

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECOMMENDING) RESOLUTION NO. 83-425
APPROVAL OF WASHINGTON COUNTY'S)
REQUEST FOR ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF) Introduced by the Regional
COMPLIANCE WITH LCDC GOALS) Development Committee

WHEREAS, Metro is the designated planning coordination body under ORS 260.385; and

WHEREAS, Under ORS 197.255 the Council is required to advise LCDC and local jurisdictions preparing Comprehensive Plans whether or not such plans are in conformity with the Statewide Planning Goals; and

WHEREAS, Washington County is now requesting that LCDC acknowledge its Comprehensive Plan as complying with the Statewide Planning Goals; and

WHEREAS, LCDC Goal 2 requires that local land use plans be consistent with regional plans; and

WHEREAS, Washington County's Comprehensive Plan has been evaluated for compliance with LCDC Goals and regional plans adopted by CRAG or Metro prior to June 1983 in accordance with the criteria and procedures contained in the "Metro Plan Review Manual," as summarized in the Staff Report attached as Exhibit "A"; and

WHEREAS, Metro finds that Washington County's Comprehensive Plan complies with LCDC Goals; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Metro Council recommends to LCDC that Washington County's Comprehensive Plan be acknowledged.
2. That the Executive Officer forward copies of this

Resolution and Staff Report attached hereto as Exhibit "A" to LCDC, Washington County and to the appropriate agencies.

3. That, subsequent to adoption by the Council of any goals and objectives or functional plans after July 1983, the Council will again review Washington County's plan for consistency with regional plans and notify Washington County of any changes that may be needed at that time.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District
this 25th day of August, 1983.


Deputy Presiding Officer

MB/gl
9170B/353
8/1/83

EXHIBIT "A"

WASHINGTON COUNTY ACKNOWLEDGMENT REVIEW

The 1980 Census listed Washington County's population as 245,808 people. Over one-half of the population, 58 percent, was located in unincorporated areas--nearly all within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). Between 1970 and 1980 the population of Washington County grew by 55 percent, while the growth rate for the state was 26 percent. By the year 2000, the population of Washington County is projected to reach 383,610.

The Washington County Comprehensive Plan for the Urban Area, adopted in June 1983, is comprised of several elements as follows:

- . Resource Document - provides the factual data base and the identification of issues and problems.
- . Comprehensive Framework Plan - provides ultimate policy choices and strategy statement.
- . Community Plans - provides the land use designations for the planning area and specific design element states.
- . Community Development Code - sets the standards and procedures to carry out the Comprehensive Plan.
- . Transportation Plan - prescribes the transportation system necessary to accommodate travel to the year 2000.

The review of the plan that follows is intended to highlight issues of regional concern.

Goal No. 1: Citizen Involvement

Washington County's citizen involvement process was established in February 1974. The process is organized around nine Community Planning Organizations (CPO) in the urban area. The chairs of each CPO serve on the Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI). The development of the Comprehensive Plan included numerous citizen involvement activities which are summarized in the County's draft LCDC Comprehensive Plan Findings document.

Conclusion: There are no acknowledgment issues of major regional concern with Goal 1.

Goal No. 2: Land Use Planning

Goal 2 requires that the County's land use plan be coordinated with the plans of cities and Metro. To comply with the regional aspects of Goal 2, the County must have valid "urban planning area agreements" with each of the cities in the County and must also recognize Metro's authority to require "re-opening" of the County's

plan to conform to adopted regional functional plans, i.e., the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Washington County has entered into Urban Planning Area Agreements with the 16 cities within the County. The Framework Plan includes Metro's "opening language." In addition the Framework Plan includes a strategy to comply with Metro's procedures to amend the UGB.

Until the community plans for 185th East-West, Raleigh Hills/Garden Home and Metzger/Progress are updated in December 1983, the comprehensive plan actually includes a second, older framework plan and development code relating specifically to these areas. Given that there are two sets of documents, there is a potential for inconsistency between documents. The preface to the new Framework Plan includes a provision to resolve ambiguities between documents in light of the provisions of the new Comprehensive Plan. While this may not be the most desirable of situations, it appears to be a workable interim solution. Ensuring that the community plans are updated by January 12, 1984, as indicated by the County's work program, will minimize the time frame within which inconsistencies could arise.

Conclusion: There are no acknowledgment issues of major regional concern. Metro emphasizes the need to adhere to the January 1, 1984, deadline for updating the three stated community plans.

Goal No. 3: Agricultural Lands

Not Applicable.

The relationship between Goal 3 and Specially Regulated Areas (SPA) is discussed under Goal 14.

Goal No. 4: Forest Lands

No acknowledgment issues of major regional concern.

