

17. Goal 13 – Energy Conservation. Arguments that a revised Transportation System Plan (TSP) does not provide for a more energy efficient transportation system, and fails to forecast or plan for an increase in bicycle modal share, fail to demonstrate a violation of Goal 13 since Goal 13 does not state requirements with respect to other land use provisions, even where those provisions have incidental impacts on energy use and conservation, and therefore does not require a maximization of alternative modes. *Shaff v. City of Medford*, 79 Or LUBA 317 (2019).

17. Goal 13 – Energy Conservation. The Goal 13 requirement for local governments to “maximize the conservation of all forms of energy” does not impose an affirmative obligation on local governments to promote the development of renewable energy, or provide a basis to conclude that there is a “demonstrated need” to meet a goal requirement, in order to satisfy the standards at OAR 660-004-0022(1)(a) for adopting a reasons exception in order to site a solar energy facility on agricultural land. *1000 Friends of Oregon v. Jackson County*, 76 Or LUBA 270 (2017).

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).