

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATIONS DATA STANDARD

An Extension of the Administrative Boundary Framework Standard

Version 0.3

April 2020

Endorsed by Oregon Geographic Information Council, July 2020

Revision History:

v 0.2 incorporates Planning Workgroup input

v 0.3 addresses public comments received by March 13, 2020

For more information, contact:

Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development

dlcd.info@state.or.us

Contents

- 1.0 INTRODUCTION..... 5
- 2.0 MISSION AND GOALS OF THE STANDARD 5
- 3.0 RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING STANDARDS 5
- 4.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARD..... 6
- 5.0 STANDARD DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES..... 6
 - 5.1 PARTICIPATION IN STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT 7
- 6.0 MAINTENANCE OF THE STANDARD 7
- 7.0 SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE STANDARD 7
 - 7.1 REFERENCE SYSTEM..... 8
 - 7.2 RESOLUTION 8
 - 7.3 ACCURACY 8
 - 7.4 EDGE MATCHING 8
 - 7.5 GEOMETRY TOPOLOGY..... 8
 - 7.6 DATA SCHEMA 8
 - 7.7 STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATIONS/CODES 9
 - 7.8 STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION DEFINITIONS 10

The table below details public comments received on version 0.2 of the comprehensive plan data standard along with DLCD’s response.

<u>Public Comment</u>	<u>DLCD Response</u>
<p>Section 3.0 of the standard appears to be “City Centric” and inaccurate on the 20 year description. Growth in unincorporated areas outside of a UGB needs to be addressed.</p>	<p>Two bullet points were added to Section 3 to specify that the comprehensive plan dataset details development types allowed within UGBs over the next 20 years, and development in unincorporated regions outside of UGBs.</p>
<p>Add aggregate resource and limited use comp plan designations.</p>	<p>This standard references the 2019 comprehensive plan data release. Additional comprehensive plan code designations will be considered prior to the next data update.</p>
<p>Define low, medium, and high density residential for unincorporated communities.</p> <p>Will there be universal specifications for low, medium, and high density residential development?</p>	<p>Because density classifications vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, there will not be a universal standard applicable for the entire state. Comprehensive plan density classifications should reflect the current zoning designations for the applicable local jurisdiction. Further explanation can be found in Section 7.7 of this Standard.</p>
<p>Will the ability to represent a form-based code be available? How will physical constraints represented in certain zoning districts be represented?</p>	<p>Unfortunately, we do not have the ability to represent form-based code at a statewide scale at this time. We recommend that users interested in a more specific, localized dataset go directly to the local jurisdiction for that information.</p>
<p>How will neighborhood plans adopted as comp plan designations be represented within the statewide dataset?</p>	<p>Neighborhood plans and overlay zones are not currently accommodated in the comprehensive plan data. This suggestion can be considered by the Planning Workgroup for the next data update.</p>
<p>How should airports be designated under the statewide dataset?</p>	<p>Airports are classified under the ‘Urban Industrial’ code.</p>
<p>The language in the introduction should be simplified. The goal of the statewide comprehensive plan dataset should be added to Section 1.</p>	<p>Section 1 was edited to provide clarity to users as requested. The goal of the statewide comprehensive plan dataset was added to the end of the final paragraph in Section 1.</p>
<p>Within Section 7.4 (edge matching), there’s no section 2.3.5 below.</p>	<p>The text referencing Section 2.3.5 was incorrect and has been edited to read Section 7.5 to accurately reflect the location of topology information within the data standard.</p>
<p>Within sections 7.7 and 7.8, there’s a code field which does not appear to be located in Section 7.6.</p>	<p>The ‘Comp Plan Code’ field in Section 7.7 refers to ‘orCCode’ filed in Section 7.6. A note providing clarification has been added at the beginning of</p>

