

**URBAN GROWTH MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONAL PLAN
ANNUAL COMPLIANCE REPORT
December 23, 2004**

INTRODUCTION

Metro Code 3.07.880 requires an annual Urban Growth Management Functional Plan Annual Compliance Report and requires that this report include:

- An accounting of compliance with each requirement of the Functional Plan by each city and county in the district.
- A recommendation for action that would bring a city or county into compliance with the functional plan requirement and advice to the city or county whether it may seek an extension pursuant to Metro Code 3.07.850 or an exception pursuant to Metro Code 3.07.860.
- An evaluation of the implementation of the Functional Plan and its effectiveness in helping achieve the 2040 Growth Concept.

This report outlines the status of each local government's effort to comply with Titles 1 through 7 and Title 11 of the Functional Plan since the adoption of the 2003 Compliance Order and any outstanding compliance issues. Compliance for Titles 1 through 7 is presented in a compliance matrix in Appendix A, Tables 1 through 7 and summarizes compliance by jurisdiction. Attachment 1 to this compliance report is the Title 7 Affordable Housing component that provides a detailed analysis of Title 7 compliance issues. Title 11 reporting is presented by area rather than by jurisdiction.

EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FUNCTIONAL PLAN

A primary goal of regional policy contained in the Regional Framework Plan is efficient use of land within the urban growth boundary (UGB). The Urban Growth Management Functional Plan helps the region achieve that goal by setting forth specific actions that local governments can take to use land more efficiently. Those actions include setting minimum densities, increasing zoned capacities for dwelling units and jobs, permitting accessory dwelling units, limiting the amount of land dedicated to parking and enhancing the role of centers in the region.

The region has reached a compliance rate of 99% for Titles 1 through 6 requirements as shown in Appendix B. Compliance for Title 7 is at 62% and only three local governments have met all of the Title 7 reporting requirements. Passage of ballot measure 37 has delayed some local government action on Title 3 compliance legislation.

Some progress is being made by those local governments that have Title 11 planning responsibilities, however, compliance with Title 11 is complex and expensive. For example, new areas will often be government and serviced by more than one jurisdiction or service provider, requiring multi-party coordination. Even if the area falls within one jurisdiction, it can be costly and time-consuming to carry out the Title 11 planning. Furthermore, some of the areas are not contiguous to city boundaries, requiring intervening land to be annexed prior to Title 11 planning. As a result of these issues, several areas will likely not meet deadlines scheduled for 2005. According to the Office of Metro Attorney, the Council has several options available to it should local governments not meet their Title 11 deadline. These include 1) extension of time to complete planning, 2) amending the UGB ordinance to allow more time for completion by a local

government, 3) providing Metro resources to assist local government, 4) relying on landowners in an area to complete Title 11 planning for consideration by the local government or 5) pursue an enforcement action according to Metro Code. These may not be the only options available to the Council. If the Council chooses, staff can research further possible options.

GENERAL COMPLIANCE ISSUES

Ordinance No. 02-969B, adopted by the Metro Council in December 2002, contained amendments to Titles 1, 4 and 6 of the Functional Plan. Ordinance No. 04-1040B, adopted by the Metro Council in June 2004, amended Title 4 of the Functional Plan. A number of these amendments require local governments to take action by July 7, 2005 to comply with new requirements. In addition, when land is brought into the Urban Growth Boundary, conditions including a timeline for compliance are placed on those areas. In May 2004, the Chief Operating Officer sent a letter to local governments clarifying the requirements of the third year (2004) report of Title 7. These compliance issues are summarized below.

Title 1: Requirements for Housing and Employment Accommodation

Two reporting requirements were added to Title 1. Local governments are required to report annually on changes in capacity and biennially on the actual density of new residential development.

Title 4: Industrial and Employment Areas

A new design type, Regionally Significant Industrial Areas (RSIAs) was added and changes were made to Industrial Areas. Local jurisdictions will have new reporting requirements in 2005.

Title 6: Central City, Regional Centers, Town Centers and Station Communities

Title 6 requires each city and county with a center shown on the 2040 Growth Concept Map to develop a strategy to enhance centers within their jurisdiction by December 31, 2007. To assist in evaluating the effectiveness of Title 6, each local government with a center is to biennially report on the progress of Centers. The next report will be due April 15, 2006.

Title 7: Affordable Housing

Title 7 requires each jurisdiction to: a) adopt voluntary affordable housing production goals; b) adopt policies ensuring that their comprehensive plan and implementing ordinances include diverse range of housing, measures to maintain existing supply and increase dispersion of affordable housing, and measures to increase housing for all income levels; c) consider amendment of their comprehensive plan and implementing ordinances with land use tools and strategies; and d) submit three progress reports in 2002, 2003 and 2004.

