

---

[www.oregonmetro.gov](http://www.oregonmetro.gov)

# 2012 Compliance Report

Metro Code Chapter 3.07 Urban Growth  
Management Functional Plan

and

Metro Code Chapter 3.08 Regional  
Transportation Functional Plan

March 2013



**Metro** | *Making a great place*

## About Metro

Clean air and clean water do not stop at city limits or county lines. Neither does the need for jobs, a thriving economy, and sustainable transportation and living choices for people and businesses in the region. Voters have asked Metro to help with the challenges and opportunities that affect the 25 cities and three counties in the Portland metropolitan area.

A regional approach simply makes sense when it comes to making decisions about how the region grows. Metro works with communities to support a resilient economy, keep nature close by and respond to a changing climate. Together we're making a great place, now and for generations to come.

Stay in touch with news, stories and things to do.

**[www.oregonmetro.gov/connect](http://www.oregonmetro.gov/connect)**

### **Metro Council President**

Tom Hughes

### **Metro Councilors**

Shirley Craddick, District 1

Carlotta Collette, District 2

Craig Dirksen, District 3

Kathryn Harrington, District 4

Bob Stacey, District 5

Sam Chase, District 6

### **Auditor**

Suzanne Flynn

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Overview</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Urban Growth Management Functional Plan Compliance Status</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Regional Transportation Functional Plan Compliance Status</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Metro's Urban Growth Boundary Management Functional Plan provides tools and guidance for local jurisdictions to implement regional policies and achieve the goals set out in the region's 2040 Growth Concept. The 2012 Compliance Report summarizes the status of compliance for each city and county in the region with the Metro Code requirements included in the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan and the Regional Transportation Functional Plan. Every city and county in the region is required, if necessary, to change their comprehensive plans or land use regulations to come into compliance with Metro Code requirements within two years of acknowledgement by the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission and to remain in compliance. The information in this report confirms the strong partnerships at work in this region to implement regional and local plans.

In 2012, most local governments that had outstanding compliance issues requested and were granted extensions of their compliance deadlines for Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements. Beaverton and Tigard took over West Bull Mountain and River Terrace planning, respectively, from Washington County putting Washington County into compliance and leaving Beaverton and Tigard not in compliance.

Ten jurisdictions originally requested deadlines of December 31, 2012 for meeting the requirements of the Regional Transportation Functional Plan. As described below and in Appendix D, four of these jurisdictions have requested extensions until 2013. Five have requested extensions to 2014. All nine jurisdictions were found to meet one of the two criteria: 1) the city or county is making progress towards compliance; or 2) there is good cause for failure to meet the deadline for compliance. Thus all nine of these extensions were granted by Metro's Chief Operating Officer.

The City of Oregon City is the only jurisdiction with a 2012 deadline that did not request an extension. While technically out of compliance, the City has made significant progress with its Transportation System Plan and is nearing completion.

In 2012, four jurisdictions requested exemption from the Regional Transportation Functional Plan. All four jurisdictions were found to meet the criteria for exemption.

## **Metro Code Chapter 3.07 Urban Growth Management Functional Plan and Metro Code Chapter 3.08 Regional Transportation Functional Plan – March 2012**

### **Introduction**

Metro Code 3.07.870 requires the Chief Operating Officer to submit the status of compliance by cities and counties with the requirements of the Metro Code Chapter 3.07 (Urban Growth Management Functional Plan) annually to the Metro Council. In an effort to better integrate land use and transportation requirements, this compliance report includes information on local government compliance with the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (Metro Code Chapter 3.08) as well as the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP).

On December 16, 2010 the Metro Council adopted Ordinance No. 10-1244B which amended several Urban Growth Management Functional Plan titles. The Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) acknowledged components of the ordinance including changes to the UGMFP in December 2012.

### **Overview**

Per the Metro Code, the Chief Operating Officer (COO) may grant an extension request if a local government meets one of two criteria: 1) the city or county is making progress towards compliance; or 2) there is good cause for failure to meet the deadline for compliance. Currently, a decision by the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) is pending for Spring 2013 regarding Lake Oswego and Title 13.

By statute, cities and counties have two years following the date of acknowledgement of Metro's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) dated November 24, 2011 to bring their Transportation System Plans (TSPs) into compliance with any new or changed regional requirements. However, Metro exercised its authority under the state's Transportation Planning Rule to extend city and county deadlines beyond the two-year statutory deadline. Metro consulted with each city and county to determine a reasonable timeline for this work and adopted a schedule that is part of the RTP Appendix. The deadlines are phased to take advantage of funding opportunities and the availability of local and Metro staff resources.

