



# 2014 Compliance Report

March 2015

## 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 providing services, operating venues and 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

Sam Chase, District 5

Bob Stacey, District 6

### **Auditor**

Brian Evans

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary .....	2
Introduction .....	3
Overview .....	3
Urban Growth Management Functional Plan Compliance Status .....	4
Regional Transportation Functional Plan Compliance Status .....	4
Appendices A, B, C, D & E	

## Executive Summary

Metro's Urban Growth 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 2014 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 2014, there were no requests for extensions of existing compliance dates for the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan.

Eleven jurisdictions had a deadline of December 31, 2014 to meet the requirements of the Regional Transportation Functional Plan. As described below and in Appendix D, two of these jurisdictions have requested extensions until 2015. Two have requested an extension to 2016. Two have requested an extension to 2017. All six of these 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 these extensions have been granted by the Chief Operating Officer.

Five jurisdictions completed Transportation System Plan and development code updates in 2013 and are now in compliance with the RFTP: Forest Grove, Lake Oswego, Sherwood, Troutdale and Washington County.

## Metro Code Chapter 3.07 Urban Growth Management Functional Plan and Metro Code Chapter 3.08 Regional Transportation Functional Plan – March 2015

### 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).

### 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.

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 available on Metro's website at [www.oregonmetro.gov/tsp](http://www.oregonmetro.gov/tsp). 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 2014.

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, 2014.

Appendix E is the Annual Report on Amendments to the Employment and Industrial Areas Map dated January 1, 2015.

### Urban Growth Management Functional Plan Compliance Status

**Washington County:** A February 2013 Intergovernmental Agreement between Washington County and the City of Beaverton identified the city to lead long-range planning

efforts in the Cooper Mountain area. The South Cooper Mountain Concept Plan area includes two subareas inside the UGB – North Cooper Mountain and South Cooper Mountain Annexation Area – and an urban reserve between those two areas located outside the Urban Growth Boundary. The City of Beaverton completed this work in 2014 and the Beaverton City Council adopted the Concept Plan in January 2015. Washington County has land use authority for the North Cooper Mountain area and the Washington County Board of Commissioners acknowledged the South Cooper Mountain Concept Plan on January 20, 2015. Washington County staff will carry forward the land use, natural resource and transportation proposals generated by the city in preparation for amending the county’s comprehensive plan documents which will be addressed during the 2015 land use ordinance season occurring annually between March 1 and October 31.

### Regional Transportation Functional Plan Compliance Status

Eleven jurisdictions had the deadline of December 31, 2014 to meet the requirements of the Regional Transportation Functional Plan. As described below and in Appendix D, two of these jurisdictions have requested extensions until 2015. Two have requested an extension to 2016. Two have requested an extension to 2017. All six of these 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 these extensions were granted by the Chief Operating Officer.

Five jurisdictions completed Transportation System Plan and development code updates and are now in compliance with the RTFP: Forest Grove, Lake Oswego, Sherwood, Troutdale and Washington County.

#### Jurisdictions with 2014 deadlines that requested extensions until 2015

Happy Valley: The City of Happy Valley has obtained an Oregon Transportation Growth Management (TGM) grant to complete its TSP update. The City has selected a consultant, prepared a work plan and held its first TSP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting.

West Linn: The City of West Linn has obtained a TGM grant to complete its TSP update. The City has selected a consultant and has held its first TAC meeting. The TSP is currently in the existing conditions and potential solutions phase.

#### Jurisdictions with 2014 deadlines that requested extensions until 2016

Portland: The City of Portland Bureau of Transportation Policy team has made substantial progress on its TSP update and has substantial work still to be completed. Below is a summary of what has been completed or is underway and what remains to be completed.

#### Completed/Underway

- Project team in place.
- Transportation Expert Group (agency and public advisory group) in place.
- Senior management, Bureau Commissioner and Planning & Sustainability Commission briefed on key issues and schedule.
- Project and program candidate list updated and posted to interactive web map.
- Outcome-based project and program evaluation criteria developed, vetted and tested.

