www.oregon**metro.gov**

2010 Compliance Report

Metro Code Chapter 3.07 Urban Growth Management Functional Plan

~~March 2011~~

Revised June 2011

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

This 2010 Compliance Report includes a summary of the status of compliance of each city and county in the region with Metro Code requirements. Those requirements are intended to implement regional policies and achieve the goals set out in the 2040 Growth Concept. Each city and county in the region are 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 the compliance.

Most local governments in the region have complied with most of the code requirements. However, several cities and counties have not completed planning for new urban areas (Title 11). Many of the local governments that have not completed concept planning are making progress in planning for new urban areas. Some cities have not adopted natural resource protection programs (Title 13); however, most of these cities are working toward adoption in 2011.

This compliance report also evaluates the effectiveness of Metro Code requirements. In 2010, the Metro Council changed regional policy and implementation strategies and a summary of those changes is included in the report.

2010 Compliance Report

Metro Code Chapter 3.07 Urban Growth Management Functional Plan

Introduction

Metro Code 3.07.870 requires the Chief Operating Officer to submit to the Metro Council by March 1 of each year the status of compliance by cities and counties with the requirements of the Metro Code Chapter 3.07 (Urban Growth Management Functional Plan). The purpose of Title 8 (Compliance Procedures) and this compliance report is to establish a process for ensuring city or county compliance with requirements of Metro Code 3.07 and for evaluating and informing the region about the effectiveness of those requirements.

During the past three years of the Making a Great Place initiative, certain Metro Code reporting requirements were suspended while changes to Metro Code were being refined and finalized. Other compliance requirements remained in effect, however, including maintaining housing capacity (Title 1), protecting industrial land (Title 4), continuing concept planning in areas added to the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) (Title 11), and protecting and enhancing fish and wildlife habitat (Title 13).

On December 16, 2010, the Metro Council adopted Ordinance 10-1244B which amended several Functional Plan titles. A summary of those changes is included in this report. The status of compliance contained in this compliance report summarizes the compliance status of each jurisdiction for Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010, prior to adoption of Ordinance 10-1244B.

Accomplishments

- From 2002 through 2010, 12 local governments completed planning for new urban areas. Of these, ten used grant funding from Metro's Construction Excise Tax to complete planning efforts.
- In 2005, the Metro Council adopted Title 13 Nature in Neighborhoods. Since then, 23 local governments have completed Title 13 evaluations and adopted plans.
- Though not required by Metro Code, 18 cities and one county submitted their aspirations for growth in 2009. These aspirations reflect the values of the region for vibrant communities that have a balance of jobs and housing, economic prosperity, transportation choices, and clear air and water. To achieve these aspirations, communities identified a series of investments that need to be made to serve as catalysts of growth including investments in transit, infrastructure, and parks among others.

Status of Compliance by Jurisdiction (as of December 15, 2010)

Beaverton: The City of Beaverton is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010.

Cornelius: The City of Cornelius is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010, except for Title 11 planning for the North Holladay Concept Plan. It is Metro's understanding that the plan will be completed by the city in early 2011.

Damascus: The City of Damascus is not in compliance with Functional Plan requirements. The city recently adopted its comprehensive plan. It is Metro's understanding that the city is working on implementation measures during 2011 that will be the basis for assessing Functional Plan compliance.

Durham: The City of Durham is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010.

Fairview: The City of Fairview is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010, except for Title 13 Nature in Neighborhood. It is Metro's understanding that the city has a Title 13 work plan that calls for city council action in August 2011.

Forest Grove: The City of Forest Grove is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010.

Gladstone: The City of Gladstone is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010.

Gresham: The City of Gresham is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010.

Happy Valley: The City of Happy Valley is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010.

Hillsboro: The City of Hillsboro is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010, except for Title 11 planning for UGB expansion areas 69 and 71.

Johnson City: The City of Johnson City is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010.

King City: The City of King City is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010.

Lake Oswego: The City of Lake Oswego is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010, except for Title 4 protection of Industrial and Other Employment Areas. For Title 4, the city needs to submit documentation to Metro staff detailing what actions the city has taken to come into compliance.

Maywood Park: The City of Maywood Park is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010.

Milwaukie: The City of Milwaukie is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010, except for Title 13 Nature in Neighborhoods. It is Metro's understanding that the city has submitted a draft plan of action for adoption of code amendments by the Milwaukie City Council in April 2011.