	Section 7.7.
Having a description of the traditional workflow would be useful. Can an example process be provided?	A workflow process description will not be located within the data standard. However, a workflow model may be included within the Data Stewardship document or given out upon request.
Are all fields required to be completed by local jurisdictions? Who's responsibility for completing the fields if there is missing information?	As many fields as possible should be completed by the local jurisdiction. All remaining fields will be completed by DLCD as needed.
The current language of the standard states that comp plan attributes are 'inherited' from the zoning layer. It may be clearer to say that the 'attribute <i>structure</i> ' is inherited from the zoning layer.	Language has been changed to reflect this note.
While the zoning layer does indicate 'what is allowed now' as stated in the standard, the comp plan designation indicates what is anticipated to be allowed over the next 20 years, not what <i>will</i> be allowed.	Language has been changed to remove the word 'will' from the standard.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Under the direction of the Oregon Geographic Information Council (OGIC), the Oregon Framework Implementation Team for Administrative Boundaries created an Administrative Boundary Data Content Standard. The Administrative Boundaries Framework Theme is a collection of prioritized, spatially-referenced, digital representations of broadly defined boundary feature sets for Oregon. This Theme includes approximately 100 data elements that define service territories, administrative programs, local jurisdictions, and boundaries used for elections, revenue generation, and natural resource area management.

The Oregon Administrative Boundary Standard specifies a common content model for geographic area boundary data that applies to all data elements within the Administrative Boundaries theme. The Comprehensive Plan Designations data layer is an extension to the common content model and inherits some of its substance from the parent standard. Thus, only the portions applying uniquely to comprehensive plan designations are documented in this Extension.

A Comprehensive Plan is defined as the following: A generalized, coordinated land use map and policy statement of the governing body of a local government that interrelates all functional and natural systems and activities relating to the use of lands.

Comprehensive Plan Designations are codes assigned to a specific area that represent the long-term vision for that area and can vary by jurisdiction. As such, the goal of this data standard is to provide a clear framework by which local comprehensive plan designations from Oregon counties and cities can be aggregated into one statewide dataset.

2.0 MISSION AND GOALS OF THE STANDARD

All local jurisdictions in Oregon are required by state statute (ORS 197) to create a comprehensive plan in order to plan for future growth and development. The mission of this standard is to provide a consistent set of comprehensive plan designations statewide to support analyses that cross multiple jurisdiction boundaries. This document provides the structure for organizing, storing, and using comprehensive plan maps from multiple jurisdictions. It allows for county, regional, and statewide analysis by removing attribute inconsistencies (normalizing attributes) of the discrete, large-scale maps.

Because this dataset is a compilation of local comprehensive plan designations, it does not provide an exact replication of the local data. The originators of this data are local jurisdictions in Oregon.

The following goals influenced development of this standard:

- To assemble approximately 275 datasets into one seamless, statewide data layer.
- To provide for periodic updates as this dataset since the local data are updated by jurisdictions on an irregular basis.
- Create a widely usable dataset and data structure.

3.0 RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING STANDARDS

The Oregon Administrative Boundary Standard specifies a common content model for geographic area boundary data. The Administrative Boundary Framework Theme consists of several land use, planning-related datasets including Statewide Zoning Designations, Statewide Land Use, and the Statewide Comprehensive Plan Designations. All of these data layers share a common content model that is inherited from the parent administrative boundaries standard.

Because there are similarities between local zoning and local comprehensive plan data, the Comprehensive Plan Designations data layer was built using a similar data attribute structure as the Statewide Zoning Designations dataset. However, while the attribute values within the two datasets are similar, they reflect a different policy meaning. A zoning map provides a snapshot of what type of development is currently allowed in a specific area. A comprehensive plan (comp plan) map depicts a long-term vision of how and where a city or county will grow in order to accommodate expected population changes and job growth. A local comprehensive plan map will show:

1. Types of development allowed over the next 20 years within city UGBs, and
2. Types of development allowed in unincorporated regions outside of UGBs.

It is important to keep in mind that comprehensive plans and their associated maps are subject to change as amendments are requested by local jurisdictions.

4.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARD

This standard lays out the essential content and data structure necessary to describe, produce, and use the comprehensive plan designations data. The standard addresses three organizational components:

- Geospatial elements (or geometry)
- Description of comprehensive plan designations
- Metadata for documentation

This standard provides a set of common comprehensive plan designations or codes that are used to allow for cross-jurisdiction analysis. Many of these designations are used by local jurisdictions across the state. For codes that are unique to a particular jurisdiction, the steward and/or the local jurisdiction, will change/crosswalk the code to one in the state standard that is most representative of the intent of the local code.

In essence, the data standard groups local codes together based on local definitions. It is this normalization of the attributes that makes this data standard so powerful and useful to GIS users. A crosswalk table is used to catalog all of the various local codes that are grouped into a set of statewide codes which allows for an apples-to-apples comparison across administrative boundaries.

