
www.oregonmetro.gov

2011 Compliance Report

Metro Code Chapter 3.07 Urban Growth
Management Functional Plan

and

Metro Code Chapter 3.08 Regional
Transportation Functional Plan

March 2012



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

Metro Council President

Tom Hughes

Metro Councilors

Shirley Craddick, District 1

Carlotta Collette, District 2

Carl Hosticka, District 3

Kathryn Harrington, District 4

Rex Burkholder, District 5

Barbara Roberts, District 6

Auditor

Suzanne Flynn

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	2
Introduction	3
Overview.....	3
Urban Growth Management Functional Plan Compliance Status	4
Regional Transportation Functional Plan Compliance Status	4
Recommendations.....	5
Options Available.....	6
Appendices A, B, C and D	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This 2011 Compliance Report summarizes the status of compliance for each city and county in the region with the Metro Code requirements included in the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan. The purpose of this requirement is to implement regional goals to make this region a greater place to live, work and play. For the first time, this compliance report also addresses compliance with the Metro Code requirements included in the Regional Transportation Functional Plan.

In 2011, most local governments that had outstanding compliance issues requested and were granted extensions of their compliance deadlines for Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirements. Two local governments, the City of Fairview and the City of Troutdale, requested extensions which were granted to December 31, 2011. However, neither city met the compliance deadline.

Six jurisdictions requested deadlines of December 31, 2011 for requirements of the Regional Transportation Functional Plan. Two of these jurisdictions have completed Transportation System Plan updates and are currently in compliance and four are still in the process of completing Transportation System Plan updates.

Staff is recommending that that the Regional Transportation Functional Plan procedures for extending compliance deadlines and granting exceptions be changed to match the procedures in the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan. Staff also recommends adding a section to allow an exemption from transportation requirements in certain circumstances.

2011 COMPLIANCE REPORT

Metro Code Chapter 3.07 Urban Growth Management Functional Plan and Metro Code Chapter 3.08 Regional Transportation Functional Plan

March 2012

Introduction

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

On December 16, 2010 the Metro Council adopted Ordinance 10-1244B which amended several Urban Growth Management Functional Plan titles. The Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission are expected to consider acknowledgement of the components of the ordinance including changes to the UGMFP in Spring 2012. Until the Commission acknowledges the changes to the UGMFP, the titles in effect on December 15, 2010 remain in effect. Once the Commission acknowledges the UGMFP changes, Metro is required to provide each local government the date in which they must come into compliance.

Overview

In 2011, 12 local governments requested extensions of their compliance deadlines for specific compliance requirements for the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan. Under Metro Code, the Chief Operating Officer (COO) may grant an extension request if a local government meets one of two criteria: 1) the city or county is making progress towards compliance; or 2) there is good cause for failure to meet the deadline for compliance. All extension requests were found to meet one of the criteria and were granted by the COO. The COO decision was appealed to the Council in two cases and, after a public hearing, the Council denied the appeals and the extension were upheld.

By statute cities and counties have two years following the date of acknowledgement of Metro's Regional Transportation Plan (November 24, 2011) to bring their Transportation System Plans (TSPs) into compliance with any new or changed regional requirements. However, Metro exercised its authority under the state's Transportation Planning Rule to extend city and county deadlines beyond the two-year statutory deadline. Metro consulted with each city and county to determine a reasonable timeline for this work and adopted a schedule that is part of the Regional Transportation Plan Ordinance No. 10-1241B. The deadlines were phased (2011, 2012, 2013) to take advantage of funding opportunities and the availability of local and Metro staff resources.

Urban Growth Management Functional Plan Compliance Status

Two jurisdictions, the cities of Fairview and Troutdale, are out of compliance with Title 13 Nature in Neighborhoods requirements. The Metro Council has directed staff to schedule a public hearing on the City of Troutdale's non-compliance. *[Note: As of February 2012, the City of Fairview has submitted Title 13 material and Metro staff is reviewing it to determine if it complies with Title 13 requirements]*. Appendix A summarizes the compliance status for all local governments with the requirements of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan as of the end of 2011.

Appendix B shows the status of Title 11 new urban area planning for areas added to the Urban Growth Boundary since 1998. Appendix C summarizes the compliance dates for each UGMFP title.

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Compliance Status

Six jurisdictions requested deadlines of 2011. As described below and in Appendix D two of these jurisdictions have completed TSP updates and are currently in compliance with the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP), and four have not yet completed TSP updates.