Oregon City: The City of Oregon City is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010, except for Title 11 planning for the South End area and the implementation measures for the Beavercreek Road concept plan area. It is Metro's understanding that while the city has updated its code for industrial uses, it must still apply the protection requirements of Title 4 when the industrial land is annexed into the city.

Portland: The City of Portland is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010, except for Title 13 Nature in Neighborhoods. It is Metro's understanding that the City is continuing to work on a number of fronts to come into compliance with Title 13 and that Metro and City staff need to assess the existing natural resource protection programs and develop a new schedule and plan for meeting compliance. The city is working with Metro to revise the Title 4 Industrial and other Employment Areas map.

Rivergrove: The City of Rivergrove is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010.

Sherwood: The City of Sherwood is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010. It should be noted that the ordinance that brought Study Area 61 Cipole Road into the urban growth boundary makes Washington County or City of Tualatin responsible for Title 11 planning. The cities of Tualatin and Sherwood believe, however, that the city of Sherwood should have Title 11 planning responsibility for Study Area 61. It is Metro's understanding that the City of Sherwood has no plans at this time to begin concept planning. The area in question is less than five acres with one acre being developable.

Tigard: The City of Tigard is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010.

Troutdale: The City of Troutdale is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010, except for Title 13 Nature in Neighborhoods. It is Metro's understanding that the City Council tabled the adoption of the necessary code amendments in October 2009 and to date, the City has not supplied Metro with a revised estimated timeline for adoption of Title 13 protection measures.

Tualatin: The City of Tualatin is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010, except for Title 11 planning requirements for the, Southwest Tualatin industrial area and Study Area 61 Cipole Road. It is Metro's understanding that the city council has accepted a concept plan for the Southwest Tualatin area and the city is now working on implementation measures which are anticipated to be completed in spring 2011. For Study Area 61 Cipole Road, it should be noted that the ordinance that brought that study area into the UGB makes Washington County or the City of Tualatin responsible for Title 11 planning. However, the cities of Tualatin and Sherwood believe that the City of Sherwood should have Title 11 planning responsibility for Study Area 61. The City of Sherwood has no plans at this time to begin concept planning. The area in question is less than five acres with one acre being developable.

Metro appealed to the Land Use Board of Appeals a Tualatin ordinance that reduced zoned residential capacity below the minimum capacity in Table 3.07-1 of Title 1, taking the city out of compliance with Title 1. Metro and the city have agreed to a delay in the appeal to December 31, 2011 to allow the city time to increase minimum zoned capacity in another part of the city.

West Linn: The City of West Linn is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010.

Wilsonville: The City of Wilsonville is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010, except for Title 11 planning for East Wilsonville (Frog Pond area. It is Metro's understanding that the city is evaluating and budgeting for a major sewer upgrade that must be completed before planning and developing the East Wilsonville/Frog Pond area

Wood Village: The City of Wood Village is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010.

Clackamas County: Clackamas County is in compliance for all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010. It is Metro's understanding that the County is continuing to review land use and development code changes to eliminate barriers to habitat friendly development practices.

Multnomah County: Multnomah County is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010, except for Title 11 planning for Bonny Slope West (Area 93). It is Metro's understanding that a concept plan has been completed but that it has not yet been adopted by the County Board of Commissioners. The county and Metro are in discussions about a process to complete the planning for this area.

Washington County: Washington County is in compliance with all Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 15, 2010, except for Title 11 planning for the West Bull Mountain and Cooper Mountain areas. It is Metro's understanding that a West Bull Mountain concept plan has been adopted and that implementation measures are scheduled for completion in fall 2011. For the Cooper Mountain area, it is Metro's understanding that the county will begin Title 11 planning in 2011.

Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Metro Code Chapter 3.07 (Urban Growth Management Functional Plan) in achieving the 2040 Growth Concept

The 2040 Growth Concept is this region's blueprint for the future, guiding growth and development based on a shared vision to create vibrant communities while protecting what we love about this place – safe and stable neighborhoods for families; compact development which uses both land and money more efficiently; a healthy economy that generates jobs and business opportunities; protection of farms, forests, rivers, streams, and natural areas; a balanced transportation system to move people and goods; and housing for people of all incomes in every community. This section briefly evaluates the effectiveness of compliance in helping achieve the 2040 Growth Concept.

A primary goal of regional policy contained in the Regional Framework Plan is efficient use of land within the urban growth boundary. Local governments have complied with Functional Plan requirements relating to maintain or increasing zoned capacity for housing, encouraging a balanced transportation system, enhancing the role of centers and protecting natural resources, is the region achieving the desired results?

