

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** Where an acknowledged comprehensive plan addresses matters relevant to a state agency’s program, the state agency is not required to demonstrate compliance with the plan and with the goals under ORS 197.180(1). *Schaefer v. OAB*, 81 Or LUBA 819 (2020).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** The fact that an overlay zone that a county applies to lands adjacent to an airport extends into a city and the existence of an intergovernmental agreement between the county and the city regarding airport planning coordination do not give the city “planning authority” over the airport and, therefore, do not make the city an “affected city or county” for purposes of OAR 738-130-0015(1), OAR 731-015-0015(2), and those SAC programs. *Schaefer v. OAB*, 81 Or LUBA 819 (2020).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** A state agency SAC program’s identification of “activities” that “significantly affect land use” for purposes of the SAC program does not relate to or answer the jurisdictional question of whether LUBA has jurisdiction over a decision because the decision creates “actual, qualitatively or quantitatively significant impact on present or future land uses” under the “significant impacts” test articulated in *Peterson v. City of Klamath Falls*, 279 Or 249, 566 P2d 1193 (1977). *Schaefer v. OAB*, 81 Or LUBA 819 (2020).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** Although providing notice of proposed zoning ordinance text amendments and an extended open record period, alone, will not necessarily fulfill a county’s Goal 2 coordination requirement if, in a given case, the local government input is not given meaningful consideration, where the county responds to legitimate issues raised by local governments and incorporates some of the comments it receives into the amendments, LUBA will conclude that the county has met its Goal 2 coordination requirement. *City of Albany v. Linn County*, 81 Or LUBA 104 (2020).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** Where a city has made it clear in its comprehensive plan and in dealings over the years with a water district and a sanitary district that as a condition of the city providing city water and sewer services to water and sanitary district customers the properties receiving such services would have to annex to the city in the future, and the districts have no plans to provide water or sewer service to the disputed area, the city’s decision to annex and withdraw that territory from the districts was adequately coordinated under Goal 2, although the city and the districts may dispute the desirability of that annexation. *Roads End Water District v. City of Lincoln City*, 67 Or LUBA 452 (2013).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** Where evidence in the record shows that in one year during a multi-year planning process the city and county met five times to coordinate on joint projects, including the water public facilities planning process, the city satisfied its Goal 2 obligation to coordinate with the county in adopting the city’s public facilities plan. *Central Oregon Landwatch v. City of Bend*, 66 Or LUBA 392 (2012).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** Nothing in Goal 2, Goal 11, or an urban growth management agreement between the city and the county for lands within the urban growth boundary requires the city to consider the impacts of a public facilities project on a county-identified Goal 5 resource, where the county was given an opportunity to and did not

raise any concerns about the project's impact on a county-identified Goal 5 resource. *Central Oregon Landwatch v. City of Bend*, 66 Or LUBA 392 (2012).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** Where an interchange area management planning effort was a joint Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)/city effort, in satisfying its OAR 734-051-0155(5)(c) obligation to coordinate with affected property owners ODOT is not required to repeat the public outreach effort that was made before the city adopted the interchange area management plan. *Parker Johnstone Wilsonville Honda v. ODOT*, 62 Or LUBA 116 (2010).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** Under Statewide Planning Goal 2, a local government is obligated to coordinate its plans with affected local governments and address the legitimate concerns of affected government units. However, a local government is not required to coordinate between the local government's proposed stormwater master plan and a plan that is adopted by the board of directors of a water control district in a non-public meeting and process that is merely a unilateral attempt by the water control district to dictate a particular outcome in an ongoing dispute between the local government and the water control district. *Santiam Water Control District v. City of Stayton*, 62 Or LUBA 149 (2010).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** Under ORS 197.015(5), comprehensive plans are "coordinated" when the needs of all levels of government have been considered and accommodated as much as possible, and the local government has balanced the needs of all affected governmental units and selected a particular course of action from among the competing proposed courses of action. *Santiam Water Control District v. City of Stayton*, 62 Or LUBA 149 (2010).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** A city satisfies its Goal 2 and Airport Planning Rule coordination responsibilities where the city considers an airport's and the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA's) concerns about a zoning district that allows through the fence access for residential development next to a public airport and the city requires that any applicant for such residential development secure a through the fence agreement with the airport and a letter of support from the FAA. *Port of St. Helens v. City of Scappoose*, 58 Or LUBA 122 (2008).