Goal No. 5: Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas and Natural Resources

Goal 5 requires that a certain process be followed as specified in the Oregon Administrative Rules. That process involves the identification of significant resources and the consideration of economic, social, environmental and energy consequences where conflicting uses have been identified. The ultimate choices that must be made are to protect the resource site, allow conflicting uses, or limit conflicting uses. This process has been documented in the Resource Document and the resource protective measures are contained in the Community Plans and Community Development Code.

No acknowledgment issues of a regional concern.

Goal No. 6: Air, Water, and Land Resource Quality

DEQ and Metro share responsibility for air quality planning in the region and have jointly prepared the State Implementation Plan (SIP)

for the Portland area. The County's plan includes strategies to cooperate with the State and Metro in the implementation of the SIP.

Metro is the lead agency for "208" water quality planning in the region. The County's plan includes recognition of the "208" plan and designates the Unified Sewerage Agency as having principal responsibility for planning and operation of sewage treatment facilities. The plan also includes strategies to comply with DEQ water quality standards.

The County's plan is responsive to Metro's authority and responsibility to prepare and implement a Solid Waste Management Plan. This is discussed more fully under Goal 11.

Conclusion: There are no acknowledgment issues of major regional concern.

Goal No. 7: Natural Hazards

The County's Framework Plan includes policies and strategies addressing floodplain and steep slope hazards. The Community Plans include a design element statement that further provides protection for floodplains and steep slopes. The Community Development Code includes standards and procedures addressing these hazard areas. The Code also provides for a density transfer from hazard and natural resource areas to the buildable portions of a site.

Conclusion: There are no acknowledgment issues of major regional concern with Goal 7.

Goal No. 8: Recreation

The County's plan includes an inventory and analysis of recreation facilities and needs within the County. The preparation of this inventory includes consideration of CRAG's The Urban Outdoors, and also includes more recent and more specific information on recreation needs. In addition, the Community Plans provide for an identification of park deficient areas.

Conclusion: There are no acknowledgment issues of major regional concern.

Goal No. 9: Economy of the State

The County's plan provides approximately 2,300 acres of gross buildable land to accommodate future industrial, retail commercial and office development. This in turn is estimated to provide approximately 77,000 future jobs.

Previous studies by Metro, SRI and others indicate that the Portland area has a shortage of large industrial sites suitable for high-tech industries. This finding led Metro to request (Resolution No. 82-348) an amendment to the UGB findings to permit industrial development on sites of 30 acres or more for Specially Regulated

Areas (SRA) without applying Goal 3. In October 1982, LCDC amended the UGB acknowledgment order by adding a new provision to permit industrial development as outlined above.

Since this amendment, Washington County has done additional research in the preparation of the Community Development Code and the adoption of a Special Industrial District. This district provides for the preservation of 30-acre-plus industrial sites while incorporating the flexibility to permit some smaller industrial sites in close proximity to larger industrial facilities.

Conclusion: There are no acknowledgment issues of major regional concern.

Goal No. 10: Housing

Oregon Administrative Rules require that cities and counties within the Metro UGB meet a certain new construction residential mix and residential densities. For Washington County this requirement is to provide the opportunity for at least 50 percent of new residential units to be single family or multi-family housing and a minimum overall density of eight or more dwelling units per net buildable acre.

The County's Findings include data for each Community Planning area which indicate that a new construction housing mix of 46% single family and 54% multi-family for the urban area has been provided. The overall density is 8.89 dwelling units per net buildable acre. Attached and detached housing is permitted in all residential districts subject to the applicable standards in the Community Development Code. Mobile homes are permitted in parks and subdivisions in residential districts ranging from 5 to 24 units per acre.

Conclusion: There are no acknowledgment issues of major regional concern.

Goal No. 11: Public Facilities and Services

Jurisdictions in the Metro region have been required to include plan policies which recognize Metro's adopted procedures for siting sanitary landfills within the region. Washington County's plan includes policies and strategies recognizing Metro's responsibility in this area and a pledge to cooperate with Metro in solid waste planning and implementation.

The County's plan includes inventory and analysis of other public services. The provision of these services to new development in an orderly and efficient manner is guided by the County's growth management policies.

Conclusion: There are no acknowledgment issues of major regional concern.

Goal No. 12: Transportation

Metro's RTP sets forth regional transportation goals and objectives, and recommends improvements to the year 2000. Local jurisdictions must demonstrate consistency with the RTP by December 31, 1983. Metro had reviewed the draft Transportation Plan in May 1983 and noted several areas where changes were necessary to be consistent with the RTP. We find that these changes have been made in the Transportation Plan.

Conclusion: No acknowledgment issues.

Goal No. 13: Energy Conservation

The County's plan includes policies and implementation measures which provide for and encourage energy conservation. The Community Development Code contains standards and criteria which implement the energy-related policies.

Conclusion: There are no acknowledgment issues of a regional concern.