In May 2004, Metro's Chief Operating Officer sent a letter to local jurisdictions clarifying the requirements of the third year (2004) report due in June 2004. The third report requires that:

*"...each city and county within the Metro region shall report to Metro on the **outcome** of the amendments to its comprehensive plan and implementing ordinances pending at the time of submittal of the report described in subsection B of this section and on the **public response**, if any, to any implementation adopted by the city and county to increase the community's stock of affordable housing, including but not limited to the tools and strategies in subsection 3.07.730.B. "*

As used above:

Outcome includes:

1. Affordable housing projects that were initiated or completed as a result of the implementation of the tools and strategies described in the previous sections, including the number of units produced and income level/s served; and
2. Partnerships that were created between the city and affordable housing developers (non-profit developers and private sector developers)
3. Pending amendments to the comprehensive plan and implementing ordinances.

Public response means: A summary of comments of developers and citizens expressed during the consideration of affordable housing strategies, including the following:

1. Affordable housing production goals;
2. Policies to ensure diversity of housing types, maintaining the existing supply and increasing the opportunities for new dispersed affordable housing, and increasing opportunities for household of all income levels to live within the jurisdiction;
3. Land use affordable housing tools and strategies: i) density bonus; ii) replacement housing; iii) inclusionary housing; iv) transfer of development rights; iv) elderly and people with disabilities; vi) local regulatory constraints – discrepancies in planning and zoning codes, and local permitting or approval process; and vii) parking;
4. Other affordable housing tools and strategies: i) replacement housing resulting from urban renewal; ii) inclusionary housing in urban renewal districts; iii) fee waivers or funding incentives; iv) promotion of affordable housing for incomes 50% to 120% of the regional median household income (RMHI); and v) joint coordination or action to meet the affordable housing production goals; and
5. Funding for housing.

Title 8: Compliance Deadlines

Metro is required to notify local governments of the deadlines for compliance with the requirements of the Functional Plan. Appendix C lists the schedule of compliance dates.

Title 11: Planning for New Urban Areas

The purpose of Title 11 is to guide planning for conversion from rural to urban use for land that is brought into the UGB. Interim protection measures and planning requirements are placed on the land as a condition to the ordinances that add land to the UGB. The conditions include a timeline for compliance that varies by area.

OUTSTANDING COMPLIANCE ISSUES BY TITLE

Title 1: Wilsonville has not provided a capacity analysis as required by Title 1.

Title 3: Lake Oswego, West Linn and Clackamas County have not fully complied with the Water Quality Performance Standards as required by Title 3.

Title 6: Gresham did not submit a progress report on Centers as required by Title 6.

Title 7:

- Three jurisdictions – Beaverton, Portland and Multnomah County – have fully complied with all the requirements of Title 7 by submitting the three progress reports, adopting affordable housing production goals and policies in their comprehensive plans and code, and adopting most of the land use strategies.

- Two jurisdictions – Fairview and King City – have complied with almost all of the Title 7 requirements by indicating the two strategies currently implemented in the cities, and considering but declining to adopt the rest of the strategies.
- Four jurisdictions – Cornelius, Johnson City, Rivergrove and Sherwood – have not submitted any of the three progress reports.
- The other 18 jurisdictions¹ have complied partially with the Title 7 requirements.

These compliance issues are shown in Appendix D, Outstanding Compliance Elements.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION TO BRING JURISDICTIONS INTO COMPLIANCE WITH TITLES 1 THROUGH 7

Titles 1 through 6

There are five jurisdictions – Gresham, Lake Oswego, West Linn, Wilsonville, and Clackamas County -- that have not yet met all of the requirements of Titles 1 through 6. Lake Oswego and West Linn are not in compliance for Title 3 Water Quality Resource Area Performance Standards. Gresham has not submitted a Centers progress report as required by Title 6 and Wilsonville has not submitted a capacity analysis required by Title 1. Lake Oswego and West Linn are working on their compliance requirements. Clackamas County is requesting an exception to Title 3 for a small portion of the county. Staff recommends that Gresham and Wilsonville formally be requested to attend the public hearing on compliance to explain to the Council the status of their compliance work and when the work will be completed.