5.0 STANDARD DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES

The Oregon Administrative Boundaries Framework Implementation Team formed a Planning Workgroup in 2012 to organize and support data development efforts of land use planning-related data. This workgroup has met many times since in order to shepherd several datasets through the Framework development, review, and approval process. The workgroup also provides the steward with direction, input, and review of the key elements of the datasets. In this case, the Planning

Workgroup has created, reviewed, and approved the set of statewide comprehensive plan designations and their descriptions, for use in compiling this dataset. The workgroup will also provide final QA of the compiled dataset.

5.1 PARTICIPATION IN STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT

The Planning Workgroup is comprised of state, regional, and local government representatives. Participation in the Workgroup is open to all entities that are concerned with the production, use and exchange of statewide comprehensive plan information. Current member affiliations that were involved in this specific data layer include:

- Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development
- Oregon Department of Agriculture
- Oregon Department of Transportation
- Metro
- City of Eugene
- City of Corvallis
- City of Portland
- Lane Council of Governments

The Planning Workgroup may be reassembled with different members depending on the data element under development and the associated interested parties.

6.0 MAINTENANCE OF THE STANDARD

Maintenance of the standard will occur on an as-needed basis. The primary driver for an update will be the need to accommodate new local comprehensive plan designations that do not fit cleanly within the statewide set of codes. Otherwise, the standard will be updated as needed based on input from the Planning Workgroup and/or the users. Regular updates to this data standard is unlikely.

7.0 SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE STANDARD

The scope of this standard encompasses the public domain vector and associated attribute data compiled for the statewide comprehensive plan designations dataset. The data reflects polygons derived from and provided by the local jurisdictions. Original local jurisdiction comp plan map scales may vary across the state. The local comp plan maps and associated data may evolve over time, but this product will continue to be based on the single designation assigned to each individual polygon. The designations or codes are converted to the state set of codes at the time of the dataset update. Any revisions to the set of state codes will be submitted to the Planning Workgroup for review and acceptance and the revised data content publicized to all interested users of the standard.

7.1 REFERENCE SYSTEM

Local comprehensive plan maps may be maintained in a variety of formats and coordinate systems. Upon collection, the steward will ensure that data are stored and exchanged in the Oregon Lambert projection. This is the standard projection adopted by the Oregon Geographic Information Council. Specific parameters of this projection can be found at:

<https://www.oregon.gov/geo/Pages/projections.aspx>

7.2 RESOLUTION

The resolution of the dataset will vary according to the original reference comp plan maps. The scale of the maps will continue to be determined by the local governments. No attempt will be made by the steward to align individual map scales.

7.3 ACCURACY

This standard supports varying levels of positional accuracy, as implied by the range of original reference map scales. Comp plan designations from the original written explanatory reference materials are interpreted by the steward or the local jurisdiction, and a crosswalk table is created to document these conversions to the set of state comp plan codes. In cases where the steward has converted the local comp plan codes, a crosswalk table is provided to the local jurisdiction for review and approval.

7.4 EDGE MATCHING

The concept of seamless geometry is not compatible with the integration and maintenance of data from local jurisdictions since these data sets use disparate map scales, and by their nature, are not intended to align with seamless geometry. Example: The urban landscape within an urban growth boundary should not extend past the urban growth boundary. Therefore, this urban/rural divide will create a natural geometry misalignment.

Topology errors are addressed in Section 7.5 below.

7.5 GEOMETRY TOPOLOGY

At this point in time, topology errors along comp plan map boundaries will remain in the dataset. The steward does not have the capacity or authority to mitigate jurisdiction boundary discrepancies that originate from local jurisdictions.

7.6 DATA SCHEMA

Polygons are geospatial objects that represent the boundaries of comp plan designations that have been mapped for long-term planning purposes. Each polygon is assigned a local comp plan designation by the local jurisdiction. The steward or the local jurisdiction assigns the state comp plan designation code used

in this compilation dataset. The following table provides the data schema and associated descriptions.

