to this analysis was for Medford based upon their adopted BLI and adopted Economic Element; all other analysis relies upon the UGB estimates provided with the original spreadsheets (this is a critical assumption for which all subsequent Urban Reserve Planning is dependent).**
- URA Capacity Sum: Analysis of development capacity within proposed Urban Reserve Areas. **No changes to the assumptions in this section, but total capacity affected by amount of actual developable land per base data discussion below.**
- URA Base Data: Base acreages in URAs. **These figures are significantly changed for all City's based upon improved GIS analysis by CSA Planning Ltd.**
- **CSA also takes this opportunity to observe that the structure of the spreadsheet is now such that land demands are not referenced in a circular manner to land supply for the Urban Reserves. As such, for the 'population allocation' spreadsheet that attempts to calculate deficits related to the Urban Reserves for residential land, the estimated deficits in that sheet will not precisely equate to the calculated deficits where individual land supplies are subtracted in iterative process according to the urban reserve rule procedures. The actual acreages and associated populations will be very close using the urban reserve method, but cannot be made to tie precisely to the 'population allocation' estimate. An attempt to create an automated calculation will result in a circular reference.**

Jackson County Planning Commission

File No. LRP2009-00010 Exhibit # 17

Offered by: _____

Date: 3-25-10 Received by: UMC

- 207 -

Number	Name	Description	Land Need Scenarios			Subcommittee Recommendations		
			Low	Medium	High	Low	High	
1	Employment by land use type	Distribution of employment by land use type	Retail and Services: 70% Industrial: 20% Government: 10%	Retail and Services: 67% Industrial: 23% Government: 10%	Retail and Services: 65% Industrial: 25% Government: 10%	Retail and Services: 65% Industrial: 25% Government: 10%		
2	Percent of Employment that requires no vacant land	Adjustment factor for employment that locates on already developed land or does not require land	20%	15%	10%	18%	12%	
3	Employees per acre	Employment density assumptions in employees per acre	Retail and Services: 20 Industrial: 12 Government: 10	Retail and Services: 17 Industrial: 10 Government: 8	Retail and Services: 14 Industrial: 8 Government: 6	Retail and Services: 18 Industrial: 11 Government: 9	Retail and Services: 16 Industrial: 9 Government: 7	
4	Employment net to gross factor	Adjustment to accommodate streets and other right of ways	10%	15%	20%	13%	17%	
5	Percent of persons in group quarters	New persons in group quarters	2.0%	1.5%	1.0%	2%	1%	
6	Housing Mix	Percent of single-family and multifamily housing	Single-family: 65% Multifamily: 35%	Single-family: 70% Multifamily: 30%	Single-family: 75% Multifamily: 25%	Single-family: 65% Multifamily: 35%		
7	Average household size	Household size by housing type	Single-family: 2.50 Multifamily: 1.85	Single-family: 2.50 Multifamily: 1.85	Single-family: 2.60 Multifamily: 1.9	Single-family: 2.50 Multifamily: 1.85		
8	Average residential density	Overall residential density in dwelling units per gross residential acre.	7.5	6.7	6	7.5		
9	Existing density in UGBs and URAs	Existing residential density by jurisdiction in dwelling units per gross acre	See Table 6	See Table 6	See Table 6	See Table 6	See Table 6	
10	Percent of housing that requires no new residential land	Infill and Redevelopment factor	Infill and Redevelopment is factored in to each city's UGB buildout calculations					
11	Other land needs	Factor to account for parks, schools and other lands that are not housing or employment	8%-13%	10%-15%	12%-18%	aspirational, jurisdiction specific	aspirational, jurisdiction specific	

Assumptions

This sheet includes all of the assumptions for the land supply/demand simulator. Changes to assumptions here will affect the output in other sheets. Highlighted cells are assumptions that can be changed in the simulator.

Model Scenario: PSU 2007 HIGHER LAND NEEDS
Model Date: 12/11/2009

Employment Density Assumptions

	Baseline	This Run			
Percent of employment that will require no new land	15%	12%			
Percent of future employment by land use type					
Retail & Services	67%	65%			
Industrial	23%	25%			
Government	10%	10%			
Total Employment Change		100%			
2006-2026	38,313	38,313			
2006-2056	96,106	96,106			
Employment allocated to land base				No Land Demand Employment	
2006-2026	32,566	33,715			
2006-2056	81,690	84,573		11,533	
Employee Per Net Acre Assumptions					
Retail/Services	20	16	DLCD handbook ranges:	14-20	Handbook 17
Industrial	12	9		8-12	Mean 10
Public	10	7		6-10	8
Gross to net factor	20%	17%			