Title 7

Ten jurisdictions (Beaverton, Durham, Fairview, Gladstone, Maywood Park, Portland, Tigard, West Linn, Multnomah County and Washington County) have submitted the three progress reports, but only three (Beaverton, Portland and Multnomah County) have fully complied with Title 7 requirements. Among the remaining jurisdictions, some have submitted one or two reports that do not have complete information, while four (Cornelius, Johnson City, Rivergrove and Sherwood) have not submitted any report.

Staff recommends that the assessment of the region's affordable housing supply effort in early 2005 will provide comprehensive information on factors creating barriers to affordable housing production in the region. The information will help the new HTAC to be created in early 2005 by the Metro Council to understand the housing problems in the region and recommend appropriate roles for the variety of local jurisdictions in the region.

TITLE 11: PLANNING FOR NEW URBAN AREAS

Title 11 guides planning for converting land brought into the UGB from rural to urban uses. Title 11 has interim protection measures (Metro Code 3.07.1110) and planning requirements (Metro Code 3.07.1120). When land is brought into the boundary, meeting the requirements of Title 11 is one of the conditions of approval. Title 11 does not require interim protection measures to be codified in local comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances.

¹ The new City of Damascus is not included in this count.

Since land is added to the UGB by area, not all jurisdictions are required to comply with Title 11. A jurisdiction may have more than one area added at one time or over a series of additions to the boundary and all must meet the requirements of Title 11. As a result, compliance is reported on an area basis rather than on a jurisdictional basis.

3.07.1110 Interim Protection of Areas Brought into the Urban Growth Boundary

This section requires no affirmative actions by local governments. Instead, it includes four provisions for preserving the condition of land until the planning requirements of Metro Code 3.07.1120 are completed. The local governments responsible for the protection measures are the counties. An exception to this is Area 94 brought into the UGB in 2002 and largely within the City of Portland.

Under this section, a county may not approve any of the following four actions:

1. Land use regulations or zoning map amendments that increase residential density
2. Land use regulations or zoning map amendments that allow commercial and industrial uses not previously allowed to occur prior to the completion of the concept planning process
3. Any land division or partition that would result in the creation of any new parcel that would be less than 20 acres in total size
4. In a Regionally Significant Industrial Area, a commercial use that is not accessory to an industrial use, schools, churches or other institutional or community services intended to serve people who do not work or reside in the area

The counties, under Title 8 (Metro Code 3.07.820), are currently required to report to Metro land use regulations or zoning map amendments such as items 1 and 2 above. During this reporting period, Metro has not received notification of any such action by Clackamas, Multnomah or Washington counties. The Metro Code does not require counties to notify Metro of "land use decisions" such as land divisions or conditional use permits in a specific zone thus Metro has no information to report on measures 3 and 4. During the past year, Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties have not approved any of the above listed actions and thus are in compliance with the Title 11 interim protection measures.

3.07.1120 Urban Growth Boundary Amendment Urban Reserve Plan Requirements

This section requires that all land added to the UGB be subject to adopted comprehensive plan amendments consistent with all applicable titles of the Functional Plan including the requirements of Title 11 planning. Either a city or a county can complete the planning. As a condition of approval for all land added to the UGB in 2002 and 2004 a timeframe was placed on individual areas for completion of the Title 11 planning. At this time, no local jurisdiction is out of compliance with Title 11 planning requirements; however, several jurisdictions will likely not meet their March 2005 planning timeline. The chart below summarizes the status of each Title 11 planning area. A map showing these areas will be available in January 2005.

**TITLE 11 NEW AREA PLANNING
(as of December, 2004)**

Project	Lead Government	Plan Deadline	Status
1998 UGB Expansion			
Pleasant Valley Concept Plan	Gresham and Portland	NA	Concept plan and implementation planning completed; zoning adopted
1999 UGB Expansion			
Villebois Village	Wilsonville	NA	Concept plan and comprehensive plan amendments & zoning complete; construction underway
Witch Hazel Community Plan	Hillsboro	March 2005	Concept plan complete; City adopted comprehensive plan amendment in February 2004; zoning will be adopted upon annexation.
2002 UGB Expansion			
Springwater Community Plan	Gresham	March 2005	Planning process ongoing; three alternatives have been narrowed to one
Damascus/Boring Concept Plan	Clackamas County	March 2007	Core values completed; inventory phase complete; alternatives developed and now being evaluated
Park Place Master Plan	Oregon City	March 2007	Developer portion of area to work with neighborhood residents in developing plan for all three sites
Beavercreek Road	Oregon City	March 2007	Area residents hired consultant to develop a concept plan
South End Road	Oregon City	March 2007	City has no plans for this area yet
West Linn	West Linn or Clackamas County	March 2005	City has no plans for this area yet Not likely to complete on time
East Wilsonville	Wilsonville	March 2007	No action; some early talks on part of residents and homebuilders
Northwest Wilsonville	Wilsonville	March 2007	No action; the city had a consultant do a preliminary urban reserve plan in 1998
Brookman Road Area	Sherwood or Washington Co	March 2007	No plans for concept planning at this time
Study Area 59	Sherwood or Washington County	March 2005	City to work with school district to site facilities; concept planning and annexation complete within 3 years; Not likely to complete on time
Cipole Road	Sherwood	March 2005	No plans for concept planning at this time Not likely to complete on time
99W Area	Sherwood	March 2005	No plans for concept planning at this time. City Transportation System Plan to be completed first Not likely to complete on time
NW Tualatin	Tualatin	March 2005	The city received a TGM grant and planning is underway
Tonquin Site	Tualatin	March 2007	These two sites, known as 'SW Tualatin', are being planning together. The city received a TGM grant for \$170,000 and will be underway
Tigard Sand and Gravel Site	Tualatin	March 2007	