- Draft transportation policies released for public comment in comprehensive plan.
- Updated revenue projections.
- Public Involvement Plan drafted.
- Public Involvement started with key stakeholder groups.
- Phase 1 modeling completed (2010 RTP plus proposed land use changes) and modeling technical advisory committee in place.
- Project and program scoring based on evaluation criteria has begun.

#### To Be Completed

- Implement remaining elements of Public Involvement Plan.
- Finish project and program scoring based on evaluation criteria (includes public support and/or opposition).
- Finalize revenue projections, establish financially constrained budget, and match to projects and programs.
- Conduct Phase 2 and Phase 3 system and corridor performance modeling.
- Proposed financially constrained project/program list for public comment and Planning & Sustainability Commission recommendation to the City Council.
- Propose project/program study list.
- Finalize comprehensive plan transportation policies.
- Propose Transportation System Plan policies.
- City Council hearings and adoption.

Wood Village: All comprehensive plan policies and local implementing ordinances were revised and updated in the TSP update in May of 2012 and adopted following all appropriate land use hearings in June 2012. Work completed at the time did not include required performance measures, integration of a street plan, or the creation of a capital investment strategy due to the pending completion of the East Metro Connections Plan. With that work completed, the City pursued a TGM grant to complete its TSP. The City has been awarded the funding and anticipates completing the work in early 2016.

#### Jurisdictions with 2014 deadlines that requested extensions until 2017

Damascus: The City of Damascus' charter requires any ordinance or plan that will be submitted to LCDC, DLCD or Metro, to be submitted to the voters. A comprehensive plan has yet to pass a vote of the people, therefore the City of Damascus does not have an adopted comprehensive plan or TSP with which to demonstrate compliance with the RTFP. On November 4, 2014 the voters rejected the city's latest proposed comprehensive plan. Another comprehensive plan is scheduled for the March 2015 ballot. Per the city charter, a double majority is needed for the plan to pass in March. In the event this plan also fails, the City is requesting an extension until December 31, 2017 to allow time for the city and the people of Damascus to develop and pass a new comprehensive plan

Multnomah County: Multnomah County's TSP includes planning for urban unincorporated pockets, which will be completed in partnership with the City of Portland. The county requested more time until the city has completed its own TSP and focus staff resources on the urban unincorporated pockets. The county's urban roads are also addressed in TSP updates for the cities of Fairview, Troutdale and Wood Village, and the City of Gresham for the Pleasant Valley and Springwater Corridor Plan Areas. The county coordinates with the cities on their TSPs as part of compliance with the RTP. The cities of Gresham and Troutdale

have recently completed their TSP updates and are in compliance with the RFTP. The county will continue working with the cities of Wood Village and Fairview, both of which have received TGM grants, to complete their TSP work. The county will also amend its Comprehensive Framework Plan Transportation Elements as part of RTP compliance as part of the two-year County Comprehensive Plan Update process that the county kicked off in November 2014.



## APPENDIX A

### Summary of Compliance Status as of December 31, 2014 (Functional Plan effective 1/18/12)

<b>City/ County</b>	<b>Title 1 Housing Capacity</b>	<b>Title 3 Water Quality &amp; Flood Management</b>	<b>Title 4 Industrial and other Employment Land</b>	<b>Title 6<sup>1</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	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Cornelius	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Damascus	Not in compliance	Not in compliance	Not in compliance	See footnote	Not in compliance	Not in compliance	Not in compliance
Durham	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Fairview	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Forest Grove	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Gladstone	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Gresham	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Happy Valley	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Hillsboro	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Johnson City	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
King City	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Lake Oswego	In compliance	In compliance	Pending final city action	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	Currently amending code to be in compliance
Maywood Park	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Milwaukie	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Oregon City	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance

<sup>1</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 as a new high-capacity transit line) will need to comply.

<b>City/ County</b>	<b>Title 1 Housing Capacity</b>	<b>Title 3 Water Quality &amp; Flood Management</b>	<b>Title 4 Industrial and other Employment Land</b>	<b>Title 6<sup>1</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>
Portland	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Rivergrove	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Sherwood	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Area 61 extended to 12/31/21*	In compliance
Tigard	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance.	In compliance
Troutdale	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Tualatin	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Basalt Creek extended to 9/30/2016	In compliance
West Linn	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Wilsonville	In compliance	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	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Clackamas County	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Multnomah County	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Washington County	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Cooper Mountain not in compliance	In compliance

\*The City of Tualatin requested that the City of Sherwood take over concept planning for Area 61 Title 11 planning in 2012.