Efficient use of land

Metro measures the region's progress toward achieving the objectives of the 2040 Growth Concept biennially in a report to the state. According to the 2009 Performance Measures Report and the 2009 Urban Growth Report, the collective actions of the cities and counties of the region to use urban land more efficiently are moving the region toward meeting some of the objectives of the 2040 Growth Concept. For example, the density of residential development has increased since the 2040 Growth Concept was first developed in 1995 reflecting how land is being used more efficiently. The number of residential units built per net acre increased from 5.5 units in 1995 to 10.7 units in 2006. Median residential lot size decreased from 6,738 square feet in 1995 to 4,300 square feet in 2006.

Healthy economy

In 2002 and 2004, the Metro Council adopted changes to Title 4 Industrial and Other Employment Areas to provide and protect a supply of sites for employment by limiting the types and scale of non-industrial uses in Regionally Significant Industrial Areas (RSIAs), industrial, and employment areas. All local governments in the region have adopted protections required by Title 4. It is also the region's policy to encourage employment opportunities in Centers, Corridors, Station Communities and Main Streets by encouraging cities and counties to allow a wide range of employment uses and building types in those design types.

The following information shows the net employment change from 2000 to 2006 by 2040 design type according to the 2009 Performance Measures report:

Central City:	1.5%
Regional Centers:	0%
Town Centers:	2.8%
Corridors:	1.4%
RSIAs	(5.3%)
Industrial:	28.5%
Employment:	2%
Other	1.7%

In 2010, the Metro Council adopted a Community Investment Strategy to fulfill the vision of the 2040 Growth Concept to focus public investments in areas that will stimulate private investment. As a result, development in the above design types is expected to increase over time.

Protection of farms, forest and natural areas

It is regional policy to protect farm and forest land as well as other natural areas. In 2005, the Council adopted Title 13 Nature in Neighborhoods to protect and restore a viable streamside corridor system. Metro required local jurisdictions to protect more than 39,000 acres of the highest value riparian areas.

During 2009-2010, Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington counties and Metro worked to designate urban and rural reserves. Urban reserves are areas outside of the urban growth boundary where future urban development could occur. Rural reserves are areas outside the

UGB reserved for long-term protection of agriculture, forestry or important natural landscape features that limit urban development. Clackamas County designated more than 68,000 acres of rural reserves and Multnomah County designated more than 46,000. The decision on reserves in Washington County is under further review and consideration by the county, Metro and the state Land Conservation and Development Commission.

Balanced transportation system

According to the 2009 Performance Measure Report which reviewed Federal Highway Administration and State Highway Performance Monitoring System data, between 1998 and 2008, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita in this region declined 8 percent while VMT increased nationally by more than 4 percent. Average annual growth for the overall transit system was about 4 percent in the TriMet service district between FY1998 and FY2008. Bicycles play an important and growing role in the regional transportation system. Between 1991 and 2004, the City of Portland developed a bikeway network that increased the mileage on bike lanes and bike boulevards from 78 to 256, according to the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan. Bicycle count data is currently limited to Portland, but anecdotal evidence suggests that bicycle ridership has increased throughout the region.

Housing choice

According to the 2009 Performance Measures report which used data from the Regional Multiple Listing Service and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, between1993 to 2008, the median price of owner-occupied single family dwellings in the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan region rose by 160%, reaching a peak in 2005 of almost $300,000. During 2000-2009, rent increases reached their peak for efficiency units in 2006 at $545 per month, for one-bedroom units in 2009 at $645, for two-bedroom units in 2009 at $842, for three-bedroom units in 2004 at $1,107. Several local government mayors who sit on the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) have expressed an interest in reviewing efforts to provide housing choice in the region.

Areas for Monitoring

Development of new urban areas

While significant progress has been made over the past five years in concept planning for new urban areas, several areas that were added to the urban growth boundary in 2002-2004 remain unplanned. In most cases, concept planning for those areas will begin or be completed in 2011. The progress that has been made is primarily a result of the establishment of the grant program funded by the Construction Excise Tax that funded concept planning efforts. See Appendix B for a summary of the status of new urban area planning.

Center Development

The previous version of Title 6 covered only Centers and Station Communities and required local governments to develop a strategy to enhance all centers by December 2007. It also required jurisdictions to submit progress reports to Metro every two years. This approach was not effective in encouraging center development and development in centers has not achieved the results originally anticipated.