Note: Baseline assumptions are from the medium density scenario in the EOA

Other Land Need Assumptions

In acres per 1000 population

Jurisdiction	Baseline	Assumption
Ashland	10.0	10.0
Central Point	10.0	10.0
Eagle Point	15.0	15.0
Jacksonville	15.0	15.0
Medford	10.0	10.0
Phoenix	10.0	10.0
Talent	10.0	10.0

Note: Other land need assumptions includes parks, public and semi-public facilities that do not have employment

Housing Density and Household Size

From standard number sheets provided by cities

Jurisdiction	UGBs		URAs	
	Density (DU/Gross Ac)	Persons Per Household	Density (DU/Gross Ac)	Persons Per Household
Ashland	5.28	2.15	n/a	n/a
Central Point	5.50	2.69	6.00	2.69
Eagle Point	5.20	2.82	6.40	2.82
Medford	5.20	2.47	6.50	2.41
Phoenix	6.00	2.30	6.20	2.30
Talent	5.65	2.25	6.20	2.30
South Valley	na	na		
Tolo	na	na		
Weighted Average	5.28		6.4	

	Eagle Point	Medford	Central Point	Phoenix	Talent	Ashland	Jackson County	TOTALS
1) TARGET POPULATION								
Base Target Population	8,702	78,780	17,652	5,339	6,561	22,117	24,804	139,151
City Limits (2007 PSU estimate)	8,565	75,675	17,025	4,845	6,525	21,630		
UGB and county (2000 census)	137	3,105	627	494	36	487		
2) BUILD-OUT POTENTIAL - CITY and UGB								
Within City & UGB, in persons	4,502	39,983	4,749	2,525	1,325	4,425	(Net Growth in Unincorporated Area)	57,510
Actual average density	5.20	5.20	5.50	6.00	5.65	5.28		
Projected average pph	2.82	2.47	2.69	2.30	2.25	2.15		
3) BUILD-OUT POTENTIAL - URBAN RESERVES¹								
Population Transfer (existing population inside URAs)	156	766	1,104	2,730	115	n/a	n/a	
Available URA Acres for New Residential Use	480	2,139	745	129	167	n/a	n/a	3,661
LOWER land need capacity at buildout (pop)	10,637	41,345	15,663	4,960	2,991	n/a	n/a	75,596
LOWER land need target density ²	7.74	7.87	7.26	7.50	7.50	n/a	n/a	
Projected pph	2.82	2.41	2.69	2.30	2.30	n/a	n/a	
HIGHER land need capacity at buildout (pop)	8,822	34,281	13,136	4,574	2,492	n/a	n/a	63,306
HIGHER land need target density ²	6.40	6.50	6.00	6.20	6.20	n/a	n/a	
Projected pph	2.82	2.41	2.69	2.30	2.30	n/a	n/a	
4) TOTAL UGB, URA CAPACITY FOR ADDITIONAL POPULATION								
With LOWER land need assumptions	15,138	81,329	20,412	7,486	4,316	4,425	2,719	135,824
With HIGHER land need assumptions	13,324	74,265	17,885	7,099	3,818	4,425	2,719	123,534
5) PERCENT ALLOCATION OF ADDITIONAL CITY POPULATIONS (FROM JACKSON COUNTY COMP PLAN POP ELEMENT)								
Comp plan population increases (2005 - 2040)	13,864	62,542	15,597	3,372	3,562	2,176		101,113
% distribution of increased pop (2005 - 2040)	13.7%	61.9%	15.4%	3.3%	3.5%	2.2%		100%
County Comprehensive Plan plus URA Transfer from County	14,020	63,308	16,701	6,102	3,677	2,176		105,984
% Distribution of increase from Comp Plan + Transfer	13.2%	59.7%	15.8%	5.8%	3.5%	2.1%		100%
Extrapolated Future RPS Population Growth allocation	18,048	81,495	21,499	7,855	4,733	2,801	2,719	139,152
6) ESTIMATED POPULATION AND ACREAGE SURPLUS / DEFICIT								
LOWER land need surplus or deficit - population	(2,910)	(167)	(1,087)	(370)	(417)	1,624	0	(3,327)
LOWER land need surplus/deficit - acres	(133)	(9)	(56)	(21)	(24)	0	0	(243)
HIGHER land need surplus or deficit - population	(4,724)	(7,231)	(3,614)	(756)	(915)	1,624	0	(15,617)
HIGHER land need surplus/deficit - acres	(262)	(462)	(224)	(53)	(64)	0	0	(1,064)

