

12. Goal 8 – Recreational Needs. OAR chapter 660, division 034 governs “State and Local Park Planning.” Where a local comprehensive plan recreation element is being adopted or amended in part to implement particular local park master plans, the detailed planning requirements of OAR 660-34-0040(1)(a) and (b) would apply. But OAR 660-34-0040(1)(a) and (b) do not apply when adopting comprehensive plan provisions that establish a city’s policy for how it will decide how many acres it will devote to parks, what kinds of parks it will build and when it will build them. *Home Builders Assoc. v. City of Eugene*, 52 Or LUBA 341 (2006).

12. Goal 8 - Recreational Needs. OAR 660-034-0040(1) leaves local governments the option of including any existing park master plans for particular parks in their comprehensive plan. However, OAR 660-034-0040(1) does not make all comprehensive planning for parks and recreation under Goal 8 optional. *Home Builders Assoc. v. City of Eugene*, 52 Or LUBA 341 (2006).

12. Goal 8 - Recreational Needs. Any parks and recreation planning obligation that is imposed by the ORS 197.015(6) definition of “comprehensive plan” does not necessarily have to “indicate specific locations of any [recreational] area, activity or use.” *Home Builders Assoc. v. City of Eugene*, 52 Or LUBA 341 (2006).

12. Goal 8 - Recreational Needs. Goal 8 is “[t]o satisfy the recreational needs of the citizens of the state and visitors and, where appropriate, to provide for the siting of necessary recreational facilities including destination resorts.” While it might be consistent with Goal 8 to do so, Goal 8 does not mandate that comprehensive plans include a list of park, open space and recreation facilities that will be constructed during the planning period or include an estimate of the costs of such facilities. *Home Builders Assoc. v. City of Eugene*, 52 Or LUBA 341 (2006).

12. Goal 8 – Recreational Needs. While Goal 8 requires a city to plan for recreational facilities consistent with availability of resources, nothing in Goal 8 requires a city to fully fund identified recreational improvements, or ensure that those improvements are available concurrently with projected growth. *NWDA v. City of Portland*, 47 Or LUBA 533 (2004).

12. Goal 8 – Recreational Needs. Where ORS 197.435 requires that the county locate and exclude all high value crop areas from a destination resort zone overlay and the county’s analysis of the high value crop areas is limited to farms that actually demonstrated the ability to grow high value crops, rather than those capable of producing them, the county’s analysis is inconsistent with Goal 8 and the statute. *Boyer v. Baker County*, 35 Or LUBA 223 (1998).

12. Goal 8 – Recreational Needs. The statutory order of operations for confirming that a destination resort overlay amendment meets the requirements of Goal 8 and ORS 197.435(2) is to first map the concentrations of commercial farms and then determine which farms could produce the requisite \$1,000 per-acre per-year yield. *Boyer v. Baker County*, 35 Or LUBA 223 (1998).

12. Goal 8 – Recreational Needs. A destination resort overlay zone based on the mapping and excluding of all high value farmland by definition also excludes "unique or prime farmland" as defined in ORS 197.455(1). *Boyer v. Baker County*, 35 Or LUBA 223 (1998).

12. Goal 8 - Recreational Needs. When LUBA reviews a post-acknowledgment comprehensive plan or land use regulation amendment for compliance with Goal 8, the relevant concern is whether the amendment has direct or secondary effects on "recreation areas, facilities and opportunities" inventoried and designated by the acknowledged plan to meet the local government's recreational needs. Goal 8 does not require that there will be no adverse effects on any recreational activity occurring in the vicinity of the proposed amendment. *Salem Golf Club v. City of Salem*, 28 Or LUBA 561 (1995).

12. Goal 8 - Recreational Needs. Where a proposed transportation facility includes open space and pedestrian and bicycle facilities to satisfy comprehensive plan policies implementing Goal 8, petitioner's speculation that those facilities might be eliminated in the future in favor of more traffic lanes provides no basis for reversal or remand. Such changes would require a plan amendment and a demonstration that the altered facility complies with the plan policies. *Friends of Cedar Mill v. Washington County*, 28 Or LUBA 477 (1995).

12. Goal 8 - Recreational Needs. Where an acknowledged comprehensive plan inventories certain property as a county park available to meet present and future recreational needs and includes a policy requiring that such property be designated and zoned for recreational use, it is inconsistent with Goal 8 to interpret the plan to allow changing the designation and zoning of that property to non-recreational uses without amending the plan text and demonstrating the amended plan remains in compliance with Goal 8. *Sahagian v. Columbia County*, 27 Or LUBA 592 (1994).