Goal No. 14: Urbanization

The central issue with regard to compliance with Goal 14 for Washington County is treatment of the SRAs found in West Union, Bethany, surrounding most of Sherwood and northeast of Hillsboro. In order to understand the various aspects of the issue, a brief recap of the relevant orders and resolutions is necessary:

| | |
|---------------|--|
| January 1979 | Metro submits UGB to LCDC for acknowledgment; LCDC grants a Continuance. |
| August 1979 | Metro adopts Resolution No. 79-83 responding to the five questions in the LCDC Continuance. |
| November 1979 | Metro adopts Resolution No. 79-102 amending No. 79-83 and clarifying policies on the management of urban lands. |
| January 1980 | LCDC acknowledges the UGB. |
| June 1980 | Metro adopts Ordinance No. 80-95 relating to the use of urbanizable land and the conversion of urbanizable land to urban use--particularly SRAs. |
| April 1981 | Washington County adopts Resolution and Order No. 81-59--Growth Management Policies. |
| May 1981 | Metro adopts Resolution No. 81-244 finding Washington County's No. 81-59 as an adequate replacement for Metro's No. 80-95. |

October 1982

LCDC amends the UGB acknowledgment order to permit industrial development in SRAs for sites of 30 acres+ without having to apply Goal 3.

Washington County has submitted 22 Working Papers in their Findings document responding to urbanization issues, growth management and SRAs. Staff's review of these findings as it relates to the above orders and resolutions and the County's plan follows:

Metro Resolution No. 79-83 and No. 79-102

These resolutions provided five policy guidelines for managing urban growth which can be compared to the Washington County Comprehensive Plan provisions.

Policy Guidelines

Plan Provisions

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Encourage infill and contiguous development. | Plan policies provide for infill (p. 3.3.32) and Code provisions in Sect. 430.51. |
| 2. Preserve urbanizable land in 10-acre minimum lot sizes until urban services are available. | Plan policies provide for 10-acre minimum lot size (p. 3.3.1). |
| 3. Require urban development to have water and sewer available. | Plan policies on growth management (p. 3.3.5) and public facility expenditures (p. 3.3.8). |
| 4. Prohibits septic tanks within the UGB except on lots of record. | Septic tanks allowed only on lots of record where USA does not now serve (p. 3.3.1). |
| 5. SRAs in the UGB prohibits residential development for 10 years except for lots of record and provides for local jurisdiction exceptions based on clear and concise criteria. | Plan policies limit residential development in SRAs and prohibit residential partitioning without public services (p. 3.3.2 and Code Section 501). |

LCDC UGB Acknowledgment Order

Relative to SRAs, this order specified that Goal 3 shall be applied to SRAs until the Washington County Plan is acknowledged by the Commission.

Metro Ordinance No. 80-95

The purpose of this ordinance was to establish temporary restrictions on SRAs and directed Washington County to develop growth management policies. The temporary restrictions on SRAs were to be removed upon the County's Plan being submitted to LCDC for compliance. Subsequently, Washington County adopted Resolution and

Order No. 81-59, Growth Management Policies, and Metro, in Resolution No. 81-244 found the County's policies to be an adequate replacement for No. 80-95.

In summary, the provisions of the Community Development Code and the policies of the Framework Plan treat the SRAs in a manner that permits continued agricultural activity while ensuring that eventual urbanization occurs in an orderly and efficient manner.

As a growth management tool the Framework Plan includes a strategy to prioritize and phase public facility expenditures. Under this system, outlying undeveloped residential areas receive the lowest priority. Properly employed, this priority and phasing policy should allow for the efficient urbanization of the SRAs. The phasing policy included in the Plan is somewhat vague in terms of its definition. However, the framework is there. The Plan recognizes the need to clarify this policy by July 1, 1984.

Conclusion: There are no acknowledgment issues of major regional concern with Goal 14. Metro emphasizes the need to operationalize the phasing policy by July 1, 1984.

MB/gl
9110B/355
08/01/83

STAFF REPORT

Agenda Item No. 6.3

Meeting Date August 25, 1983

CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING
APPROVAL OF WASHINGTON COUNTY'S REQUEST FOR
ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH LCDC GOALS

Date: August 10, 1983

Presented by: Mark Brown

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Washington County adopted its Comprehensive Plan in June 1983 and submitted it to LCDC on June 30, 1983. Metro has previously commented on draft copies of the plan and noted several changes that were needed. These changes have been made. Based on a final review of the Comprehensive Plan and Findings documents with the Metro Plan Review Manual, staff finds that there are no acknowledgment issues of major regional concern and, therefore, support its acknowledgment by LCDC.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Washington County's request for acknowledgment of compliance with LCDC Goals.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION AND RECOMMENDATION

On August 8, 1983, the Regional Development Committee unanimously recommended adoption of Resolution No. 83-425.

MB/gl
9170B/353
8/1/83