Project	Lead Government	Plan Deadline	Status
King City	King City	March 2005	Planning completed; annexed to city
Bull Mountain Area (Study Area 63)	Tigard or Washington County	March 2005	City and county need to first work out agreements about serving areas and then a planning timeline Not likely to complete on time
Bull Mountain Area (Study Area 64)	Tigard or Washington County	March 2005	City and county need to first work out agreements about serving area and then a planning timeline Not likely to complete on time
Cooper Mountain	Washington County, Beaverton or Hillsboro	March 2005	Washington County and Beaverton not pursuing planning at this time Not likely to complete on time
Study Area 69	Washington County or Hillsboro	March 2005	Washington County and Hillsboro not pursuing planning at this time (area not in Beaverton planning areas)
Study Area 71	Hillsboro	March 2005	Portion contained in Witch Hazel Community Plan; remainder of area to be planned in new few years Not likely to complete on time
Study Area 77	Cornelius	March 2005	Concept plan complete; City adopted comprehensive plan and zoning amendments, and annexed the area in January 2004
Shute Road Site	Hillsboro	March 2005	Concept plan complete; City adopted comprehensive plan and zoning in late 2003; annexed to Metro; shovel-ready site status pending
Forest Grove Swap	Forest Grove	March 2005	Work plan being developed Not likely to complete on time
Bethany	Beaverton or Washington County	March 2005	County to do planning after appeals completed Not likely to complete on time
Bonny Slope (Study Area 93)	Multnomah County	March 2005	County analyzing options to implement Title 11; some land owners examining privately-lead plan and self-funding; Metro Council adopted Resolution 04-3518 directing Metro staff to facilitate the completion of concept planning Not likely to complete on time
Area 94	Portland	March 2009	City considering budgeting for planning during FY 2005-06. Appeal is pending for this area
2004 UGB Expansion			Areas not yet acknowledged by LCDC

APPENDICES

**Appendix A:
Status of Compliance by Jurisdiction
by Functional Plan Title**

Titles 1 through 7

Title 1: Housing and Employment Accommodation								
	Capacity Analysis Metro Code 3.07.120	Change in capacity reporting 3.07.120(D) ²	Map of design types 3.07.130	Minimum density 3.07.140(A)	Partitioning standards 3/07.140(B)	Accessory dwelling units 3.07.140(C)	Accessory dwelling units in centers 3.07.140(C)	Reporting Requirements ³ 3.07.140(D)
Beaverton	In compliance		In compliance	in compliance	in compliance	in compliance	07/07/05	4/15/06
Cornelius	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	N/A	4/15/06
Durham	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	N/A	4/15/06
Fairview	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	07/07/05	4/15/06
Forest Grove	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	07/07/05	4/15/06
Gladstone	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	07/07/05	4/15/06
Gresham	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	07/07/05	4/15/06
Happy Valley	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	07/07/05	4/15/06
Hillsboro	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	07/07/05	4/15/06
Johnson City	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	N/A	4/15/06
King City	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	07/07/05	4/15/06
Lake Oswego	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	07/07/05	4/15/06
Maywood Park	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	N/A	4/15/06
Milwaukie	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	07/07/05	4/15/06
Oregon City	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	07/07/05	4/15/06
Portland	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	07/07/05	4/15/06
Rivergrove	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	N/A	4/15/06
Sherwood	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	07/07/05	4/15/06
Tigard	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	07/07/05	4/15/06
Troutdale	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	07/07/05	4/15/06
Tualatin	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	07/07/05	4/15/06
West Linn	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	07/07/05	4/15/06
Wilsonville	In progress		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	07/07/05	4/15/06
Wood Village	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	07/07/05	4/15/06
Clackamas County	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	07/07/05	4/15/06
Multnomah County	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	N/A	4/15/06
Washington County	In compliance		In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	07/07/05	4/15/06

² Required only if capacity changes

³ Report contains actual density of new residential development per net developed acre authorized in those zoning districts that allow residential development in the preceding 24 months.