<sup>1</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 as a new high-capacity transit line) will need to comply.

**APPENDIX B  
TITLE 11 NEW AREA PLANNING COMPLIANCE  
(As of December 31, 2014)**

<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	No	Damascus portion: City out of compliance with DLCD order; City out of compliance with Functional Plan extension and CET extension.
	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	Yes	Concept plan completed and accepted by Metro.
South End Road	Oregon City	Yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed.
East Wilsonville (Frog Pond area)	Wilsonville	Extension to 12/31/15	CPDG grant awarded in 2013. Planning for area currently underway with completion projected for Spring 2015.
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
Study Area 59	Sherwood	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; school constructed.
Study Area 61 (Cipole Rd)	Sherwood	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.

<b>Project</b>	<b>Lead Government(s)</b>	<b>Compliance</b>	<b>Status</b>
Cooper Mountain area	Washington County	No	Planning completed January 2015. Work program pending.
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; annexations underway with development occurring.
Bonny Slope West Concept Plan (Area 93)	Multnomah County	Extension to 6/2/21 or 2 yrs after agreement w/other govt, whichever earlier	Undertaking planning for area with completion expected in Fall 2015.
<b>2004/2005 UGB Expansion</b>			
Damascus area	Damascus	See under 2002 above	Included with Damascus comprehensive plan (see notes 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	Planning underway. Completion expected Winter 2015
<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 completed. Awaits annexation to city.
South Hillsboro	Hillsboro	Yes	Concept planning completed. Awaits annexation to city.
South Cooper Mountain	Beaverton	Yes	Concept planning completed January 2015.
Roy Rogers West (River Terrace)	Tigard	Yes	See West Bull Mountain.

**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
<b>Title 3:</b> Erosion control performance standards (3.07.340.C)	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 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)	12/21/12	12/21/13	12/21/14
<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		
<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>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 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 for 2014

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

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<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	12/31/17	12/31/17	12/31/17	12/31/17	12/31/17
Durham	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt
Fairview	12/31/15	12/31/15	12/31/15	12/31/15	12/31/15
Forest Grove	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Gladstone	12/31/15	12/31/15	12/31/15	12/31/15	12/31/15
Gresham	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Happy Valley	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14	12/31/14
Hillsboro	12/31/15	12/31/15	12/31/15	12/31/15	12/31/15
Johnson City	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt
King City	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt
Lake Oswego	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Maywood Park	Recommending exemption	Recommending exemption	Recommending exemption	Recommending exemption	Recommending exemption
Milwaukie	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Oregon City	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Portland	12/31/16	12/31/16	12/31/16	12/31/16	12/31/16
Rivergrove	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt
Sherwood	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Tigard	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Troutdale	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	Exception	In compliance
Tualatin	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
West Linn	12/31/15	12/31/15	12/31/15	12/31/15	12/31/15
Wilsonville	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Wood Village	12/31/16	12/31/16	12/31/16	12/31/16	12/31/16
Clackamas County	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Multnomah County	12/31/17	12/31/17	12/31/17	12/31/17	12/31/17
Washington County	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance

*Date shown in table is the deadline for compliance with the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (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 1, 2015  
To: Metro Council, MPAC  
From: Martha Bennett, Chief Operating Officer  
Subject: 2014 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 2014.

### Title 4 map amendments in 2014

During 2014, the Oregon Legislature added land to the Metro urban growth boundary (UGB) under HB 4078. The Metro Council subsequently designated 830 of those acres as Title 4 lands. Those additions and their Title 4 designations are as follows:

Area added to UGB	Acres	Title 4 designation
Urban Reserve 7B Forest Grove	240	Employment
Urban Reserve 7E Forest Grove	38	Industrial
Urban Reserve 8A Hillsboro	552	Industrial
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>830</b>	

### Chief Operating Officer recommendations for 2014

Staff does not, at this time, recommend changes to Title 4 policies.