The version of Title 6 adopted by the Metro Council in December 2010 as part of the Community Investment Strategy legislation moves away from reporting requirements to an incentive approach to encourage cities and counties to develop centers including incentives to local governments that adopt a plan of actions and investments to enhance their center, corridor, station community, or main street. Focusing development in centers, corridors, station communities, and main streets is a key strategy to use land more efficiently.

Housing Choice

As previously mentioned, several local government mayors have expressed an interest in reviewing efforts to provide housing choice in the region. Metro and its advisory committee, the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC), may consider reviewing Title 7 (Housing Choice) of the Metro Code to ensure that local governments in the region are continuing to take steps to implement its provisions.

Looking ahead

As previously noted, certain functional plan reporting requirements were suspended while the plan was under review and revision. In amending the functional plan in 2010, those reporting requirements were removed and the focus of functional plan compliance in the future will be implementing regional policy to achieve the 2040 Growth Concept and the recently adopted six desired outcomes and characteristics of a successful region:

1. People live, work and play in vibrant communities where their everyday needs are easily accessible.
2. Current and future residents benefit from the region's sustained economic competitiveness and prosperity.
3. People have safe and reliable transportation choices that enhance their quality of life.
4. The region is a leader in minimizing contributions to global warming.
5. Current and future generations enjoy clean air, clean water and healthy ecosystems.
6. The benefits and burdens of growth and change are distributed equitably.

Summary of Functional Plan Changes

The Metro Council adopted several ordinances in 2010 that amended the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (Metro Code Chapter 3.07). Below is a summary of those changes.

Title 1 Housing Capacity (Metro Code 3.07.110-120)

The new Title 1 moves to a "no-net-loss" approach for housing based on plan amendments or zone changes, eliminates Table 1 and the need to calculate capacity city-wide, and eliminates the requirement for calculating and tracking job capacity. The new Title 1 requires that an increase in capacity must be adopted before a decrease in capacity is adopted. Title 1 also allows a local government to reduce capacity to allow an industrial use, a major educational or medical facility, or to protect natural resources without violating the no-net-loss policy.

Title 2 Regional Parking Policy (see Regional Transportation Functional Plan Title 4 Regional Parking Management, Metro Code 3.08.410)

Although Title 2 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan was repealed in 2010 by Ordinance 10-1241B, it was added to Metro Code Chapter 3.08 (Regional Transportation Functional

Plan) in the same ordinance. Title 4 of the Regional Transportation Functional Plan provides parking requirements for cities and counties in the region.

Title 4 Industrial and Other Employment Areas (Metro Code 3.07.410-450)

Title 4 seeks to protect a regional supply of sites for industrial uses. In recent years, several industrial-designated sites have been developed for non-industrial uses. The new version of Title 4 limits new schools, places of assembly, recreational facilities and parks (with exceptions for habitat protection) in Regionally Significant Industrial Areas. A new Title 14 (Urban Growth Boundary), discussed below, includes an expedited process for adding large industrial sites to the UGB. The process to amend the Title 4 map does not change. Title 4 sets guidelines for map changes. When considering a map change, local governments should contact Metro staff.

Title 6 Centers, Corridors, Station Communities and Main Streets (Metro Code 3.07.610-650)

The new version of Title 6 moves away from reporting requirements to an incentive approach to encourage cities and counties to develop centers. Title 6 provides incentives to local governments that adopt a plan of actions and investments to enhance their center, corridor, station community, or main street. These incentives include:

- Eligibility for a regional investment (currently defined as new high capacity transit lines).
- Ability to use a higher volume-to-capacity standard under the Oregon Highway Plan when considering amendments to comprehensive plans or land use regulations, and
- Eligibility for an automatic 30 percent trip reduction credit under the Transportation Planning Rule when analyzing traffic impacts of new development in plan amendments for a center, corridor, station community, or main street

Title 6 is no longer a compliance requirement and affects only those local governments who want to be eligible for one of the incentives listed above. A new Title 6 map will be Metro's official depiction of adopted boundaries for centers, corridors, station communities and main streets and will be revised as local governments adopt revised boundaries.

Title 8 Compliance Procedures (Metro Code 3.07.810-870)

Title 8 establishes a process for determining whether a jurisdiction complies with requirements of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan. To streamline the process, Title 8 was changed to make requests from local governments for extensions of compliance deadlines or exceptions from compliance administrative functions but still allow for an appeal to the Metro Council. The criteria for determining whether an extension or exception is granted remain the same.