Title 2: Regional Parking Policy	Minimum/Maximum Performance Standards 3.07.220(A)(1) and (2)	Variance Process 3.07.220(A)(3)	Blended Ratios 3.07.220(B)
Beaverton	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Cornelius	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Durham	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Fairview	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Forest Grove	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Gladstone	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Gresham	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Happy Valley	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Hillsboro	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Johnson City	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
King City	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Lake Oswego	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Maywood Park	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Milwaukie	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Oregon City	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Portland	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Rivergrove	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Sherwood	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Tigard	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Troutdale	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Tualatin	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
West Linn	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Wilsonville	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Wood Village	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Clackamas County	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Multnomah County	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Washington County	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance

	Title 3: Water Quality, Flood Management and Fish and Wildlife Conservation		
	Flood Management Performance Standards 3.07.340(A)	Water Quality Performance Standards 3.07.340(B)	Erosion and Sediment Control 3.07.340(C)
Beaverton	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Cornelius	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Durham	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Fairview	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Forest Grove	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Gladstone	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Gresham	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Happy Valley	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Hillsboro	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Johnson City	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
King City	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Lake Oswego	In compliance	In progress	In compliance
Maywood Park	NA	NA	In compliance
Milwaukie	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Oregon City	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Portland	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Rivergrove	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Sherwood	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Tigard	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Troutdale	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Tualatin	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
West Linn	In compliance	In progress	In compliance
Wilsonville	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Wood Village	NA	In compliance	In compliance
Clackamas County	In compliance	Exception Requested	In compliance
Multnomah County	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Washington County	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance

	Title 4: Industrial and Other Employment Areas		
	Protection of Regionally Significant Industrial Areas 3.07.420	Protection of Industrial Areas 3.07.430	Protection of Employment Areas 3.07.440
Beaverton	NA	7/7/05	In compliance
Cornelius	NA	7/7/05	In compliance
Durham	NA	7/7/05	In compliance
Fairview	7/7/05	7/7/05	In compliance
Forest Grove	NA	7/7/05	In compliance
Gladstone	NA	NA	In compliance
Gresham	7/7/05	7/7/05	In compliance
Happy Valley	7/7/05	NA	NA
Hillsboro	7/7/05	7/7/05	In compliance
Johnson City	NA	NA	NA
King City	NA	NA	NA
Lake Oswego	NA	7/7/05	In compliance
Maywood Park	NA	NA	NA
Milwaukie	NA	7/7/05	In compliance
Oregon City	7/7/05	7/7/05	In compliance
Portland	7/7/05	7/7/05	In compliance
Rivergrove	NA	NA	NA
Sherwood	NA	7/7/05	In compliance
Tigard	NA	7/7/05	In compliance
Troutdale	7/7/05	7/7/05	In compliance
Tualatin	7/7/05 ⁴	7/7/05	In compliance
West Linn	NA	NA	In compliance
Wilsonville	7/7/05	In compliance	In compliance
Wood Village	NA	7/7/05	In compliance
Clackamas County	7/7/05	7/7/05	In compliance
Multnomah County	NA	7/7/05	In compliance
Washington County	NA	7/7/05	In compliance

⁴ Area is in unincorporated Washington County but Tualatin is has grant to plan for area and area is expected to be annexed to Tualatin

Title 5: Neighbor Cities and Rural Reserves		
	Rural Reserves 3.07.520	Green Corridors 3.07.520
Beaverton	NA	NA
Cornelius	NA	NA
Durham	NA	NA
Fairview	NA	NA
Forest Grove	NA	NA
Gladstone	NA	NA
Gresham	NA	In compliance
Happy Valley	NA	NA
Hillsboro	NA	In compliance
Johnson City	NA	NA
King City	NA	NA
Lake Oswego	NA	NA
Maywood Park	NA	NA
Milwaukie	NA	NA
Oregon City	NA	In compliance
Portland	NA	NA
Rivergrove	NA	NA
Sherwood	NA	In compliance
Tigard	NA	NA
Troutdale	NA	NA
Tualatin	NA	In compliance
West Linn	NA	In compliance
Wilsonville	NA	In compliance
Wood Village	NA	NA
Clackamas County	In compliance	In compliance
Multnomah County	NA	In compliance
Washington County	In compliance	In compliance