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** The Goal 2 coordination requirement requires that a local government's comprehensive plan be coordinated with the plans of affected governmental units. While a water district is an affected governmental unit, when the water district does not identify any plan that the local government must coordinate with, the local government does not violate the coordination requirement by failing to coordinate with the water district. *Santiam Water Control District v. City of Stayton*, 54 Or LUBA 553 (2007).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** Where an urban growth management agreement between a county and city requires that each jurisdiction consider the comments of the other in certain specified proceedings, the local government need only consider those "legitimate concerns" that present issues that are relevant to the matter that is before it. *Borton v. Coos County*, 52 Or LUBA 46 (2006).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** Where a city amends its transportation system plan to include an access management plan that was previously prepared by ODOT, it is the city's obligation to comply with the OAR 660-012-0015(5) requirement for coordination with affected private providers of transportation services. While the city may be able to rely on ODOT's coordination efforts at the time the access management plan was adopted, the city must establish that such coordination in fact occurred. *Rhodes v. City of Talent*, 50 Or LUBA 415 (2005).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** The Goal 2 coordination requirement is satisfied where the hearings officer adopts lengthy findings addressing the city's concerns and explaining why the hearings officer believed he could not or should not accommodate the city's requests. The hearings officer is not required to accede to the city's requests. *City of Damascus v. Clackamas County*, 50 Or LUBA 514 (2005).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** The Goal 2 coordination requirement applies when comprehensive plans and land use regulations are being adopted or amended, not when a local government applies the plan and land use regulations to grant tentative subdivision approval. *Ghena v. City of Grants Pass*, 50 Or LUBA 552 (2005).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** The Goal 2 coordination requirement is not satisfied by a response to affected governmental bodies' concerns regarding a legislative text amendment that allows a dog control facility in county parks will be addressed when the facility is actually constructed, where the text amendment makes dog control facilities outright permitted uses, which can be constructed without notice or hearing at which such concerns can be raised and addressed. *Cox v. Polk County*, 49 Or LUBA 78 (2005).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** There is nothing in the language of ORS 197.025(1) and 268.385(1) that imposes a higher obligation on the Metropolitan Service District in performing its coordination obligation than is imposed under the Goal 2 coordination obligation. Therefore, in performing periodic review of a regional plan amendment, the Land Conservation and Development Commission will resolve the question of whether the Metropolitan Service District properly coordinated its decision, and LUBA does not have jurisdiction to consider that issue in a LUBA appeal of the same regional plan amendment. *City of Sandy v. Metro*, 48 Or LUBA 363 (2005).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** A city's failure to enter into an urban services agreement with a rural fire protection district prior to annexing property located within the fire district does not violate either Goal 2 or Goal 11. *West Side Rural F.P.D v. City of Hood River*, 43 Or LUBA 546 (2003).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** When a city invites comments from and meets with affected agencies, and the city incorporates some of the agencies' concerns and requests into its final decision, the Goal 2 coordination requirement is met. *ODOT v. City of Klamath Falls*, 39 Or LUBA 641 (2001).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** The coordination requirement at OAR 660-012-0015(5) provides that the adopting local government must provide notice and an opportunity to comment to affected local governments. However, the rule does not require that the adopting local government provide additional notice and opportunity to comment each time the proposal is modified. *Northwest Aggregates Co. v. City of Scappoose*, 38 Or LUBA 291 (2000).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** Allowing affected local governments only seven days to comment on a revised UGB amendment master plan is consistent with the Goal 2 coordination requirement, where the local governments had opportunity to comment on the original master plan, the revisions reflect and attempt to accommodate those comments, and the affected local governments failed to request any additional time to comment on the revisions. *Residents of Rosemont v. Metro*, 38 Or LUBA 199 (2000).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** The duty to coordinate under Goal 2 and ORS 197.015(5) does not mandate success in accommodating the needs or legitimate interests of all affected governmental agencies, but it does mandate a reasonable effort to accommodate those needs and legitimate interests “as much as possible.” For LUBA to be able to determine that this coordination obligation has been satisfied, a local government must respond in its findings to “legitimate concerns” that are expressed by affected governmental agencies. *Turner Community Association v. Marion County*, 37 Or LUBA 324 (1999).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** An affected local government raises a legitimate concern where the concern is explained in sufficient detail to (1) communicate the expectation of some sort of response from the local government and (2) provide the decision maker with a sufficient understanding of the concern that an appropriate response can be included in the decision. *Turner Community Association v. Marion County*, 37 Or LUBA 324 (1999).