Title 9 Performance Measures

Title 9 set out a process for Metro to measure and report on the progress of achieving implementation of the Functional Plan. Title 9 was repealed but the policy of measuring performance is now included in the Regional Framework Plan.

Title 10 Functional Plan Definitions (Metro Code 3.07.1010)

Title 10 defines terms found in Metro Code Chapter 3.07. Changes to Title 10 reflect updated definitions.

Title 11 Planning for New Urban Areas (Metro Code 3.07.1105-1140)

Title 11 was amended during the urban and rural reserves process in spring 2010 and with the more recent adoption of Ordinances 10-1244B and 11-1252A. The new Title 11 requires concept planning for urban reserve areas prior to their coming into the UGB. Previously, concept planning occurred after an area was brought into the UGB. Title 11 also contains outcomes that must be achieved by the concept plan. The concept planning provisions of Title 11 do not apply until December 31, 2011.

Title 14 Urban Growth Boundary (Metro Code 3.07.1405-1465)

The Urban Growth Boundary and reserves procedures and criteria that were in Metro Code Chapter 3.01 were moved to this new Title 14 to join other growth management tools and strategies. In addition, Title 14 includes an expedited process for adding large industrial sites to the UGB (3.07.1435).

Appendices

APPENDIX A
Outstanding Compliance Elements

	Title 1 Housing Capacity	Title 2[1] Parking Management	Title 3 Water Quality & Flood Management	Title 4 Industrial and other Employment Areas	Title 5[2] Neighbor Cities & Rural Reserves	Title 6 Centers, Corridors, Station Communities & Main Streets	Title 7 Housing Choice	Title 11 Planning for New Urban Areas	Title 13 Nature in Neighborhoods
Beaverton								See Appendix B	
Cornelius								See Appendix B	
Damascus	Not in compliance	Not in compliance	Not in compliance	Not in compliance			Not in compliance	See Appendix B	Not in compliance
Durham									
Fairview									Not in compliance
Forest Grove								See Appendix B	
Gladstone									
Gresham								See Appendix B	
Happy Valley								See Appendix B	
Hillsboro								See Appendix B	
Johnson City									
King City								See Appendix B	
Lake Oswego				Not in compliance					

[1] 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 in the same ordinance.
[2] Title 5 was repealed in Ordinance 10-1238A

APPENDIX A
Outstanding Compliance Elements

	Title 1 Housing Capacity	Title 2 Parking Management	Title 3 Water Quality & Flood Management	Title 4 Industrial and other Employment Areas	Title 5 Neighbor Cities & Rural Reserves	Title 6 Centers, Corridors, Station Communities & Main Streets	Title 7 Housing Choice	Title 11 Planning for New Urban Areas	Title 13 Nature in Neighborhoods
Maywood Park									
Milwaukie									Not in compliance
Oregon City								See Appendix B	
Portland								See Appendix B	Not in compliance
Rivergrove									
Sherwood								See Appendix B	
Tigard									
Troutdale									Not in compliance
Tualatin								See Appendix B	
West Linn									
Wilsonville								See Appendix B	
Wood Village									
Clackamas County									
Multnomah County								See Appendix B	
Washington County								See Appendix B	

APPENDIX B
TITLE 11 NEW AREA PLANNING COMPLIANCE
(As of December 31, 2010)

Project	Lead Government(s)	Compliance[1]	Status
1998 UGB Expansion			
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.
1999 UGB Expansion			
Witch Hazel Community Plan	Hillsboro	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; development on-going.
2000 UGB Expansion			
Villebois Village	Wilsonville	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; development on-going.
2002 UGB Expansion			
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: Comprehensive plan map approved, implementation measures due late 2011.
	Gresham	yes	Gresham portion, called Kelly Creek Headwaters, 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	no	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	no	City working on scope of work & intends to start in 2011.
East Wilsonville (Frog Pond area)	Wilsonville	no	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	no	Concept plan has been accepted by City Council, and City now working on code (early 2011).
Brookman Concept Plan	Sherwood	yes	Concept Plan and implementation measures completed; waiting development.
Study Area 59	Sherwood	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed for residential area; school constructed.
Adams Avenue	Sherwood	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed.

[1] The compliance responses are limited to 'yes' or 'no', however, many projects are partially or mostly completed.