Appendix A summarizes the compliance status for all local governments with the requirements of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) by the end of 2012.

Appendix B shows the status of Title 11 new urban area planning for areas added to the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) since 1998.

Appendix C summarizes the compliance dates for each UGMFP title.

Appendix D summarizes the compliance dates for the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) in effect as of December 31, 2012.

Appendix E is the Annual Report on Amendments to the Employment and Industrial Areas Map dated January 10, 2013.

## **Urban Growth Management Functional Plan Compliance Status**

**Lake Oswego:** The City of Lake Oswego's removal of their Resource Conservation overlay protections from certain "isolated tree groves" was in violation of Title 13 protections. Metro filed an appeal with the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) regarding the approval of these comprehensive plan and zoning code changes. The parties to the LUBA appeal have agreed to another 60-day extension of the schedule, which set the date for the city to submit the record to LUBA as February 15, 2013.

The City of Lake Oswego has proposed code changes to bring the city into compliance with Title 4. The first hearing was scheduled for the end of January 2013. Compliance with Title 4 is pending approval of these zoning code amendments.

**Sherwood & Tualatin:** Order No.74, Relating to the Request by the Cities of Tualatin and Sherwood to Extend the Time for Planning under Title 11 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan for the Area Known as Area 6 was issued August 20, 2012.

**Tigard:** Order No. 75, Relating to the Request by the City of Tigard to Extend the Timeline for Planning under Title 11 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan for the West Bull Mountain Concept Plan was issued September 11, 2012.

## **Regional Transportation Functional Plan Compliance Status**

Ten jurisdictions originally requested deadlines of December 31, 2012 for meeting the requirements of the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP). As described below and in Appendix D, four of these jurisdictions have requested extensions until 2013. Five have requested extensions to 2014. All nine jurisdictions were found to meet one of the two criteria: 1) the city or county is making progress towards compliance; or 2) there is good cause for failure to meet the deadline for compliance. Therefore, all of the extensions requested were approved by the Chief Operating Officer.

### **Jurisdictions with 2012 deadlines that requested extensions until 2013**

#### **Clackamas County**

Clackamas County has been in the process of updating its Transportation System Plan (TSP) since early 2011. The county began the process by laying the ground work for the update by developing a Transportation Framework which guided the TSP update project. Working with a 22-member public advisory committee (PAC), the Board of County Commissioners adopted the "Vision, Goals and Objectives" for the transportation system in April of 2012. The consulting team completed the existing conditions and future conditions review of the system in July of 2012. Presently, the county and the consulting team have worked with the PAC and other members of the public to confirm the full list of projects that will be needed over the next 20 years. Parallel to the work of identifying the needed projects, the county has been reviewing all of their transportation policies to ensure they implement the RTP as well as the vision, goals and objectives for Clackamas County's transportation system

Items that remain to be completed as of October 2012 include identification and finalization of a fiscally constrained project list, completion of review of policies, development of implementation language and adoption of comprehensive plan language changes.

It is anticipated that the recommendations from the PAC will be completed by June 2013 and final adoption of comprehensive plan changes will be done by December 2013. Clackamas County requested, and was granted, a revised deadline of December 31, 2013.

### **Milwaukie**

In June 2012, the city contracted with DKS Associates to address many of the technical components of their TSP update project. The DKS scope of work includes revising the existing conditions and future forecasting chapters in the TSP, as well as updating the sections on future conditions and needs and the motor vehicle plan. DKS has delivered turn-movement counts at three key intersections as well as updates of various figures, tables, and text related to existing conditions and future forecasting.

The city is in the process of finalizing the overall scope of the TSP update project. City staff will incorporate the final DKS deliverables into the TSP and will make other updates to ensure that the TSP, zoning code, and comprehensive plan comply with the requirements of the RTFP. The target for adoption of the needed changes by the Milwaukie City Council is early June 2013. However, to allow for any unforeseen delays, the city requested, and was granted, an extension to December 31, 2013.

### **Tualatin**

The City of Tualatin began their TSP update with a public involvement campaign designed by JLA Public Involvement consultants in Summer 2011. Staff and consultants set out to understand the community's concerns and vision for the city's transportation future. Throughout the summer of 2011, staff had a booth at the city's farmers' market and presented materials at several other community events and additionally had an online map on which they collected comments. The city hired a technical consultant, CH2M Hill in Fall 2011 and with the assistance of the consultant team, formed a task force comprised of citizens, city committee representatives, business representatives, elected officials and agency representatives. The task force began meeting in November of 2011. In Spring 2012, the city held an open house to initiate the working group meetings. Working groups were open to the public and focused on specific transportation topics such as Major Corridors and Intersections, Downtown, Transit, Industrial and Freight, Bicycle and Pedestrian, and Neighborhood Livability. The working groups met three to four times to generate ideas, evaluate, and prioritize projects between April and June 2012.