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** The requirement at OAR 660-021-0020 that a local government coordinate with affected governmental units in including lands within urban reserves is coextensive with the Goal 2 coordination requirement. Under either requirement, the local government must consider and accommodate as much as possible the needs of affected jurisdictions, and must respond in its findings to the legitimate concerns raised by those jurisdictions. *D.S. Parklane Development, Inc. v. Metro*, 35 Or LUBA 516 (1999).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** A local government fails to satisfy the requirement of the Transportation Planning Rule, OAR 660-012-0060, to coordinate with affected jurisdictions, where it amends its comprehensive plan to allow a shopping mall designed to be a regional destination point, but limits its coordination efforts to ODOT and the surrounding county. *Citizens for Florence v. City of Florence*, 35 Or LUBA 255 (1998).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** Where there is no particularized showing that a challenged decision will have any more effect on adjoining cities and counties than other jurisdictions in the metropolitan region, the Goal 2 coordination obligation is met by providing DLCD and the responsible regional agency notice and an opportunity to comment. *Barnard Perkins Corp. v. City of Rivergrove*, 34 Or LUBA 660 (1998).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** The Goal 2 coordination requirement is fulfilled when written notice of a proposed land use plan amendment is provided to all potentially affected governmental units, and the notice explains the proposed action and invites written comment. Coordination does not require a local government to compel the governmental units to reply. *Sanders v. Yamhill County*, 34 Or LUBA 69 (1998).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** A county fails to satisfy the Goal 2 coordination requirement of exchange of information when it rejects the state's request to postpone county population projections until the state completes its own projections, because the rejection eliminates any possibility of exchanging information or balancing the needs of other affected agencies. *DLCD v. Douglas County*, 33 Or LUBA 216 (1997).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** The Goal 2 coordination requirement must be met by adopted findings that respond to state agency concerns. A statement in the record that county staff rejected state agency concerns does not satisfy the coordination requirement. *DLCD v. Douglas County*, 33 Or LUBA 216 (1997).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** County findings which do not accede to every request made by the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department regarding the proposed development, but explain the concerns raised by that agency, comment specifically on those concerns, and add conditions which the county determined appropriate to address the concerns raised, are sufficient to establish compliance with the Goal 2 coordination requirement. *Brown v. Coos County*, 31 Or LUBA 142 (1996).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** When, prior to an appeal to LUBA, a city satisfies the coordination requirement of OAR 660-12-060(3) by consulting with the county, and the development proposal does not change between LUBA's remand order and a second appeal, the city is not required to consult with the county again during the proceedings on remand. *Melton v. City of Cottage Grove*, 30 Or LUBA 331 (1996).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** The coordination obligation imposed by Statewide Planning Goal 2 (Land Use Planning), and similarly worded local government comprehensive plan provisions, does not require that a local government accede to every concern expressed by a state agency, but does require that a local government adopt findings responding to legitimate concerns expressed by a state agency. *ONRC v. City of Seaside*, 29 Or LUBA 39 (1995).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** Letters from state and federal agency personnel that are not addressed to the local government, and the oral comments of an individual member of a regional government council, may raise substantive issues but do not trigger a coordination obligation under Goal 2. *Friends of Cedar Mill v. Washington County*, 28 Or LUBA 477 (1995).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** The coordination requirement of OAR 660-12-060(3) should be interpreted the same as the coordination provision in Goal 2, which requires

the jurisdiction developing plan or land use regulation provisions (1) to exchange information with other affected governmental units; and (2) to consider and accommodate the needs of such governmental units as much as possible in formulating or revising the plan or regulations. *Melton v. City of Cottage Grove*, 28 Or LUBA 1 (1994).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** If a city located outside the Metro UGB wishes to plan to capture growth currently anticipated to occur within the Metro UGB, it must specifically coordinate that desire with Metro and the affected units of government within the Metro UGB. *1000 Friends of Oregon v. City of North Plains*, 27 Or LUBA 372 (1994).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** The coordination required by Goal 2 is achieved by balancing the needs of all affected governmental units and selecting a particular course of action from among the competing proposed courses of action. *1000 Friends of Oregon v. City of North Plains*, 27 Or LUBA 372 (1994).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** Providing notice of a post-acknowledgment plan or land use regulation amendment to the Department of Land Conservation and Development under ORS 197.610(1) is inadequate to satisfy a local government's coordination obligations. *1000 Friends of Oregon v. City of North Plains*, 27 Or LUBA 372 (1994).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** A sanitary district's obligation to provide sewer service, and a person's right to receive such sewer service, are subject to county comprehensive plan and land use regulation limitations on the provision of such sewer service. *Bear Creek Valley San. Auth. v. City of Medford*, 27 Or LUBA 328 (1994).