Title 6: Central City, Regional Centers, Town Centers and Station Communities				
	Develop a Strategy to Enhance Centers (Due 12/31/2007) 3.07.620	Special Transportation Areas 3.07.630 ⁵	Encourage Siting Government Offices in Centers 3.07.640	Reporting on Centers Progress 3.07.650
Beaverton	In compliance	07/07/05	07/07/05	In compliance
Cornelius	NA	NA	NA	NA
Durham	NA	NA	NA	NA
Fairview	12/31/07	07/07/05	07/07/05	In compliance
Forest Grove	12/31/07	07/07/05	07/07/05	In compliance
Gladstone	12/31/07	07/07/05	07/07/05	In compliance
Gresham	12/31/07	07/07/05	07/07/05	
Happy Valley	12/31/07	07/07/05	07/07/05	In compliance
Hillsboro	12/31/07	07/07/05	07/07/05	In compliance
Johnson City	NA	NA	NA	NA
King City	12/31/07	07/07/05	07/07/05	In compliance
Lake Oswego	12/31/07	07/07/05	07/07/05	In compliance
Maywood Park	NA	NA	NA	NA
Milwaukie	12/31/07	07/07/05	07/07/05	In compliance
Oregon City	12/31/07	07/07/05	07/07/05	In compliance
Portland	12/31/07	07/07/05	07/07/05	In compliance
Rivergrove	NA	NA	NA	NA
Sherwood	12/31/07	07/07/05	07/07/05	In compliance
Tigard	12/31/07	07/07/05	07/07/05	In compliance
Troutdale	12/31/07	07/07/05	07/07/05	In compliance
Tualatin	12/31/07	07/07/05	07/07/05	In compliance
West Linn	12/31/07	07/07/05	07/07/05	In compliance
Wilsonville	12/31/07	07/07/05	07/07/05	In compliance
Wood Village	12/31/07	07/07/05	07/07/05	In compliance
Clackamas County	12/31/07	07/07/05	07/07/05	In compliance
Multnomah County	12/31/07	07/07/05	07/07/05	In compliance
Washington County	12/31/07	07/07/05	07/07/05	In compliance

⁵ Any city or county that has adopted a Centers Development Strategy (3.07.620) and measures to discourage commercial retail use along state highways outside of centers shall be eligible for designation of a center as a Special Transportation Area. A Special Transportation Area is a designation authorized by the Oregon Transportation Commission for urban street design features on state highways.

Title 7: Affordable Housing

	Voluntary Goals	15 Strategies Addressed	First Progress Report – 2002		Second Progress Report – 2003		Third Progress Report – 2004	
			Report Received	Consideration by Elected Body	Report Received	Consideration by Elected Body	Report Received	Consideration by Elected Body
Beaverton	Adopted	Completed	Received	No	Received	Yes	Received	Yes
Cornelius								
Durham		Partial	Received	No	Received	Yes	Received	Yes
Fairview		Partial	Received	Yes	Received	Yes	Received	Yes
Forest Grove		Partial	Received	Yes				
Gladstone		Partial	Received	Yes	Received	Yes	Received	Yes
Gresham		Partial	Received	Yes	Received	Yes		
Happy Valley		Partial	Received	Yes				
Hillsboro		Partial	Received	No				
Johnson City								
King City					Received	Yes	Received	Yes
Lake Oswego					Received	Yes	Received	Yes
Maywood Park		Partial	Received	Yes	Received	Yes	Received	Yes
Milwaukie		Partial	Received	Yes				
Oregon City		Partial	Received	Yes	Received	Yes		
Portland	Adopted	Completed	Received	No	Received	Yes	Received	Yes
Rivergrove								
Sherwood								
Tigard		Partial	Received	Yes	Received	Yes	Received	No
Troutdale		Partial	Received	Yes	Received	Yes		
Tualatin		Partial	Received	No				
West Linn		Partial	Received	No	Received	No	Received	Yes
Wilsonville		Partial	Received	Yes	Received	Yes		
Wood Village		Partial	Received	No	Received	Yes		
Clackamas County		Partial	Received	No				
Multnomah County	Adopted	Completed	Received	No	Received	No	Received	Yes
Washington County		Partial	Received	Yes	Received	Yes	Received	Yes