Beaverton: The City of Beaverton adopted its TSP in September 2010 and is in compliance with all Regional Transportation Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 31, 2011.

Tigard: The City of Tigard adopted its TSP in November 2010 and is in compliance with all Regional Transportation Functional Plan requirements in effect on December 31, 2011.

Damascus: The City of Damascus is not in compliance with the Regional Transportation Functional Plan.

The City of Damascus started the development of its TSP in June 2009, but the project was put on hold due to significant revisions to the City's draft comprehensive plan map. The development of the TSP is scheduled to resume in March 2012. The City Council reaffirmed the appointments to the Transportation Steering Committee and Transportation Topic Specific Team in 2011. An 18-month work plan is in place to complete the TSP. The estimated completion date of the TSP is August 2013. The TSP is scheduled to be adopted by the Damascus City Council with the completed Comprehensive Plan and submitted to DLCD in Fall 2014.

Multnomah County: Multnomah County is not in compliance with the Regional Transportation Functional Plan. The County's TSP, including the unincorporated urban pockets, will be completed in partnership with the City of Portland, whose deadline is December 31, 2013. The County would like to amend its compliance deadline to December 31, 2013 to match up with the City of Portland.

The County's urban roads are also addressed in TSP updates for cities of Fairview, Troutdale and Wood Village, and the City of Gresham for the Pleasant Valley and Springwater Corridor Plan Areas. The cities' TSPs will reflect the outcome of the East Metro

Connections Plan, anticipated in Summer 2012. The County coordinates with the cities on their TSPs as part of compliance with the RTP. The County will also amend its Comprehensive Framework Plan Transportation Elements as part of RTP compliance.

Troutdale: Troutdale is not in compliance with the Regional Transportation Functional Plan. An update to Troutdale's TSP is a required task under the city's approved Periodic Review work program. The City was recently informed that its periodic review assistance grant application has been approved. This grant will enable the City to hire a transportation planning consultant to complete the TSP update. Compliance with the RTFP will be one of the tasks for the TSP update. The City is waiting to receive the grant agreement from the State in order to commence work on the TSP update. Its intention is to complete the TSP update by July 1, 2013; however, given the uncertainty of when the grant agreement will be executed with the state and work actually commences, it is more reasonable to assume the work will be completed by December 31, 2013.

Wood Village: The City of Wood Village planned to complete its TSP in 2011 until the East Metro Connections Plan (EMCP) was chosen to be completed as Metro's next Corridor study. During scope development and early stages of the EMCP, it was a concern that beginning the TSP process could result in a plan that would be prematurely outdated by the adoption of the EMCP. As the EMCP scope took shape it became apparent that portions of the Wood Village TSP could be accomplished concurrent with the EMCP. It was then that Wood Village began its TSP update and with a proper process in mind its completion is planned for Spring 2012. The City would like to amend its deadline to December 31, 2012.

The remaining jurisdictions in the region have deadlines of either 12/31/12 or 12/31/13 by which they anticipate completing TSP updates to come into compliance with the RTFP (see Appendix D).

Metro staff recommends exemption from RTFP requirements for three jurisdictions (Johnson City, Maywood Park, and Rivergrove). The transportation system in these cities is generally adequate to meet their needs, little population or employment growth is expected and exempting them would not make it more difficult to accommodate regional or state transportation needs or to meet regional performance targets.

Recommendations

In 2010, Council amended the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan to simplify and streamline the compliance process. Metro staff recommends amending the Regional Transportation Functional Plan procedures for extending compliance deadlines (3.08.620) and granting exceptions to specific requirements (3.08.630) to match the procedures within the UGMFP (3.07.830 and 3.07.840). The changes would allow Metro's COO to grant extensions and exceptions, rather than requiring a public hearing and decision by the Metro Council. Under the new process, a hearing before the Council would only be held if a person or jurisdiction appeals the COO order.

Metro staff recommends amending the RTFP to add a section (3.08.640) providing for exemption from all RTFP requirements. A jurisdiction would be eligible for an exemption if:

- Its existing transportation system is generally adequate to meet its needs;
- Little population or employment growth is expected, and;
- Exempting them would not make it more difficult to accommodate regional or state transportation needs or to meet regional performance targets.

Staff recommends exemption for three jurisdictions (Johnson City, Maywood Park, and Rivergrove).