Starting November 2011, the technical team drafted an existing conditions report and plans and policies analysis. In January 2012, they produced a future conditions analysis and in the spring began developing and screening system options. The technical team presented all of their work to the task force for comments and feedback. Additionally, the Planning Commission, Tualatin Parks Advisory Committee and the City Council received updates and briefings.

As of September 2012, the technical team was drafting and refining project recommendations for the TSP. The project recommendations will come from the Task Force, City Council and the community engaging in decisions about the future of transportation in Tualatin. The city requested, and was granted, an extension until June

2013 to allow time for potential additional public meetings and conversations about what projects to include in the TSP.

### **Wilsonville**

In 2010 the City applied for a Transportation Growth Management (TGM) grant to fund a project to update the city's TSP. The city was awarded an \$185,000 grant, which the City matched with \$50,000 in local funds. The project was delayed due to slow progress by contracting, but the project consultant DKS Associates began work on the project in May 2011.

Significant work has been completed by the project consultants, by city staff and with the community. Of the nine tasks identified in the scope of work, six will be completed by December 2012. Key accomplishments include completion of:

- Existing system inventory
- Needs analysis
- Funding analysis
- Safe Routes to School action plan
- Development and analysis of solutions alternatives
- Two public open houses
- Six technical advisory committee meetings
- Two city council briefings
- Several Planning Commission work sessions
- Draft Planned and Financially Constrained project lists

In 2013 the project team will complete the Planned and Financially Constrained project lists, draft the TSP document and implementing ordinances, and present the package to the Planning Commission and City Council for adoption. The project schedule is to complete these tasks by June 2013. The city requested August 30, 2013 as the revised deadline and was granted an extension until December 31, 2013.

### Jurisdictions with 2012 deadlines that requested extensions until 2014

#### **Fairview**

The main reason that Fairview could not meet the 2012 deadline was due to budget. In the 2012-2013 fiscal year budget cycle, Fairview went from funding two full-time planning positions to funding one half-time planning position. Without the award of the TGM grant to provide funding for hiring a consultant to assist with the TSP update, Fairview needs additional time to either apply for another TGM grant, or to revise the planning work plan to accommodate the addition of the TSP update work requirement.

In the meantime, The City of Fairview has taken measures towards preparing a TSP Update including the following:

- Attended Metro sponsored workshops regarding elements of the RTFP affecting local TSP updates.
- Reviewed current TSP to identify needed areas of improvements/amendments.
- Applied for a TGM grant to assist with the cost of updating Fairview's TSP.



Unfortunately, Fairview was not awarded the TGM grant, and therefore the city requested, and was granted, an extension to December 31, 2014 in order to allow adequate time to complete the required TSP update.

### **Happy Valley**

The City of Happy Valley has spent approximately \$13,000 on consulting work with the Angelo Planning Group (APG) and DKS Associates toward determining the scope of work necessary to create a RTFP-compliant Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update. It is estimated that a RTFP-compliant TSP Update will cost the city between \$75,000 and \$100,000. This amount far exceeds the budgeted amount the city will be able to dedicate towards the TSP update, which will likely take multiple years to complete. This issue is complicated by the removal of the “Sunrise Project” (also referred to as Phase II or Unit II of the Sunrise) extending from roughly 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue to 172<sup>nd</sup> Avenue from the financially constrained RTP. The removal of this facility from the financially constrained RTP may have serious implications to the city’s TSP, including the removal of the project itself, the removal of the Rock Creek Interchange Access Management Plan (IAMP) and the downgrade and potential removal of a portion of a major arterial (Rock Creek Boulevard – west of 162<sup>nd</sup> Avenue) from the City’s TSP. Due to these budgetary and technical constraints, the city requested (and was granted) a revised deadline of December 31, 2014.

### **Sherwood**

The city has their TSP Update listed in the Capital Improvement Project 5-year listing and has budgeted sufficient funding to perform a complete TSP update in Fiscal Years 2012-2013 & 2013-2014.

The city is also in the process of performing a town center planning study. The scheduled completion date of the Town Center Plan is June 2013. Since the TSP update is based on information developed as part of the Town Center Plan, the city is requesting an extension of the TSP compliance deadline by one year to accommodate the development and use of this information in the update of the TSP.