APPENDIX B
TITLE 11 NEW AREA PLANNING COMPLIANCE
(As of December 31, 2010)

Project	Lead Government(s)	Compliance	Status
Study Area 61 (Cipole Rd	Tualatin/Sherwood[2]	no	City of Sherwood has no plans for this area yet.
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	Washington County	no	Concept plan adopted; implementation measures scheduled for completion fall 2011.
Cooper Mountain area	Washington County	no	Pending staff confirmation, Wash County to start planning in 2011.
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	no	Areas are included in South Hillsboro Area 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 with final code modifications and finance plan to be completed in 2011.
Bonny Slope West Concept Plan (Area 93)	Multnomah County	no	Concept plan map developed though not yet adopted by Board of Commissioners; completion of process under discussion between Metro and County.
2004/2005 UGB Expansion			
Damascus area	Damascus	no	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	no	Cities scheduled to begin planning in early 2011.
N. Holladay Concept Plan	Cornelius	no	City due to complete planning in early 2011.
Evergreen Concept Plan	Hillsboro	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed.
Helvetia Concept Plan	Hillsboro	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed.

[2] The Metro ordinance conditions designate Tualatin or Washington County as responsible for completing Title 11 planning. City of Sherwood and City of Tualatin indicate that it makes more sense for Sherwood to complete planning since the property is west of Cipole Road.

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(C)[1]	**Land Use Decision** 3.07.810(D)[2]	**Adoption** 3.07.810(B)[3]
Title 1: Adopt minimum dwelling unit density (3.07.120.B)	12/16/2010		2 years after acknowledgement by LCDC
Title 1: Allow accessory dwelling unit in SFD zones (3.07.120.G) *(provision included in previous version of Metro Code as 3.07.140.C)*	12/8/2000		12/8/2002
Title 3: Adopt model ordinance or equivalent and map or equivalent (3.07.330.A)	12/8/2000		12/08/2002
Title 3: Floodplain management performance standards (3.007.340.A)	12/8/2000	12/08/2001	12/08/2002
Title 3: Water quality performance standards (3.07.340.B)	12/08/2000	12/08/2001	12/08/2002
Title 3: Erosion control performance standards (3.07.340.C)	12/08/2000	12/08/2001	12/08/2002

[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

[2] 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

[3] 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 C:
COMPLIANCE DATES FOR THE URBAN GROWTH MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONAL PLAN

Functional Plan Requirement	When Local Decisions Must Comply		
	Plan/Code Amendment 3.07.810(C)[1]	**Land Use Decision** 3.07.810(D)[2]	**Adoption** 3.07.810(B)[3]
Title 4: Limit uses in Regionally Significant Industrial Areas (3.07.420)	7/22/2005	7/22/2006	7/22/2007
Title 4: 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 Regionally Significant Industrial Areas (3.07.420D)	12/16/2010	1 year after acknowledgement by LCDC	2 years after acknowledgement by LCDC
Title 4: Limit uses in Industrial Areas (3.07.430)	7/22/2005	7/22/2006	7/22/2007
Title 4: Limit uses in Employment Areas (3.07.440)	7/22/2005	7/22/2006	7/22/2007
Title 6: (Title 6 applies only to those local governments seeking a regional investment or seeking eligibility for lower mobility standards and trip generation rates)			
Title 7: Adopt strategies and measures to increase housing opportunities (3.07.730)			6/30/04
Title 8: Compliance Procedures (45 day notice to Metro for amendments to a comprehensive plan or land use regulation) (3.07.820)	2/14/03		

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(C)[1]	**Land Use Decision** 3.07.810(D)[2]	**Adoption** 3.07.810(B)[3]
Title 11: Develop a concept plan for urban reserve prior to its addition to the UGB (3.07.1110)			2 years after acknowledgement by LCDC
Title 11: Prepare a comprehensive plan and zoning provisions for territory added to the UGB (3.07.1120)	12/08/2000	12/08/2001	2 years after the effective date of the ordinance adding land to the UGB unless the ordinance provides a later date.
Title 11: Interim protection of areas added to the UGB (3.07.1130) *(provision included in previous version of Metro Code as 3.07.1110)*	12/8/2000	12/08/2001	12/08/2002
Title 12: Provide access to parks by walking, bicycling, and transit (3.07.1240B)			7/7/2005
Title 13: 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
Title 13: 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

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(C)[1]	**Land Use Decision** 3.07.810(D)[2]	**Adoption** 3.07.810(B)[3]
Title 13: 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