



Metro | Agenda

Meeting: Metro Technical Advisory Committee
Date: Wednesday, March 19, 2014
Time: 10 a.m. to noon
Place: Council Chamber

Time	Agenda Item	Action Requested	Presenter(s)	Materials
10:00 a.m.	CALL TO ORDER Chair Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2013 Compliance Report• HB 4078	Information	John Williams, Chair	In packet
	Citizen Comments to MTAC Agenda Items	Information	All	
10:10	Amendment to Metro Functional Plan Title 4 Regarding Establishment of Trails in Regionally Significant Industrial Areas <i>Objective: Inform MTAC of proposed amendments to Title 4 allowing trails in RSIA's</i>	Recommendation to MPAC	Roger Alfred, Metro	In packet
10:30	Preview of Public Review Draft Regional Transportation Plan Update <i>Objective: Inform MTAC of proposed changes included in the draft 2014 RTP</i>	Information	John Mermin, Metro	In packet
Noon	ADJOURN			

Metro's nondiscrimination notice

Metro respects civil rights. Metro fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, that bans discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin. For more information on Metro's civil rights program, or to obtain a Title VI complaint form, visit www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights or call 503-797-1536.

Metro provides services or accommodations upon request to persons with disabilities and people who need an interpreter at public meetings.

All Metro meetings are wheelchair accessible. If you need a sign language interpreter, communication aid or language assistance, call 503-797-1536 or TDD/TTY 503-797-1804 (8 a.m. to 5 p.m. weekdays) 10 business days in advance of the meeting to accommodate your request. For up-to-date public transportation information, visit TriMet's website at www.trimet.org.

2014 MTAC Tentative Agendas As of 3/11/14

April 2 MTAC meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preview of public review of draft ATP/RTP edits • CSC Scenarios Project: Health Impact Assessment • CSC Scenarios Project: Discuss policy options for consideration by MPAC & JPACT • Draft Forecast 	April 16 MTAC meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft buildable land inventory • Findings from the 2014 RTP and 2015-2018 MTIP – Environmental Justice and Title VI analysis
May 7 MTAC meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation/preliminary approval of the draft public comment ATP • CSC: Preview of draft public engagement report and emerging ideas for draft preferred approach • RTP recommendations to MPAC on potential refinements from public comments 	May 21 MTAC meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments from the Chair: 2014 RTP Process Update/Share air quality conformity results
June 4 MTAC meeting	June 18 MTAC meeting
July 2 MTAC meeting	July 16 MTAC meeting
August 6 MTAC meeting	August 20 MTAC meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2015 Growth Management Decision: draft 2014 Urban Growth Report
September 3 MTAC meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2015 Growth Management Decision: Residential Preference Survey 	September 17 MTAC meeting
October 1 MTAC meeting	October 15 MTAC meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2015 Growth Management Decision: 2014 Urban Growth Report (recommendations to MPAC)
November 5 MTAC meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2015 Growth Management Decision: 2014 Urban Growth Report (recommendations to MPAC) 	November 19 meeting
December 3 MTAC meeting	December 17 meeting

MAKING A
GREAT
PLACE



2013 Compliance Report

March 2014

About Metro

Clean air and clean water do not stop at city limits or county lines. Neither does the need for jobs, a thriving economy, and sustainable transportation and living choices for people and businesses in the region. Voters have asked Metro to help with the challenges and opportunities that affect the 25 cities and three counties in the Portland metropolitan area.

A regional approach simply makes sense when it comes to providing services, operating venues and making decisions about how the region grows. Metro works with communities to support a resilient economy, keep nature close by and respond to a changing climate. Together we're making a great place, now and for generations to come.

Stay in touch with news, stories and things to do.

www.oregonmetro.gov/connect

Metro Council President

Tom Hughes

Metro Councilors

Shirley Craddick, District 1

Carlotta Collette, District 2

Craig Dirksen, District 3

Kathryn Harrington, District 4

Sam Chase, District 5

Bob Stacey, District 6

Auditor

Suzanne Flynn

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	2
Overview.....	2
Urban Growth Management Functional Plan Compliance Status	2
Regional Transportation Functional Plan Compliance Status	3
Appendices A, B, C, D & E	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Metro's Urban Growth Management Functional Plan provides tools and guidance for local jurisdictions to implement regional policies and achieve the goals set out in the region's 2040 Growth Concept. The 2013 Compliance Report summarizes the status of compliance for each city and county in the region with the Metro Code requirements included in the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan and the Regional Transportation Functional Plan. Every city and county in the region is required if necessary to change their comprehensive plans or land use regulations to come into compliance with Metro Code requirements within two years of acknowledgement by the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission and to remain in compliance. The information in this report confirms the strong partnerships at work in this region to implement regional and local plans.