The city also recently received an ODOT TGM Grant for updating the City’s TSP. The TSP update effort is expected to take 12 – 14 months, thus the city requested, and was granted, an extension to December 31, 2014.

### **Washington County**

Washington County began its TSP update in late 2011. Significant progress has been made toward compliance with the UGMFP. However, additional time is necessary to complete the two-phase planning effort. The following summary of tasks, activities and deliverables demonstrate the progress made to date as well as the scope of work expected to accomplish the TSP update.

#### *By the end of 2011*

- A project team was assembled made up of County staff and a consultant group (DKS Associates and CH2M Hill).

- In December 2011, the Board of County Commissioners appointed two committees: a community advisory committee (CAC) made up of community and stakeholder interests groups, and an interagency coordinating committee (ICC) comprised of cities and agency partners.

By the end of 2012

The County completed phase one of the TSP, including:

- Evaluating existing policies and regulations;
- Refining the travel forecast model;
- Identifying community values; and
- Developing and reviewing with the public, the ICC and CAC, an existing conditions and future needs report.

Phase one involved extensive public outreach and community involvement, including:

- Holding five CAC and two ICC meetings;
- Developing and maintaining a project website – [www.tsp2035.com](http://www.tsp2035.com);
- Holding three open houses in three locations throughout the county and a virtual open house hosted on the project’s website;
- Attending four farmers markets and several other public events;
- Conducting stakeholder interviews with the following interest groups: business representatives (Nike, Intel, Westside Economic Alliance), manufacturing (Sheldon Manufacturing), nursery and agriculture (Fishback Nursery), transit and demand management (Ride Connection and Westside Transportation Alliance), public health and the environment (Kaiser and 1000 Friends of Oregon);
- Collecting public input by creating an interactive online comment map and attending community and interest group meetings;
- Presenting to community and stakeholder interest groups, including: Committee for Citizen Involvement, community participation organizations, Washington County Farm Bureau, Adelante Mujeres, Washington County Urban Road Maintenance District Advisory Committee, Washington County Rural Road Operations and Maintenance Advisory Committee, Westside Economic Alliance and the Westside Transportation Alliance; and
- Holding a community workshop in December to review and discuss future needs.

By the end of 2013

The project team will work closely with the CAC and ICC and build off phase one public involvement efforts by continuing to engage public and interest stakeholders through a variety of methods. The following outlines phase two tasks necessary to complete an update of the TSP:

- Identify, evaluate and select preferred alternatives/solutions;
- Determine funding options;
- Finalize policies;
- Prepare a draft plan;
- File an ordinance; and
- Adopt a plan.

The county anticipates that the remaining tasks noted above can be completed and an updated TSP can be ready to adopt in 2013. However, to provide flexibility for delays during the ordinance and public hearing process, the county requested (and was granted) a new deadline of December 31, 2014.

### **West Linn**

West Linn's current TSP was adopted in 2008, during the early stages of the update to the RTP. As such, the West Linn TSP contains many of the required elements as outlined in the RTFP. There are however a number of missing components in West Linn's TSP (e.g., 2035 planning horizon; compliance with pedestrian system design and essential community destinations; compliance with Transportation System Management Objectives (TSMO); and performance targets for multiple transportation modes and valuation criteria that will be required to bring the TSP into compliance with the RTFP. In anticipation of the RTFP compliance mandate, West Linn applied for but was denied TGM grant funds in 2011 and in 2012. As part of the TGM grant work, the city completed an evaluation of existing deficiencies in the TSP and prepared a detailed work program to implement an update that complies with the RTFP. The city does not have enough money available to complete this work without an outside source of funding and is planning to apply for a TGM grant in 2013. In the meantime, the city will continue to explore alternative sources of funding to complete this work. For these reasons the city requested, and was granted, an extension until December 31, 2014 to complete its TSP update.

### Other jurisdictions with 2012 deadline

#### **Oregon City**

The City of Oregon City is the only jurisdiction with a 2012 deadline that did not request an extension. While technically out of compliance, the city has made significant progress with its TSP and is nearing completion. The city began their update to the TSP in June 2011. The city completed an internal draft TSP document in December 2012 and expected to publish it for public review in January 2013. In early 2013 city staff will conduct work sessions with their Planning Commission and City Commissioners to receive feedback before final adoption hearings begin. They expect to have the adoption hearing and complete this TSP update no later than June 30, 2013.