APPENDIX B
Summary of Compliance with the Functional Plan

Functional Plan Title	No. of Applicable Jurisdictions	No. of Jurisdictions in Compliance	Percentage Complete
Title 1 – minimum densities	27	27	100%
Title 1 – partitioning standards	27	27	100%
Title 1 – accessory dwelling units	27	27	100%
Title 1 – map of design types	27	27	100%
Title 1 – capacity analysis	27	26 (analysis completed)	96%
Total Title 1	135	134	99%
Title 2 – minimum/maximum standards	27	27	100%
Title 2 – variance process	27	27	100%
Title 2 – blended ratios	27	27	100%
Total Title 2	81	81	100%
Title 3 – floodplain standards	25	25	100%
Title 3 – water quality standards	26	23	88%
Title 3 – erosion control standards	27	27	100%
Total Title 3	78	75	96%
Title 4 – retail in Industrial Areas	20	20	100%
Title 4 – retail in Employment Areas	22	22	100%
Total Title 4	42	42	100%
Title 5 – rural reserves	2	2	100%
Title 5 – green corridors	10	10	100%
Title 5 - Total	12	12	100%
Title 6 – Centers Development Strategy	22	Due December 2007	
Title 6 – Siting Government Offices	22	Due July 2005	
Title 6 – Reporting on Centers Progress	22	21	95%
Total Title 6	22	21	95%
Total Titles 1-6	370	365	99%
Title 7 – 1st progress report	27 – due January 31, 2002	21 (received)	78%
Title 7 – 2nd progress report	27 – due December 31, 2003	17 (received)	63%
Title 7 – 3rd progress report	27 – due June 30, 2004	12 (received)	44%
Total Title 7	81	50	62%

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

Functional Plan Requirement	When Local Decisions Must Comply		
	Plan/Code Amendment 3.07.810(D) ⁶	Land Use Decision 3.07.810(E) ⁷	Adoption 3.07.810(B) ⁸
Title 1: Determine capacity for housing and jobs (3.07.120.A)			12/08/02
Title 1: Report changes to jobs/housing capacity annually (3.07.120.D)			07/07/05 and 4/15 each subsequent year
Title 1: Map design types (3.07.130)	12/08/00	12/08/01	12/08/02
Title 1: Adopt minimum density (3.07.140.A)	12/08/00	12/08/01	12/08/02
Title 1: No prohibition to partition lots twice the minimum size (3.07.140.B)	12/08/00	12/08/01	12/08/02
Title 1: Allow accessory dwelling unit in SFD (3.07.140.C)	12/08/00	12/08/01	12/08/02
Title 1: Allow accessory dwelling unit in attached SFD in Centers and Stations (3.07.140.C)	07/07/03	07/07/04	07/07/05
Title 1: Report density of residential development (3.07.140.D)			07/07/05
Title 2: Parking minimum and maximum standards (3.07.220.A.1)	01/07/98	01/07/99	01/07/00
Title 2: Adopt maximum parking standards (3.07.220.A.2)	01/07/98	01/07/99	01/07/00
Title 2: Adopt blended parking ratios in mixed-use areas (3.07.220.B)	01/07/98	01/07/99	01/07/00
Title 2: Establish a variance process (3.07.220.A.3)	01/07/98		01/07/00
Title 2: Monitor and report parking data annually (3.07.220.D)	01/07/98		01/07/00 and each subsequent year

⁶ A city or county that amends its plan to deal with the subject of a Functional Plan requirement any time after the effective date of the requirement (the date noted) must ensure that the amendment complies with the Functional Plan

⁷ A city or county that has not yet amended its plan to comply with a Functional Plan requirement must, following one year after acknowledgement of the requirement (the date noted), apply the requirement directly to land use decisions

⁸ Cities and counties must amend their plans to comply with a new Functional Plan requirement within two years after acknowledgement of the requirement (the date noted)