In 2013, there were no requests for extensions of existing compliance dates for the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan. However, an extension request will be processed for the Cooper Mountain planning area. The City of Beaverton took over the planning process from Washington County in 2013.

Eleven jurisdictions had a deadline of December 31, 2013 to meet the requirements of the Regional Transportation Functional Plan. As described below and in Appendix D, three of these jurisdictions have requested extensions until 2014. Two have requested an extension to 2015. All five of these jurisdictions were found to meet one of the two criteria: 1) the city or county is making progress towards compliance; or 2) there is good cause for failure to meet the deadline for compliance. Thus all of these extensions have been granted by the Chief Operating Officer.

Six jurisdictions completed Transportation System Plan and development code updates in 2013 and are now in compliance with the RFTP: Gresham, Milwaukie, Oregon City, Tualatin, Wilsonville and Clackamas County.

Metro Code Chapter 3.07 Urban Growth Management Functional Plan and Metro Code Chapter 3.08 Regional Transportation Functional Plan – March 2014

Introduction

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

Overview

Per the Metro Code, the Chief Operating Officer (COO) may grant an extension request if a local government meets one of two criteria: 1) the city or county is making progress towards compliance; or 2) there is good cause for failure to meet the deadline for compliance.

By statute, cities and counties have two years following the date of acknowledgement of Metro's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) dated November 24, 2011 to bring their Transportation System Plans (TSPs) into compliance with any new or changed regional requirements. However, Metro exercised its authority under the state's Transportation Planning Rule to extend city and county deadlines beyond the two-year statutory deadline. Metro consulted with each city and county to determine a reasonable timeline for this work and adopted a schedule that is part of the RTP Appendix. The deadlines are phased to take advantage of funding opportunities and the availability of local and Metro staff resources.

Appendix A summarizes the compliance status for all local governments with the requirements of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) by the end of 2013.

Appendix B shows the status of Title 11 new urban area planning for areas added to the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) since 1998.

Appendix C summarizes the compliance dates for each UGMFP title.

Appendix D summarizes the compliance dates for the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) in effect as of December 31, 2013.

Appendix E is the Annual Report on Amendments to the Employment and Industrial Areas Map dated January 1, 2014.

Urban Growth Management Functional Plan Compliance Status

Beaverton: Although the planning of Cooper Mountain new urban area has not been completed, the City of Beaverton, which took over planning efforts from Washington County in 2013, is making progress in the concept planning of that area. As stated in the

intergovernmental agreement for the Community Planning & Development Grant between the City and Metro, that planning will be done January 2015.

Lake Oswego: The City of Lake Oswego's removal of their Resource Conservation overlay protections from certain "isolated tree groves" was in violation of Title 13 protections in 2012. Metro filed an appeal with the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) regarding the approval of these comprehensive plan and zoning code changes. The parties to the LUBA appeal agreed to another 60-day extension of the schedule, which set the date for the city to submit the record to LUBA by February 15, 2013. LUBA agreed with Metro and the city is in the process of adopting changes that will comply with Title 13.

The City of Lake Oswego proposed code changes to bring the city into compliance with Title 4 in 2013. The city adopted those code changes in 2013 and has no outstanding Title 4 issues.

Regional Transportation Functional Plan Compliance Status

Eleven jurisdictions had the deadline of December 31, 2013 to meet the requirements of the Regional Transportation Functional Plan. As described below and in Appendix D, three of these jurisdictions have requested extensions until 2014. Two have requested an extension to 2015. All five of these jurisdictions were found to meet one of the two criteria: 1) the city or county is making progress towards compliance; or 2) there is good cause for failure to meet the deadline for compliance. Thus, all of these extensions were granted by the Chief Operating Officer.

Six jurisdictions completed Transportation System Plan and development code updates and are now in compliance with the RTFP: Gresham, Milwaukie, Oregon City, Tualatin, Wilsonville and Clackamas County.

Jurisdictions with 2013 deadlines that requested extensions until 2014

Forest Grove

The City of Forest Grove has made significant progress toward updating the Forest Grove TSP and compliance with the RTFP, including completing a public review draft of the updated TSP. In 2014 the city will hold adoption hearings for the TSP update as well as amendments to the city's development code. Furthermore, the city received a Community Planning & Development Grant to complete transportation planning work in the City's developing area within the UGB and the area with Urban Reserve 7B (Purdin Road Urban Reserve area). Transportation system related information developed through the CPDG project will inform the City's final TSP and development code

Lake Oswego

Several key people involved in Lake Oswego's TSP and Comprehensive Plan updates were laid off in June 2013 for budgeting reasons. This affected the progress of the TSP update work since tasks had to be reassigned to new staff.

Lake Oswego and its consulting team are in the final stages of TSP update and anticipate adopting the TSP by April 2014.