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** A city and county may conclude the consequences of allowing sewer service to be provided without first securing consents to annexation outweigh any difficulties requiring such consents to annexation will pose for a sanitary district's use of local improvement districts to pay the cost of providing sewer service. Coordination under Goal 2 does not require that all affected governmental units agree on the proposal. *Bear Creek Valley San. Auth. v. City of Medford*, 27 Or LUBA 328 (1994).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** A city's unilateral decision to amend its acknowledged comprehensive plan policies concerning provision of urban services within an unincorporated area, such that the amended city plan is inconsistent with the acknowledged comprehensive plans of a county and another city, violates Goal 2 and improperly exercises coordination authority assigned to the Metropolitan Service District under ORS 197.190(1) and 268.385(1). *Washington County v. City of Portland*, 27 Or LUBA 204 (1994).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** Although Goal 2 requires that special district plans and actions related to land use must be consistent with city and county comprehensive plans, the goal does not establish any hierarchy for consistency between city and county plans. *City of Portland v. Washington County*, 27 Or LUBA 176 (1994).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** The statutory and Goal 2 obligations to coordinate require an exchange of information between affected governmental units and the

planning jurisdiction and a balancing of the needs of all governmental units and citizens of the state, to reach a course of action that is consistent with the comprehensive plans of affected governmental units. *City of Portland v. Washington County*, 27 Or LUBA 176 (1994).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** Because cities and counties generally do not directly assert planning interests outside their municipal boundaries, changes in the acknowledged comprehensive plans of nearby jurisdictions generally will have only indirect consequences on the city’s or county’s comprehensive plan and will not amount to a conflict or result in an inconsistency. *City of Portland v. Washington County*, 27 Or LUBA 176 (1994).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** A city comprehensive plan amendment that simply makes a planning recommendation for an unincorporated area outside the city is unlikely to be “inconsistent” with the county comprehensive plan for that unincorporated area. *City of Portland v. Washington County*, 27 Or LUBA 176 (1994).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** Where a proposed comprehensive plan amendment is opposed by one or more affected local governments, but will not actually conflict with the affected local government’s plan, the entity proposing the comprehensive plan amendment satisfies its coordination obligation under Goal 2 by following the two steps set out in *Rajneesh v. Wasco County*, 13 Or LUBA 202 (1985). After having done so, the entity proposing the change may adopt the plan amendment. *City of Portland v. Washington County*, 27 Or LUBA 176 (1994).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** A local government that lacks ORS 197.190(1) coordination responsibility may not alter the acknowledged status quo by adopting or amending a comprehensive plan provision that is inconsistent with the acknowledged comprehensive plan of an affected local government. *City of Portland v. Washington County*, 27 Or LUBA 176 (1994).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** Although Goal 2 requires all units of government to coordinate their land use planning, ORS 197.190(1) imposes an overriding coordination responsibility on counties and the Metropolitan Service District to ensure that the plans within their boundaries make up an integrated comprehensive plan for the entire area of the county or Metropolitan Service District. *City of Portland v. Washington County*, 27 Or LUBA 176 (1994).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** In the circumstance where affected jurisdictions (1) have acknowledged plans which directly assert overlapping planning interests, and (2) cannot agree on “coordinated, consistent” plan amendments, only the county or Metropolitan Service District with ORS 197.190(1) coordination authority may unilaterally direct a change in the acknowledged status quo. *City of Portland v. Washington County*, 27 Or LUBA 176 (1994).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** The Metropolitan Service District may, under ORS 197.190(1) and 268.385(1), determine that a proposed amendment to an acknowledged comprehensive plan in an area of overlapping planning interests is “coordinated” under ORS

197.015(5) and Goal 2, even though the amendment is inconsistent with the acknowledged plan of another jurisdiction. Pursuant to ORS 268.380(2), Metro may require any existing acknowledged comprehensive plans that are inconsistent with the newly amended comprehensive plan to be amended to maintain consistency, as required by Goal 2. *City of Portland v. Washington County*, 27 Or LUBA 176 (1994).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** ORS 197.190(1) and 268.385(1) and Goal 2 directly impose plan coordination and consistency obligations on the Metropolitan Service District. Metropolitan area goals and objectives and functional plans may supplement Metro’s coordination authority and obligation, but they are not a necessary precondition to Metro’s exercise of its coordination authority, where a city’s or county’s adoption of a particular plan amendment will necessitate changes in one or more acknowledged comprehensive plans to maintain plan consistency under Goal 2. *City of Portland v. Washington County*, 27 Or LUBA 176 (1994).

**6.2 Goal 2 – Land Use Planning – Coordination.** ORS 197.190(1) and 268.285(1) both require that a Metropolitan Service District decision to coordinate be an action taken “through its governing body.” Where the product of a Metro sponsored mediation is not formally adopted by the Metro governing body, it does not constitute an exercise of Metro’s coordination obligation under those statutes. *City of Portland v. Washington County*, 27 Or LUBA 176 (1994).