

17. Goal 13 – Energy Conservation. Goal 13 is mostly a planning goal, and includes few substantive requirements that could directly conflict with Oregon Highway Plan amendments that increase mobility standards for state highways. To the extent higher mobility standards encourage denser development that causes increased traffic congestion, that is not inconsistent with Goal 13. *Setniker v. ODOT*, 66 Or LUBA 54 (2012).

17. Goal 13 – Energy Conservation. Goal 13 is to “conserve energy,” but Goal 13 does not require that comprehensive plans ensure a net decrease in energy use, or prohibit any plan amendment that would result in a net increase in energy use. *Setniker v. ODOT*, 66 Or LUBA 54 (2012).

17. Goal 13 – Energy Conservation. Goal 13 is not violated by a proposal for a 102-unit assisted living facility bordering an arterial street, with nearby mass transit and a clientele that will not be heavy users of automobiles, when there is nothing in the record to suggest the proposal will waste energy or otherwise affect the city’s compliance with Goal 13. *Hubenthal v. City of Woodburn*, 39 Or LUBA 20 (2000).

17. Goal 13 – Energy Conservation. Goal 13 does not require that a local government maximize residential density or consider the energy consequences of different levels of residential development in amending its land use regulations. *Barnard Perkins Corp. v. City of Rivergrove*, 34 Or LUBA 660 (1998).