¹ Buildout capacity of urban reserve lands is overestimated, as restrictions due to natural constraints, existing development, and the land necessary for agricultural buffers, have not been factored in. In addition, Urban Reserve buildout capacity density, pph, and vacancy rate assume a 65% single family and 35% multifamily split

² Densities are modified gross densities (park acreages are NOT included) correlated to buildable land to be designated for residential use, consistent with the Buildable Land

Employment Forecasts and Land Need for Employment
Model Scenario: PSU 2007 HIGHER LAND NEEDS
12/11/2009

This sheet compares demand (employment growth) with capacity in UGBs and URAs

Employment Forecast (from EOA)

Year	Total Employment
2006	110,459
2011	118,996
2016	128,192
2021	138,099
2026	148,772
2036	165,971
2046	185,159
2056	206,565
2006-2026	
Growth	38,313
% Growth	35%
AAGR	1.5%
2006-2056	
Growth	96,106
% Growth	87%
AAGR	1.3%

UGB LOC	SumOfANNUAL	
	4723.045517	6%
Ashland UGB	9037.389475	12%
Central Point UGB	3356.251167	5%
Eagle Point UGB	861.2009667	1%
Jacksonville UGB		0%
Medford Phoenix UCB	6059.923467	8%
Medford UGB	48026.92108	65%
Phoenix UGB	1274.6697	2%
Talent UGB	944.8205417	1%
	74284.22192	100%

Assumptions (from Assumptions Sheet)

Assumption	Assumption
Percent of employment that will require no new land	12%
Percent of future employment by land use type	
Retail & Services	65%
Industrial	25%
Government	10%
Total Employment Change	
2006-2026	38,313
2006-2056	96,106
Employment allocated to land base	
2006-2026	33,715
2006-2056	84,573
Employee Per Acre Assumptions	
Retail/Services	16.0
Industrial	9.0
Public	7.0
Net to gross factor	17%

Employment Capacity/Growth Comparison

Variable	Employment Land Use Type			Total Employment
	Retail and Services	Industrial	Government	
Job Growth				
2006-2026	21,915	8,429	3,372	33,715
2006-2056	54,973	21,143	8,457	84,573
Capacity				
UGB	16,027	18,477	23	34,527
URA	11,741	10,252	3,469	25,463
Total	27,768	28,729	3,492	59,989
Surplus (deficit)				
2006-2026	5,853	20,300	121	26,274
2006-2056	(27,205)	7,586	(4,965)	(24,584)

Land Need Capacity/Growth Comparison

Land Use Type	Gross Acres			Total
	Retail & Services	Industrial	Government / Institutional	
Needed Gross Acres				
2006-2026	1,650	1,128	580	3,359
2006-2056	4,140	2,830	1,456	8,426
Land Supply (Gross Acres)				
UGB	897	3,018	4	3,919
URA	884	1,372	597	2,854

Total	1,781	4,391	601	6,773
Surplus (deficit)				
2006-2026	131	3,262	21	3,414
2006-2056	(2,358)	1,560	(855)	(1,653)

Other Land Need
Model Scenario: PSU 2007 HIGHER LAND NEEDS
12/11/2009

City	Population		Other Land Need		Other Land Supply		Surplus (deficit)	
	UGB	URA	UGB	URA	UGB	URA	UGB	URA
Ashland	4,425	-	44	-	-	-	(44)	-
Central Point	4,749	12,032	47	120	12	219	(35)	99
Eagle Point	4,502	8,666	68	130	-	151	(68)	21
Medford	39,983	36,217	400	362	123	630	(277)	267
Phoenix	2,525	1,843	25	18	9	72	(16)	54
Talent	1,325	2,377	13	24	22	10	9	(14)
County	57,510	61,137	598	655	166	1,082	(432)	427
TOTAL								

Land in "Special Other" category

City	Acres
Ashland	0
Central Point	0
Eagle Point	0
Medford	1,877
Phoenix	0
Talent	0
County	0
#REF!	1,877

1000
200
800 333.3333

City Capacity Summaries

Updated data from Central Point, Eagle Point, Medford and Talent, August 2006

This sheet provides employment and housing capacity estimates for lands within UGBs. Capacity figures are based on assumptions provided by cities and are not included as model variables.