Troutdale

Troutdale prepared a draft TSP and the Planning Commission has recommended it to the City Council for approval. Adoption of Development Code amendments is tentatively scheduled for early 2014. TSP amendments will likely follow soon thereafter.

Jurisdictions with 2013 deadlines that requested extensions until 2015

Gladstone

The City of Gladstone is in the midst of re-evaluating its Master Plan which will include a 20-year look at its capital infrastructure projects (sewer, water, roads, buildings, green spaces, etc.). The transportation projects adopted will be dependent upon the cost of the storm water/water master plans which are being assessed at this time through a third party; sewer and street master plans; as well as the replacement possibility of its City Hall, Police Department, and Library.

Hillsboro

The City of Hillsboro has undertaken three separate large-scale TSP amendments in the past year and half. The three amendments are due to time-sensitive transportation infrastructure and development needs for the AmberGlen Community Plan area, the North Hillsboro Industrial area, and the South Hillsboro Community Plan area (both the North Hillsboro and South Hillsboro areas were added to the Urban Growth Boundary in 2011). The AmberGlen Community Plan area and North Hillsboro Industrial area TSP amendments were adopted in late 2012, and the South Hillsboro Community Plan area TSP amendments were recently adopted in October 2013.

Due to the amount of staff time and resources required to prepare these TSP amendments, the City had to its planned TSP update on hold temporarily where it would fulfill the RTFP compliance requirements. The City initially had hoped to begin the TSP update process in late 2012 with a targeted completion time of late-2013 or early-2014. The City plans to begin its TSP update process in early-2014 with a completion target date of mid-2015.

APPENDIX A

Summary of Compliance Status as of December 31, 2013 (Functional Plan effective 1/18/12)

City/ County	Title 1 Housing Capacity	Title 3 Water Quality & Flood Management	Title 4 Industrial and other Employment Land	Title 6¹ 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	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Cooper Mountain Plan not in compliance	In compliance
Cornelius	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Damascus	Not in compliance	Not in compliance	Not in compliance	See footnote	Not in compliance	Not in compliance	Not in compliance
Durham	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Fairview	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Forest Grove	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Gladstone	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Gresham	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Happy Valley	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Hillsboro	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Johnson City	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
King City	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Lake Oswego	In compliance	In compliance	Pending final city action	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	Currently amending code to be in compliance
Maywood Park	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Milwaukie	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Oregon City	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Extended to 6/30/2014 for Beaver Creek Rd and South End	In compliance

¹ Once acknowledged by LCDC, Title 6 will be an incentive approach and only those local governments wanting a regional investment (currently defined as a new high-capacity as a new high-capacity transit line) will need to comply.

City/ County	Title 1 Housing Capacity	Title 3 Water Quality & Flood Management	Title 4 Industrial and other Employment Land	Title 6¹ Centers, Corridors, Station Communities & Main Streets	Title 7 Housing Choice	Title 11 Planning for New Urban Areas (see Appendix B for detailed information)	Title 13 Nature in Neighborhoods
Portland	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Rivergrove	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Sherwood	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Tigard	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Troutdale	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Tualatin	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Area 61 extended to 12/31/12; Basalt Creek extended to 9/30/2016	In compliance
West Linn	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Wilsonville	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	East Wilsonville Extended to 12/31/2015; Basalt Creek extended to 9/30/2016	In compliance
Wood Village	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Clackamas County	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	Not applicable	In compliance
Multnomah County	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance
Washington County	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance	See footnote	In compliance	In compliance	In compliance

¹ Once acknowledged by LCDC, Title 6 will be an incentive approach and only those local governments wanting a regional investment (currently defined as a new high-capacity as a new high-capacity transit line) will need to comply.

APPENDIX B
TITLE 11 NEW AREA PLANNING COMPLIANCE
(as of December 31, 2013)

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 out of compliance with DLCD order w/deadline of August 2013; city currently undergoing corrective action process of LCDC. NOTE: City out of compliance with Functional Plan extension with deadline of 12/31/13. City has a 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 in hearings for adoption of Comp plan and code, which is substantially compliant with Metro requirements; completion expected in Feb 2014.
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. CDP Grant awarded in 2013; work to begin in summer 2014.