Field Name	Description	Data Type	Length	Domain
UnitID	Polygon ID; concatenation of unitOwner and localCCode	String	50	None
localCCode	Local comp plan designation	String	50	None
localCDesc	Local comp plan designation description	String	50	None
orCCode	State comp plan designation code (See Section 7.7 below for a list of the codes.)	String	50	None
orCDesc	State comp plan designation description (See Section 7.7 below for the descriptions.)	String	50	None
codeRef	Reference system used for unitOwner field	String	50	None
procDate	Statewide Comp Plan Designations compilation processing date; YYYYMMDD	String	50	None
planDate	Original date of comprehensive plan acknowledgement	Date		None
unitOwner	Feature ID for data source based on codeRef system. ie..GNIS	String	50	None
gsteward	Local steward responsible for maintaining the geospatial data for a local jurisdiction. The steward may or may not be the same entity as the unitOwner. Example: Metro is the local steward for data originated by cities and counties in the Metro region.	String	50	None
unitOwnerType	City or County description for unitOwner	String	50	None
unitOwnerName	Local data source/originator of comp plan designations	String	50	None

NOTE: The data provided for public consumption does not include the unitID or the local comp plan codes and descriptions in the attribute table. This information is available to public bodies upon request. All others should request this information from the data source(s) (local jurisdictions).

7.7 STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATIONS/CODES

There are no universal definitions for density in this standard as individual jurisdictions have different definitions of is classified as ‘low’ ‘medium’ or ‘high’ density development. When translating local comprehensive plan codes to the statewide codes below, the local density definition should be used. If there is no local code that classifies comprehensive plan zones by density, jurisdictions may select the most applicable statewide code from the list below.

NOTE: The Designations and Codes shown below are the values found in the *orCDesc* and *orCCode* fields. The attribute table schema is shown in Section 7.6 above.

Statewide Comprehensive Plan Designation	Comp Plan Code
LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL	LDR
MEDIUM DENSITY REDISIDENTIAL	MDR
HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL	HDR
MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL	MFR
HIGH DENSITY MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL	HMFR
URBAN RESIDENTIAL	URES
URBAN MIXED USE	MU
URBAN MIXED USE HIGH DENSITY	MUHD
URBAN MIXED USE VERY HIGH DENSITY	MUVHD
URBAN CBD/CENTER	CBD
URBAN CBD/CENTER HIGH DENSITY	CBDHD
URBAN COMMERCIAL	C
URBAN COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL	CI
URBAN PARK/RECREATION/OPEN SPACE	PROS
URBAN PUBLIC/SEMI-PUBLIC	P
URBAN INSTITUTIONAL	INST
URBAN INDUSTRIAL	IND
URBAN HOLDING/URBANIZABLE	H
AGRICULTURE	AG
MARGINAL LAND	ML
MIXED FARM/FOREST	MFF
FOREST	FO

Statewide Comprehensive Plan Designation	Comp Plan Code
INDIAN RESERVATION	IR
NATURAL RESOURCE	NR
NATURAL HAZARD	NH
FEDERAL LAND	FL
NONRESOURCE LAND	NRL
RURAL RESIDENTIAL	RR
RURAL COMMERCIAL	RC
RURAL COMMERCIAL-INDUSTRIAL	RCI
RURAL INDUSTRIAL	RI
RURAL NATURAL RESOURCE/OPEN SPACE	RNR
RURAL PARK/RECREATION	RPR
RURAL PUBLIC/SEMI-PUBLIC	RP
SHORELAND	SH
BEACHES AND DUNES	BD
ESTUARY	ES
UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITY	UC
UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL	UCC
UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITY INDUSTRIAL	UCI
UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITY PUBLIC	UCP
UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITY RESIDENTIAL	UCR

7.8 STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION DEFINITIONS

The table below provides a definition/explanation for each comprehensive plan code used in this compilation dataset.