Employment Capacity (in jobs)

Input Assumptions (from Assumptions sheet)

Employee per net acre assumptions	16
Retail/Services	9
Industrial	7
Public	7
Gross to net factor	17%

Jurisdiction	Ind	Employment Capacity (jobs)		Total
		Comm	Inst	
Ashland	418	1,647	0	2,065
Central Point	362	133	23	518
Eagle Point	239	279	0	518
Medford	5,574	8,732	0	14,306
Phoenix	248	1,381	0	1,629
Talent	172	909	0	1,080
White City	11,463	2,947	0	14,409
TOTAL UGB Employment Capacity	18,477	16,027	23	34,527

Notes:

Capacity is calculated as (Acres * (1-Net to Gross Factor)) * EPA assumption
 Institutional uses assume public densities

Housing Capacity (in Dwellings and Population)

Input Assumptions

Jurisdiction	Density (DU/Gross Ac)	Persons Per Household	
		Density (DU/Gross Ac)	Household
Ashland	5.28	2.15	2.15
Central Point	5.50	2.69	2.69
Eagle Point	5.20	2.82	2.82
Medford	5.20	2.47	2.47
Phoenix	6.00	2.30	2.30
Talent	5.65	2.25	2.25
Average Density	5.28		

Housing Capacity (Dwelling Units and Population)

Jurisdiction	Res Acres	DU	Population
Central Point	321	1,765	4,749
Eagle Point	307	1,596	4,502
Medford	3,113	16,188	39,983
Phoenix	183	1,098	2,525
Talent	102	576	1,325
TOTAL	4,416	23,282	57,510

- 214 -

Note: DU calculated by population capacity/PPH. ECO assumed that City's made population capacity adjustments to reflect physical land constraints

Base Data from Cities, provided August 3, 2006 (Technical Adjustments December 2009 CSA Planning Ltd.)

	Ashland	Central Point	Eagle Point	Medford	Phoenix	Talent	Unincorp (White City)	Total
(1) EXISTING LAND USE AND POPULATION								
Existing Acres	5,565	2,318	1,740	18,078	918	1,120	1,120	30,992
Existing Developed Residential Acres	4,315	1,173	812	8,390	359	578	578	16,122
Average Density (Units/Acre)								
Average pph	2.15	2.50	2.82	-	2.32	2.25	2.25	
Population	1,240	15,768	8,495	69,761	5,004	6,398	6,398	107,826
Existing Developed Commercial Acres		140	44	3,133	143	155	155	4,879
Existing Developed Business Park Acres			15					15
Existing Developed Industrial Acres			22	273	18	39	39	518
Existing Parks Acres	10	157	22			90	90	696
Existing Institutional Acres*		606				43	43	6,567
Existing Other Acres		242	325	6,282				325
(2) UGB BULDOZED POTENTIAL								
Fully & Partially Vacant Buildable Lands								
Residential Acres	590	555	487	10,760	330	193	193	13,103
Average Projected Density	390	321	307	3,113	183	102	102	4,489
Average Projected pph	5.28	5.50	5.20	5.20	6.00	5.65	5.65	
Projected Population	2,115	2,89	2,82	2,47	2,30	2,30	2,30	
Commercial Acres	4,425	4,749	4,502	39,983	2,525	1,325	1,325	66,505
Business Park Acres	124	10	21	658	104	68	68	897
Industrial Acres			12					12
Parks Acres	56	49	32	746	33	23	23	3,018
Institutional Acres		12	-			22	22	34
"Other" Acres		4	-					4
	5,592	5,707	5,369	55,391	3,193			138

215-

URA Capacity Summary

This worksheet applies assumptions to estimate employment and housing capacity in the URAs.

Acres (from URA Base Data Sheet)

Jurisdiction	Res	Ind	Comm	Parks	Inst	Special Other	Total
Ashland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Central Point	745	445	33	163	42	0	1,430
Eagle Point	480	270	184	151	68	0	1,154
Medford	2,139	429	605	630	320	1,877	6,000
Phoenix	129	199	54	72	116	0	571
Talent	167	29	8	9	50	0	263
South Valley	0	151	50	0	0	0	201
Tolo							
Totals							
ALL URAs, NO OVERLAP	3,661	1,372	884	1,025	597	1,877	9,417

South Valley figures provided by City of Phoenix, and overlap with Phoenix URAs

Employment Capacity (in jobs)

Input Assumptions (from Assumptions sheet)

Employee per net acre assumptions	
Retail/Services	16
Industrial	9
Public	7
Gross to net factor	17%

Jurisdiction	Employment Capacity (jobs)				<<-total
	Ind	Comm	Inst	Total	
Ashland	0	0	0	0	
Central Point	3,327	444	246	4,018	
Eagle Point	2,016	2,445	397	4,858	
Medford	3,203	8,031	1,860	13,094	
Phoenix	1,487	717	674	2,878	
Talent	219	105	291	614	

Totals

ALL URAs, NO OVERLAP	10,252	11,741	3,469	25,463	<<-Summary figures used in all other calculations
-----------------------------	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---