Metro staff also recommends moving the schedule of deadlines for RTFP compliance (table 3.08-4) from the RTFP into the RTP Appendix (Exhibit A to Ordinance No. 10-1241). This change will ensure that Metro Code need not be amended in the future if the COO grants an extension to a compliance deadline. Staff recommends establishing new deadlines in Table 3.08-4 for four jurisdictions (Damascus, Troutdale, Wood Village, and Multnomah County). The rationale for these extensions is provided earlier in this report.

Options Available

Metro Code (3.07.850) provides that the Metro Council may initiate enforcement if a city or county has failed to meet a deadline for compliance with a functional plan requirement.

APPENDIX A

Summary of Compliance Status as of December 31, 2011 (Functional Plan in effect as of 12/15/2010)

	Title 1 Housing Capacity	Title 2 ¹ Parking Management	Title 3 Water Quality & Flood Management	Title 4 Industrial and other Employment Land	Title 6 ² Centers, Corridors, Station Communities & Main Streets	Title 7 Housing Choice	Title 11 Planning for New Urban Areas <small>(see Appendix B for detailed information)</small>	Title 13 Nature in Neighborhoods
Beaverton	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Cornelius	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Damascus	Extended to 12/31/2013	See footnote	Extended to 12/31/2013	Extended to 12/31/2013	See footnote	Extended to 12/31/2013	Extended to 12/31/2013	Extended to 12/31/2013
Durham	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Fairview	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	Out of compliance
Forest Grove	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Gladstone	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Gresham	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Happy Valley	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Hillsboro	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Areas 69 & 71 extended to 12/31/2012	In compliance
Johnson City	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
King City	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Lake Oswego	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Pending final city action	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Maywood Park	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Milwaukie	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Oregon City	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Extended to 6/30/2014 for Beavercreek Rd and South End	In compliance
Portland	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	Extended to 6/30/2012
Rivergrove	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Sherwood	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance

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 (Metro Code 3.08) in the same ordinance. Compliance with parking requirements should be addressed in each local government's Transportation System Plan.

² Once acknowledged by LCDC, Title 6 will be an incentive approach and only those local governments wanting a regional investment (currently defined as a new high-capacity transit line) will need to comply. Metro is not intending to require local jurisdictions to comply with the previous version of Title 6 (pre-Ordinance No. 10-1244B).

	Title 1 Housing Capacity	Title 2 ¹ Parking Management	Title 3 Water Quality & Flood Management	Title 4 Industrial and other Employment Land	Title 6 ² Centers, Corridors, Station Communities & Main Streets	Title 7 Housing Choice	Title 11 Planning for New Urban Areas <small>(see Appendix B for detailed information)</small>	Title 13 Nature in Neighborhoods
Tigard	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Troutdale	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	Out of compliance
Tualatin	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Area 61 extended to 5/31/2012; Basalt Creek extended to 9/30/2016	In compliance
West Linn	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Wilsonville	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	East Wilsonville Extended to 12/31/2015; Basalt Creek extended to 9/30/2016	In compliance
Wood Village	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Clackamas County	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Multnomah County	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Area 93 extended to 6/2/2021	In compliance
Washington County	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	West Bull Mountain & and Cooper Mountain extended to 11/30/2012	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 (Metro Code 3.08) in the same ordinance. Compliance with parking requirements should be addressed in each local government's Transportation System Plan.

² Once acknowledged by LCDC, Title 6 will be an incentive approach and only those local governments wanting a regional investment (currently defined as a new high-capacity transit line) will need to comply. Metro is not intending to require local jurisdictions to comply with the previous version of Title 6 (pre-Ordinance No. 10-1244B).