### Jurisdictions requesting exemption from RTFP

In 2012, four jurisdictions requested exemption from the RTFP: Durham, Johnson City, King City and Rivergrove. All four jurisdictions were found to meet the criteria:

1. The city or county's transportation system is generally adequate to meet transportation needs;
2. Little population or employment growth is expected over the period of the exemption;
3. The exemption would not make it more difficult to accommodate regional or state transportation needs; and
4. The exemption would not make it more difficult to achieve the performance objectives set forth in section 3.08.010A of the RTFP.

## APPENDIX A

### Summary of Compliance Status as of December 31, 2012 (UGMFP effect as of 12/15/2010)

<b>Entity</b>	<b>Title 1 Housing Capacity</b>	<b>Title 2 <sup>1</sup> Parking Management</b>	<b>Title 3 Water Quality &amp; Flood Management</b>	<b>Title 4 Industrial and other Employment Land</b>	<b>Title 6 <sup>2</sup> Centers, Corridors, Station Communities &amp; Main Streets</b>	<b>Title 7 Housing Choice</b>	<b>Title 11 Planning for New Urban Areas</b> <small>(see Appendix B for detailed information)</small>	<b>Title 13 Nature in Neighborhoods</b>
Beaverton	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Cooper Mountain Plan not in compliance	In compliance
Cornelius	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Damascus	Extended to 12/31/2013	See footnote	Extended to 12/31/2013	Extended to 12/31/2013	See footnote	Extended to 12/31/2013	Extended to 12/31/2013	Extended to 12/31/2013
Durham	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Fairview	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Forest Grove	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Gladstone	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Gresham	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Happy Valley	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Hillsboro	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Johnson City	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
King City	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Lake Oswego	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Pending final city action	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	Pending LUBA decision 2/2013
Maywood Park	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Milwaukie	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Oregon City	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Extended to 6/30/2014 for Beavercreek Rd and South End	In compliance
Portland	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance*
Rivergrove	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Sherwood	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance

<sup>1</sup> While Title 2 was removed from the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan through Ordinance 10-1244B, the requirements of Title 2 were added to the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (Metro Code 3.08) in the same ordinance. Compliance with parking requirements should be addressed in each local government's Transportation System Plan.

<sup>2</sup> Once acknowledged by LCDC, Title 6 will be an incentive approach and only those local governments wanting a regional investment (currently defined as a new high-capacity transit line) will need to comply.

<b>Entity</b>	<b>Title 1 Housing Capacity</b>	<b>Title 2 <sup>1</sup> Parking Management</b>	<b>Title 3 Water Quality &amp; Flood Management</b>	<b>Title 4 Industrial and other Employment Land</b>	<b>Title 6 <sup>2</sup> Centers, Corridors, Station Communities &amp; Main Streets</b>	<b>Title 7 Housing Choice</b>	<b>Title 11 Planning for New Urban Areas</b> <small>(see Appendix B for detailed information)</small>	<b>Title 13 Nature in Neighborhoods</b>
Tigard	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	River Terrace Plan not in compliance	In compliance
Troutdale	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Tualatin	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Area 61 extended to 12/31/21; Basalt Creek extended to 9/30/2016	In compliance
West Linn	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Wilsonville	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	East Wilsonville Extended to 12/31/2015; Basalt Creek extended to 9/30/2016	In compliance
Wood Village	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Clackamas County	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Multnomah County	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Area 93 extended to 6/2/2021	In compliance
Washington County	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance

\*Letter dated 1/16/13 sent to Portland stating it was in full compliance with Title 13 for 2012.

<sup>1</sup> While Title 2 was removed from the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan through Ordinance 10-1244B, the requirements of Title 2 were added to the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (Metro Code 3.08) in the same ordinance. Compliance with parking requirements should be addressed in each local government's Transportation System Plan.

<sup>2</sup> Once acknowledged by LCDC, Title 6 will be an incentive approach and only those local governments wanting a regional investment (currently defined as a new high-capacity transit line) will need to comply.