Notes:

Capacity is calculated as (Acres*(1-Net to Gross Factor))*EPA assumption
 Institutional uses assume public densities

Housing Capacity (in Dwellings and Population)

Input Assumptions

Jurisdiction	Density (DU/Gross Ac)	Persons Per Household
Ashland	n/a	n/a
Central Point	6.0	2.69
Eagle Point	6.4	2.82
Medford	6.5	2.41
Phoenix	6.2	2.30
Talent	6.2	2.30
South Valley	0.0	0.00
Tolo	0.0	0.00
Weighted Density	6.4	

Housing Capacity (Dwelling Units and Population)

Jurisdiction	Residential Acres		
	Gross	DU	Population
Ashland	-	-	-
Central Point	745	4,473	12,032
Eagle Point	480	3,073	8,666
Medford	2,312	15,028	36,217
Phoenix	129	802	1,843
Talent	167	1,034	2,377
South Valley	0	-	0
Tolo	0	-	0
Totals	0	0	61,137

This Sheet is an input to all subsequent supply-side calculations and is from GIS data and City's contemplated uses.

Regional Problem Solving Proposed Urban Reserve Acres and Land Uses

03/04/2009

City	Code	Acres	res.	ind.	comm.	parks	inst.	RLRC	City	Code	Acres	res.	ind.	comm.	parks	inst.	RLRC	
Eagle Point	EP - 1A	146	0	146	0	0	0		Phoenix	PH - 1	55	0	55	0	0	0		
	EP - 2	339	149	0	75	71	44			PH - 2	40	0	0	0	20	20		
	EP - 3	399	147	124	72	56	0			PH - 3	250	built out, no development capacity						
	EP - 4	270	184	0	38	24	24			PH - 5	438	96	144	48	53	96		
Eagle Point Total		1,154	480	270	184	151	68	0	Phoenix Total		821	129	199	54	72	116	(41)	
Central Point	CP - 1B	442	0	415	22	0	4	(56)	Talent	TA - 1	43	0	0	0	0	0	43	
	CP - 1C	60	60	0	0	0	0	(36)		TA - 2	63	56	0	0	7	0	(69)	
	CP - 2B	282	229	14	0	17	23	(197)		TA - 3	105	100	0	4	0	1		
	CP - 3	27	0	0	11	16	0			TA - 4	26	0	25	2	0	0	(23)	
	CP - 4D	52	0	0	0	52	0			TA - 5	26	11	5	2	2	6		
	CP - 5	19	18	0	0	0	2			Talent Total		263	167	29	8	9	50	(92)
Central Point Total		1,430	745	445	33	163	42	(590)										
Medford	MD - 1	491	123	167	162	29	10											
	MD - 2	316	158	0	104	35	19											
	MD - 3	915	595	0	91	146	82											
	MD - 4	271	171	0	35	41	24	(274)										
	MD - 5	1,636	916	131	147	311	131											
	MD - 6	131	0	131	0	0	0	(23)										
	MD - 7n	36	0	0	30	0	6	(37)										
	MD - 7m	125	61	0	14	27	22	(142)										
	MD - 7s	45	14	0	21	6	4											
MD - 8	53	26	0	0	15	12												
MD - 9	104	76	0	0	19	9												
Medford Total		6,000	2,139	429	605	630	320	(476)	Totals (minus PH-3 and MD-P)		7,540	3,661	1,372	884	1,025	597	(1,199)	

res. = residential + normal public infrastructure (except parks)

ind. = industrial + normal public infrastructure

comm. = commercial + normal public infrastructure

parks (parks and open space) = parks, open space, and recreational areas

inst. (public & community institutional) = schools, churches, governmental and quasi-gov. facilities

Figure 4.1

SUMMARY OF URA LAND DEMAND by JURISDICTION AND LAND USE TYPE							
Need by Land Type (acres)							
Jurisdiction	Residential		Parks	Employment	Total		
	Higher	Lower			Higher	Lower	
Central Point	1,038	858	163	521	1,722	1,542	
Eagle Point	751	621	151	522	1,424	1,294	
Medford	2,650	2,189	630	1,354	4,633	4,172	
Phoenix	374	309	72	369	815	750	
Talent	239	198	9	87	335	294	
Ashland	-	-	-	-	-	-	
TOTALS	5,051	4,174	1,025	2,854	8,930	8,053	

575.322296

SUMMARY OF URA LAND PROPOSED FOR EMPLOYMENT	
Jurisdiction	Employment
Central Point	521
Eagle Point	522
Medford	1,354
Phoenix	369
Talent	87
Ashland	---
TOTALS	2,854