Statewide Comprehensive Plan Designation	Comp Plan Code	General Definition and Explanation of Comp Plan Designations
LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL	LDR	Urban single family residential development at low densities.
MEDIUM DENSITY REDISIDENTIAL	MDR	Urban single family residential development at medium densities.
HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL	HDR	Urban single family residential development at high densities.
MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL	MFR	Urban multi-family residential.
HIGH DENSITY MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL	HMFR	Urban high density multi-family residential.
URBAN RESIDENTIAL	URES	A residential classification for jurisdictions that do not have a Low, Medium or High density residential category.
URBAN MIXED USE	MU	A designation inside a UGB that plans for a mix of residential and commercial uses.
URBAN MIXED USE HIGH DENSITY	MUHD	A designation inside a UGB that plans for a mix of high density residential and commercial uses.
URBAN MIXED USE VERY HIGH DENSITY	MUVHD	A designation inside a UGB that plans for a mix of very high density residential and commercial uses.
URBAN CBD/CENTER	CBD	A designation for corridors, mains streets & station communities.
URBAN CBD/CENTER HIGH DENSITY	CBDHD	A designation for high density corridors, mains streets & station communities.
URBAN COMMERCIAL	C	General Commercial - allows a full range of commercial uses, generally on larger/irregular parcels (e.g., large footprint retailers).
URBAN COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL	CI	A designation for areas of mixed-use without residential.
URBAN PARK/RECREATION/OPEN SPACE	PROS	Public or private park uses.
URBAN PUBLIC/SEMI-PUBLIC	P	A designation inside a UGB that plans for predominantly public and semi-public uses such as government buildings, schools, museums, hospitals, and churches. This designation may include public parks if the plan does not include a separate designation.
URBAN INSTITUTIONAL	INST	A designation inside a UGB that plans for predominantly private institutions.
URBAN INDUSTRIAL	IND	A designation inside a UGB that plans for predominantly industrial uses.
URBAN HOLDING/URBANIZABLE	H	Future development areas for residential or non-residential use.

Statewide Comprehensive Plan Designation	Comp Plan Code	General Definition and Explanation of Comp Plan Designations
AGRICULTURE	AG	A designation outside a UGB that complies with Statewide Planning Goal 3 for protection of farmland.
MARGINAL LAND	ML	Land designated as Marginal Land under former provisions of ORS 215 in Lane and Washington counties.
MIXED FARM/FOREST	MFF	A designation outside a UGB that allows for both forest and farm uses consistent with OAR chapter 660, Division 6.
FOREST	FO	A designation outside a UGB that complies with Statewide Planning Goal 4 for protection of forest land.
INDIAN RESERVATION	IR	A designation for tribal reservation and other trust land.
NATURAL RESOURCE	NR	A base map designation that plans for protection of natural resources such as wetlands and riparian areas.
NATURAL HAZARD	NH	A base map designation that plans for limiting development due to a natural hazard such as floodplain or steep slope.
FEDERAL LAND	FL	A designation for federal land where no use (such as forest or farm) is indicated.
NONRESOURCE LAND	NRL	A designation outside a UGB of land that is not farm or forest land or subject to an exception to Goal 3 or Goal 4, regardless of what zone is applied.
RURAL RESIDENTIAL	RR	A residential designation outside a UGB regardless of density.
RURAL COMMERCIAL	RC	A designation outside a UGB and unincorporated community that plans for predominantly commercial uses.
RURAL COMMERCIAL-INDUSTRIAL	RCI	A designation outside a UGB and unincorporated community that plans for a mix of commercial and industrial uses where neither predominates.
RURAL INDUSTRIAL	RI	A designation outside a UGB and unincorporated community that plans for predominantly industrial uses.
RURAL NATURAL RESOURCE/OPEN SPACE	RNR	A base map designation outside a UGB that plans for protection of natural resources such as aggregate.

Statewide Comprehensive Plan Designation	Comp Plan Code	General Definition and Explanation of Comp Plan Designations
RURAL PARK/RECREATION	RPR	A base map designation outside a UGB and unincorporated community that plans for public and private parks, open space, and similar low-intensity uses. If the designation is intended to primarily protect natural resources or hazards, use an alternative designation.
RURAL PUBLIC/SEMI-PUBLIC	RP	A designation outside a UGB and unincorporated community that plans for predominantly public and semi-public uses such as government buildings, schools, museums, hospitals, and churches. This designation may include public parks if the plan does not include a separate designation.
SHORELAND	SH	Area designated for the protection of urban or rural coastal shorelands.
BEACHES AND DUNES	BD	Area designated for the protection of urban or rural coastal estuarine areas.
ESTUARY	ES	Area designated for the protection of coastal estuarine areas.
UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITY	UC	A populated place that is not within the boundaries of any incorporated municipality.
UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL	UCC	A designation within an unincorporated community that plans for commercial uses.
UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITY INDUSTRIAL	UCI	A designation within unincorporated communities that plans for predominantly industrial uses.
UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITY PUBLIC	UCP	A designation within an unincorporated community that plans for predominantly public and semi-public uses such as government buildings, schools, museums, hospitals, and churches. This designation may include public parks if the plan does not include a separate designation.
UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITY RESIDENTIAL	UCR	A designation within an unincorporated community that plans for residential uses.