**2012 COMPLIANCE REPORT, APPENDIX B  
TITLE 11 NEW AREA PLANNING COMPLIANCE  
(As of December 31, 2012)**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Lead Government(s)</b>	<b>Compliance</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>1998 UGB Expansion</b>			
Rock Creek Concept Plan	Happy Valley	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; development on-going.
Pleasant Valley Concept Plan	Gresham and Portland	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; city annexed 524 acres and development to begin in eastern section.
<b>1999 UGB Expansion</b>			
Witch Hazel Community Plan	Hillsboro	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; development on-going.
<b>2000 UGB Expansion</b>			
Villebois Village	Wilsonville	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; development on-going.
<b>2002 UGB Expansion</b>			
Springwater Community Plan	Gresham	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed for this mostly industrial area; waiting annexation & development.
Damascus/Boring Concept Plan	Happy Valley	yes	HV portion: Concept plan and implementation measures completed; waiting annexation and development.
	Damascus	DCLD extension to June 2014; FP extension to 12/31/13; Concept Plan extension to 7/31/14	Damascus portion: Comprehensive plan map approved, then overturned by vote; city working on next steps to comply with DLCD deadline of June 2014. NOTE: City has UGMFP extension to 12/31/13 and Concept Plan extension to 7/31/14.
	Gresham	yes	Gresham portion, called Kelley Creek Headwaters Plan, was adopted by city in 2009.
Park Place Master Plan	Oregon City	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; waiting annexation & development
Beavercreek Road	Oregon City	Extension to 6/30/14	Concept plan is completed and accepted by Metro; City has put on hold adoption of the final implementing ordinances pending LUBA appeal and work load.
South End Road	Oregon City	Extension to 6/30/14	Concept plan work underway; expected completion Sept 2013.
East Wilsonville (Frog Pond area)	Wilsonville	Extension to 12/31/15	City initially completed site analysis w/private builders in 2008; currently City is evaluating and budgeting for major sewer upgrade for eastern portion of City which must be completed before planning and development of site.
Coffee Creek 1 (NW Wilsonville)	Wilsonville	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed, including master plan for area adopted, for this industrial area; waiting development.
NW Tualatin Concept Plan (Cipole Rd & 99W)	Tualatin	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed for this small industrial area.
SW Tualatin Concept Plan	Tualatin	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed for this industrial area.
Brookman Concept Plan	Sherwood	yes	Concept Plan and implementation measures completed; waiting development
<b>Project</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Compliance</b>	<b>Status</b>

	<b>Government(s)</b>		
Study Area 59	Sherwood	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; school constructed.
Study Area 61 (Cipole Rd)	Tualatin	Extension to 12/31/2021	Extension agreement – planning shall be completed when Urban Reserve 5A is completed, or by 12/31/2021, whichever is sooner.
99W Area (near Tualatin-Sherwood Rd)	Sherwood	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed.
King City	King City	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; annexed to city with portion developed as park and rest in floodplain.
West Bull Mountain Concept Plan	Wash County/ Tigard	Extension to 11/30/12	Concept plan adopted by County and City of Tigard; city working to finalize re-named River Terrace Community Plan and code work; expected completion July 2014.
Cooper Mountain area	Beaverton	Extension to 11/30/12	Wash County & Beaverton signed IGA in January 2013 transferring responsibility to City; City to start concept planning in spring 2013, and is in process of applying for an extension.
Study Area 64 (14 acres north of Scholls Ferry Rd)	Beaverton	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; annexed to City.
Study Area 69 & 71	Hillsboro	yes	Areas are included in South Hillsboro Area Plan. City has adopted these areas into its comprehensive plan; upon annexation, they will be zoned to comply with comp plan.
Study Area 77	Cornelius	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; annexed to City.
Forest Grove Swap	Forest Grove	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; annexed to City.
Shute Road Concept Plan	Hillsboro	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; annexed to City and portion developed with Genentech.
North Bethany Subarea Plan	Washington County	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed.
Bonny Slope West Concept Plan (Area 93)	Multnomah County	Extension to 6/2/21 or 2 yrs after agreement w/other govt, whichever earlier	Concept plan map developed though not yet adopted by Board of Commissioners; extension order issued by Metro based on difficulty of deciding on service provider(s).
<b>2004/2005 UGB Expansion</b>			
Damascus area	Damascus	See under 2002 above	Included with Damascus comp plan (see above)
Tonquin Employment Area	Sherwood	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed.
Basalt Creek/West RR Area Concept Plan	Tualatin and Wilsonville	Extension to 9/30/16	Cities scheduled to begin planning in early 2013.

<b>Project</b>	<b>Lead Government(s)</b>	<b>Compliance</b>	<b>Status</b>
N. Holladay Concept Plan	Cornelius	yes	Concept plan completed; implementation to be finalized after annexation to City.
Evergreen Concept Plan	Hillsboro	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed.
Helvetia Concept Plan	Hillsboro	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed.
<b>2011 UGB Expansion</b>			
North Hillsboro	Hillsboro	yes	Concept planning completion due January 2014.
South Hillsboro	Hillsboro	yes	Concept planning completion due January 2014.
South Cooper Mountain	Beaverton	yes	Concept planning to begin in spring 2013; expected completion fall 2014
Roy Rogers West	Tigard	yes	Concept planning underway; expected completion July 2014.