**APPENDIX B
TITLE 11 NEW AREA PLANNING COMPLIANCE
(as of December 31, 2011)**

Project	Lead Government(s)	Compliance	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	DCLD extension to June 2014; FP extension to 12/31/13; CET extension to 7/31/14	Damascus portion: Comprehensive plan map approved, then overturned by vote; city working on next steps to comply with DLCD deadline of June 2014. NOTE: City has Functional Plan extension to 12/31/13 and CET extension to 7/31/14.
	Gresham	yes	Gresham portion, called Kelley Creek Headwaters Plan, was adopted by city in 2009.
Park Place Master Plan	Oregon City	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; waiting annexation & development
Beavercreek Road	Oregon City	Extension to 6/30/14	Concept plan is completed and accepted by Metro; City has put on hold adoption of the final implementing ordinances pending LUBA appeal and work load.
South End Road	Oregon City	Extension to 6/30/14	City working on scope of work & intends to start in early 2012.
East Wilsonville (Frog Pond area)	Wilsonville	Extension to 12/31/15	City initially completed site analysis w/private builders in 2008; currently City is evaluating and budgeting for major sewer upgrade for eastern portion of City which must be completed before planning and development of site.
Coffee Creek 1 (NW Wilsonville)	Wilsonville	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed, including master plan for area adopted, for this industrial area; waiting development.
NW Tualatin Concept Plan (Cipole Rd & 99W)	Tualatin	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed for this small industrial area.
SW Tualatin Concept Plan	Tualatin	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed for this industrial area.
Brookman Concept Plan	Sherwood	yes	Concept Plan and implementation measures completed; waiting development

Project	Lead Government(s)	Compliance	Status
Study Area 59	Sherwood	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; school constructed.
Study Area 61 (Cipole Rd)	Tualatin	Extension to 5/31/12	City is working with Wash County and Sherwood on going forward with planning.
99W Area (near Tualatin-Sherwood Rd)	Sherwood	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed.
King City	King City	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; annexed to city with portion developed as park and rest in floodplain.
West Bull Mountain Concept Plan	Washington County	Extension to 11/30/12	Concept plan adopted; City of Tigard to take over planning for area.
Cooper Mountain area	Washington County	Extension to 11/30/12	Washington County in talks with Beaverton for City to plan this area.
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	Extension to 12/31/12 or 1 yr after UGB inclusion, whichever earlier	Areas are included in South Hillsboro Area Plan. NOTE: Since the ordinance that brought the South Hillsboro area into the UGB was not effective or acknowledged before 2012, the 12/31/12 date is the deadline for compliance.
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 to be completed in early 2012.
Bonny Slope West Concept Plan (Area 93)	Multnomah County	Extension to 6/2/21 or 2 yrs after agreement w/other govt, whichever earlier	Concept plan map developed though not yet adopted by Board of Commissioners; extension order issued by Metro based on difficulty of deciding on service provider(s).
2004/2005 UGB Expansion			
Damascus area	Damascus	See under 2002 above	Included with Damascus comp plan (see above)
Tonquin Employment Area	Sherwood	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed.
Basalt Creek/West RR Area Concept Plan	Tualatin and Wilsonville	Extension to 9/30/16	Cities scheduled to begin planning in early 2012.
N. Holladay Concept Plan	Cornelius	yes	Concept plan completed; implementation to be finalized after annexation to City.

Project	Lead Government(s)	Compliance	Status
Evergreen Concept Plan	Hillsboro	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed.
Helvetia Concept Plan	Hillsboro	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed.

**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 acknowledgment by LCDC
Title 1: Allow accessory dwelling unit in SFD zones (3.07.120.G) <i>(provision included in previous version of Metro Code as 3.07.140.C)</i>	12/8/2000		12/8/2002
Title 3: Adopt model ordinance or equivalent and map or equivalent (3.07.330.A)	12/8/2000		12/8/2002
Title 3: Floodplain management performance standards (3.07.340.A)	12/8/2000	12/8/2001	12/8/2002
Title 3: Water quality performance standards (3.07.340.B)	12/8/2000	12/8/2001	12/8/2002

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)

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 3: Erosion control performance standards (3.07.340.C)	12/8/2000	12/8/2001	12/8/2002
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 Regional Significant Industrial Areas (3.07.420D)	12/16/2010	1 year after acknowledgment by LCDC	2 years after acknowledgment 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)			6/30/2004
Title 8: Compliance Procedures (45-day notice to Metro for amendments to a comprehensive plan or land use regulation) (3.07.820)	2/14/2003		

Functional Plan Requirement	When Local Decisions Must Comply		
	Plan/Code Amendment 3.07.810(C) 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)	12/8/2000	12/8/2001	2 years after the effective date of the ordinance adding land to the UGB unless the ordinance provides a later date
Title 11: Interim protection for areas added to the UGB (3.07.1130) <i>(provision included in previous version of Metro Code as 3.07.1110)</i>	12/8/2000	12/8/2001	12/8/2002
Title 12: Provide access to parks by walking, bicycling, and transit (3.07.1240.B)			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
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

APPENDIX D

Summary of Compliance Status

(Regional Transportation Functional Plan in effect as of 6/10/2010)

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

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