Functional Plan Requirement	When Local Decisions Must Comply		
	Plan/Code Amendment 3.07.810(D) ⁶	Land Use Decision 3.07.810(E) ⁷	Adoption 3.07.810(B) ⁸
Title 3: Adopt model or equivalent and map or equivalent (3.07.330.A)	12/08/00)	12/08/01	12/08/02
Title 3: Floodplain management performance standards (3.07.340.A)	12/08/00	12/08/01	12/08/02
Title 3: Water quality performance standards (3.07.340.B)	12/08/00	12/08/01	12/08/02
Title 3: Erosion control performance standards (3.07.340.C)	12/08/00	12/08/01	12/08/02
Title 3: Fish and wildlife habitat Conservation (3.07.350)			
Title 4: Map RSIA's in new UGB additions (3.07.420.A)	07/07/03	07/07/04	07/07/05
Title 4: Map RSIA's in pre-expansion UGB (3.07.430.B)	07/07/03	07/07/04	07/07/05
Title 4: Limit uses in Regionally Significant Industrial Areas (3.07.420)	07/07/03	07/07/04	07/07/05
Title 4: Limit retail uses in Industrial Areas (60,000 sq ft) (3.07.430)	01/07/98	01/07/99	01/07/00
Title 4: Limit retail uses in Industrial Areas (20,000 sq ft) (3.07.430)	07/07/03	07/07/04	07/07/05
Title 4: Limit retail uses in Employment Areas (60,000 sq ft) (3.07.440)	1/07/98	01/07/99	01/07/00
Title 4: Limit retail uses in Employment Areas (3.07.440)	07/07/03	07/07/04	07/07/05
Title 5: Rural reserves (3.07.520)	01/07/98		01/07/00
Title 5: Green corridors (3.07.520)	01/07/98		01/07/00
Title 6: Develop a strategy for each Center (3.07.620)			12/31/07

¹ A city or county that amends its plan to deal with the subject of a Functional Plan requirement any time after the effective date of the requirement (the date noted) must ensure that the amendment complies with the Functional Plan

¹ A city or county that has not yet amended its plan to comply with a Functional Plan requirement must, following one year after acknowledgement of the requirement (the date noted), apply the requirement directly to land use decisions

¹ Cities and counties must amend their plans to comply with a new Functional Plan requirement within two years after acknowledgement of the requirement (the date noted)

Functional Plan Requirement	When Local Decisions Must Comply		
	Plan/Code Amendment 3.07.810(D) ⁶	Land Use Decision 3.07.810(E) ⁷	Adoption 3.07.810(B) ⁸
Title 6: Address barriers to siting government offices in centers (3.07.640)			Based on Center Development Strategy
Title 6: Require demonstration that government offices cannot be located in Centers (3.07.640.B)	07/07/03	07/07/04	07/07/05
Title 6: Reporting on progress biennially (3.07.650)			4/15/04 and every two years
Title 7: Consider specific tools and strategies (3.07.730.B, 3.07.760)	12/31/03	12/31/03	
Title 7: Adopt strategies and measures to increase housing opportunities (3.07.730.A)			06/30/04
Title 8: Compliance procedures	02/14/03		
Title 9: Performance Measures			
Title 10: Definitions	12/08/00	12/08/01	12/08/02
Title 11: Set interim protection for areas brought into the UGB (3.07.1110)	12/08/00	12/08/01	12/08/02
Title 11: Prepare a comprehensive plan and zoning provisions for territory added to the UGB (3.07.1120)	12/08/00		Metro sets date as condition
Title 12: Establish level of service standards for parks (3.07.1240.A)			2 years after Parks Functional Plan Adopted
Title 12: Provide access to parks by walking, bicycling, transit (3.07.1240B)			07/07/05

¹ A city or county that amends its plan to deal with the subject of a Functional Plan requirement any time after the effective date of the requirement (the date noted) must ensure that the amendment complies with the Functional Plan

¹ A city or county that has not yet amended its plan to comply with a Functional Plan requirement must, following one year after acknowledgement of the requirement (the date noted) apply the requirement directly to land use decisions

¹ Cities and counties must amend their plans to comply with a new Functional Plan requirement within two years after acknowledgement of the requirement (the date noted)

APPENDIX D

Outstanding Compliance Elements

	Title 1	Title 2	Title 3	Title 4	Title 5	Title 6	Title 7
Beaverton							
Cornelius							See Title 7 section
Durham							See Title 7 section
Fairview							See Title 7 section
Forest Grove							See Title 7 section
Gladstone							See Title 7 section
Gresham						Centers progress report	See Title 7 section
Happy Valley							See Title 7 section
Hillsboro							See Title 7 section
Johnson City							See Title 7 section
King City							See Title 7 section
Lake Oswego			Water quality				See Title 7 section
Maywood Park							See Title 7 section
Milwaukie							See Title 7 section
Oregon City							See Title 7 section
Portland							
Rivergrove							See Title 7 section
Sherwood							See Title 7 section
Tigard							See Title 7 section
Troutdale							See Title 7 section
Tualatin							See Title 7 section
West Linn			Water quality				See Title 7 section
Wilsonville	Capacity Analysis						See Title 7 section
Wood Village							See Title 7 section
Clackamas County			Exception Requested				See Title 7 section
Multnomah County							
Washington County							See Title 7 section