**APPENDIX C:  
COMPLIANCE DATES FOR THE  
URBAN GROWTH MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONAL PLAN**

<b>Functional Plan Requirement</b>	<b>When Local Decisions Must Comply</b>		
	<b>Plan/Code Amendment</b> 3.07.810(C) <sup>1</sup>	<b>Land Use Decision</b> 3.07.810(D) <sup>2</sup>	<b>Adoption</b> 3.07.810(B) <sup>3</sup>
<b>Title 1:</b> Adopt minimum dwelling unit density (3.07.120.B)	12/21/2013	12/21/2013	12/21/2014
<b>Title 1:</b> Allow accessory dwelling unit in SFD zones (3.07.120.G) <i>(provision included in previous version of Metro Code as 3.07.140.C)</i>	12/8/2000		12/8/2002
<b>Title 3:</b> Adopt model ordinance or equivalent and map or equivalent (3.07.330.A)	12/8/2000		12/8/2002
<b>Title 3:</b> Floodplain management performance standards (3.07.340.A)	12/8/2000	12/8/2001	12/8/2002
<b>Title 3:</b> Water quality performance standards (3.07.340.B)	12/8/2000	12/8/2001	12/8/2002

<sup>1</sup> After one year following acknowledgment of a UGMFP requirement, cities and counties that amend their plans and land use regulations shall make such amendments in compliance with the new functional plan requirement.

<sup>2</sup> A city or county that has not yet amended its plan to comply with a UGMFP requirement must, following one year after acknowledgement of the requirement (the date noted), apply the requirement directly to land use decisions

<sup>3</sup> Cities and counties must amend their plans to comply with a new UGMFP requirement within two years after acknowledgement of the requirement (the date noted)

<b>Functional Plan Requirement</b>	<b>When Local Decisions Must Comply</b>		
	<b>Plan/Code Amendment</b> 3.07.810(C) <sup>1</sup>	<b>Land Use Decision</b> 3.07.810(D) <sup>2</sup>	<b>Adoption</b> 3.07.810(B) <sup>3</sup>
<b>Title 3:</b> Erosion control performance standards (3.07.340.C)	12/8/2000	12/8/2001	12/8/2002
<b>Title 4:</b> Limit uses in Regionally Significant Industrial Areas (3.07.420)	7/22/2005	7/22/2006	7/22/2007
<b>Title 4:</b> Prohibit schools, places of assembly larger than 20,000 square feet, or parks intended to serve people other than those working or residing in the area in Regional Significant Industrial Areas (3.07.420D)	12/21/2013	12/21/2013	12/21/2014
<b>Title 4:</b> Limit uses in Industrial Areas (3.07.430)	7/22/2005	7/22/2006	7/22/2007
<b>Title 4:</b> Limit uses in Employment Areas (3.07.440)	7/22/2005	7/22/2006	7/22/2007
<b>Title 6:</b> (Title 6 applies only to those local governments seeking a regional investment or seeking eligibility for lower mobility standards and trip generation rates)			
<b>Title 7:</b> Adopt strategies and measures to increase housing opportunities (3.07.730)			6/30/2004
<b>Title 8:</b> Compliance Procedures (45-day notice to Metro for amendments to a comprehensive plan or land use regulation) (3.07.820)	2/14/2003		

Functional Plan Requirement	When Local Decisions Must Comply		
	Plan/Code Amendment 3.07.810(C) <sup>1</sup>	Land Use Decision 3.07.810(D) <sup>2</sup>	Adoption 3.07.810(B) <sup>3</sup>
<b>Title 11:</b> Develop a concept plan for urban reserve prior to its addition to the UGB  (3.07.1110)	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Title 11:</b> Prepare a comprehensive plan and zoning provisions for territory added to the UGB  (3.07.1120)	12/8/2000	12/8/2001	2 years after the effective date of the ordinance adding land to the UGB unless the ordinance provides a later date
<b>Title 11:</b> Interim protection for areas added to the UGB  (3.07.1130) <i>(provision included in previous version of Metro Code as 3.07.1110)</i>	12/8/2000	12/8/2001	12/8/2002
<b>Title 12:</b> Provide access to parks by walking, bicycling, and transit  (3.07.1240.B)			7/7/2005
<b>Title 13:</b> Adopt local maps of Habitat Conservation Areas consistent with Metro-identified HCAs  (3.07.1330.B)	12/28/2005	1/5/2008	1/5/2009
<b>Title 13:</b> Develop a two-step review process (Clear & Objective and Discretionary) for development proposals in protected HCAs  (3.07.1330.C & D)	12/28/2005	1/5/2008	1/5/2009
<b>Title 13:</b> Adopt provisions to remove barriers to, and encourage the use of, habitat-friendly development practices  (3.07.1330.E)	12/28/2005	1/5/2008	1/5/2009



## APPENDIX D

### Summary of Compliance Status

#### (Regional Transportation Functional Plan in effect as of 12/31/12)

	<b>Title 1 Transportation System Design</b>	<b>Title 2 Development and Update of Transportation System Plans</b>	<b>Title 3 Transportation Project Development</b>	<b>Title 4 Regional Parking Management</b>	<b>Title 5 Amendment of Comprehensive Plans</b>
Beaverton	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Cornelius	12/31/16	12/31/16	12/31/16	12/31/16	12/31/16
Damascus	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14
Durham	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt
Fairview	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14
Forest Grove	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13
Gladstone	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13
Gresham	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13
Happy Valley	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14
Hillsboro	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13
Johnson City	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt
King City	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt
Lake Oswego	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13
Maywood Park	Recommending exemption	Recommending exemption	Recommending exemption	Recommending exemption	Recommending exemption
Milwaukie	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13
Oregon City	Not in compliance	Not in compliance	Not in compliance	Not in compliance	Not in compliance
Portland	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14
Rivergrove	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt
Sherwood	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14
Tigard	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Troutdale	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13
Tualatin	6/30/13	6/30/13	6/30/13	6/30/13	6/30/13
West Linn	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14
Wilsonville	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13
Wood Village	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14
Clackamas County	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13	12/31/13
Multnomah County	12/13/14	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14
Washington County	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14

*Date shown in table is the deadline for compliance with the RTFP. Note – a city or county that has not yet amended its plan to comply with the RTFP must, following one year after RTFP acknowledgement, apply the RTFP directly to land use decisions.*



## Metro | Memo

Date: January 10, 2013  
To: Metro Council, MPAC  
From: Martha Bennett, Chief Operating Officer *MAB*  
Subject: 2012 annual report on amendments to the Employment and Industrial Areas Map

---

### Background

Title 4 (Industrial and Other Employment Areas) of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan seeks to improve the region's economy by protecting a supply of sites for employment by limiting the types and scale of non-industrial uses in Regionally Significant Industrial Areas, Industrial Areas, and Employment Areas. Those areas are depicted on the Employment and Industrial Areas Map.

Title 4 sets forth several avenues for amending the map, either through a Metro Council ordinance or through an executive order, depending on the circumstances. Title 4 requires that, by January 31 of each year, Metro's Chief Operating Officer submit a written report to the Council and MPAC on the cumulative effects on employment land in the region of amendments to the Employment and Industrial Areas Map during the preceding year. This memo constitutes the report for 2012.

### Summary of Title 4 map amendments in 2012

During 2012, no Title 4 Map amendments were made by executive order. In 2012, there were three separate ordinances approved by the Metro Council that amended the Title 4 Map to reflect existing uses, local plans, or zoning designations<sup>1</sup>. These amendments responded to requests from the cities of Fairview, Forest Grove, Happy Valley, Hillsboro, Portland, Troutdale, Tualatin, and Wood Village and Washington County. The cumulative effect of the three ordinances is summarized in Table 1. The bulk of the changes took place in a map cleanup ordinance adopted in October.

**Table 1: summary of Title 4 Map changes adopted in 2012**

Adopted change	Gross acres (not all acres are vacant)
Newly added to Title 4 map	132
Change from one Title 4 designation to another	252
Removal of Title 4 designation	1,042

### Chief Operating Officer recommendations for 2013

There are currently about 49,000 acres designated on the Title 4 Map, representing about one-fifth of the acres inside the urban growth boundary<sup>2</sup>. Staff does not believe that the Title 4 Map amendments made in 2012 represent a cumulative erosion of the region's employment capacity. Therefore, staff does not, at this time, recommend changes to Title 4 policies.

<sup>1</sup> Ordinance Nos. 12-1284 (various jurisdictions), 12-1288 (Happy Valley), 12-1290 (Troutdale)

<sup>2</sup> These acreage figures are primarily for land, but do include acres of water. They are cited here for general context.