Project	Lead Government(s)	Compliance	Status
NW Tualatin Concept Plan (Cipole Rd & 99W)	Tualatin	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed for this small industrial area.
SW Tualatin Concept Plan	Tualatin	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed for this industrial area.
Brookman Concept Plan	Sherwood	yes	Concept Plan and implementation measures completed; waiting development
Study Area 59	Sherwood	yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; school constructed.
Study Area 61 (Cipole Rd	Tualatin	Extension to 12/31/2021	Extension agreement – planning shall be completed when Urban Reserve 5A is completed, or by 12/31/2021, whichever is sooner.
99W Area (near Tualatin-Sherwood Rd)	Sherwood	Yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed.
King City	King City	Yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; annexed to city with portion developed as park and rest in floodplain.
West Bull Mountain Concept Plan	Wash County/Tigard	Extension to 12/31/14	Concept plan adopted by County and City of Tigard; city working to finalize re-named River Terrace Community Plan and code work; expected completion July 2014.
Cooper Mountain area	Beaverton	Extension pending	Wash County & Beaverton signed IGA in January 2013 transferring responsibility to City; City is currently in planning process with expected completion in winter 2014
Study Area 64 (14 acres north of Scholls Ferry Rd)	Beaverton	Yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; annexed to City.
Study Area 69 & 71	Hillsboro	Yes	Areas are included in South Hillsboro Area Plan. City has adopted these areas into its comprehensive plan; upon annexation, they will be zoned to comply with comp plan.
Study Area 77	Cornelius	Yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; annexed to City.
Forest Grove Swap	Forest Grove	Yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; annexed to City.
Shute Road Concept Plan	Hillsboro	Yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; annexed to City and portion developed with Genentech.
North Bethany Subarea Plan	Washington County	Yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed; annexations underway with some development occurring.
Bonny Slope West Concept Plan (Area 93)	Multnomah County	Extension to 6/2/21 or 2 yrs after agreement w/other govt, whichever earlier	Area has been transferred to Washington County. County will commence finalizing the plan (Mult County work) and creating code for area in spring 2014 with expected completion in August 2015.

Project	Lead Government(s)	Compliance	Status
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 2014. Consultant selected January 2014. Work scheduled to begin in March/April 2014.
Project	Lead Government(s)	Compliance	Status
N. Holladay Concept Plan	Cornelius	Yes	Concept plan completed; implementation to be finalized after annexation to City.
Evergreen Concept Plan	Hillsboro	Yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed.
Helvetia Concept Plan	Hillsboro	Yes	Concept plan and implementation measures completed.
2011 UGB Expansion			
North Hillsboro	Hillsboro	Yes	Concept planning completion due January 2014.
South Hillsboro	Hillsboro	Yes	Concept planning completion due January 2014.
South Cooper Mountain	Beaverton	Yes	Concept planning to begin in fall 2013; expected completion January 2015
Roy Rogers West	Tigard	yes	Concept planning completed; comprehensive planning on going as part of the West Bull Mountain planning, also called River Terrace Community Plan, to be completed December 2014.

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)	12/21/2013	12/21/2013	12/21/2014
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 After one year following acknowledgment of a UGMFP requirement, cities and counties that amend their plans and land use regulations shall make such amendments in compliance with the new functional plan requirement.

² A city or county that has not yet amended its plan to comply with a UGMFP requirement must, following one year after acknowledgement of the requirement (the date noted), apply the requirement directly to land use decisions

³ Cities and counties must amend their plans to comply with a new UGMFP requirement within two years after acknowledgement of the requirement (the date noted)

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)	12/21/2013	12/21/2013	12/21/2014
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)	N/A	N/A	N/A
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 12/31/12)

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

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.

2013 Compliance Report
Appendix E
Annual Report on Title 4



Metro | Memo

Date: January 1, 2014
To: Metro Council, MPAC
From: Martha Bennett, Chief Operating Officer
Subject: 2013 annual report on amendments to the Employment and Industrial Areas Map

Background

Title 4 (Industrial and Other Employment Areas) of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan seeks to improve the region's economy by protecting a supply of sites for employment by limiting the types and scale of non-industrial uses in Regionally Significant Industrial Areas, Industrial Areas, and Employment Areas. Those areas are depicted on the Employment and Industrial Areas Map.

Title 4 sets forth several avenues for amending the map, either through a Metro Council ordinance or through an executive order, depending on the circumstances. Title 4 requires that, by January 31 of each year, Metro's Chief Operating Officer submit a written report to the Council and MPAC on the cumulative effects on employment land in the region of amendments to the Employment and Industrial Areas Map during the preceding year. This memo constitutes the report for 2013.

Title 4 map amendments in 2013

There were no amendments made to the Title 4 map in 2013.

Chief Operating Officer recommendations for 2014

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

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING)	ORDINANCE NO. 14-XXXX
TITLE 4 OF THE URBAN GROWTH)	
MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONAL PLAN)	Introduced by Martha J. Bennett, Chief
REGARDING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF)	Operating Officer, with the concurrence of
TRAILS IN REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT)	Tom Hughes, Council President
INDUSTRIAL AREAS)	
)	

WHEREAS, on December 16, 2010 the Metro Council adopted Ordinance No. 10-1244B, which included amendments to Title 4 (Industrial and Other Employment Areas) of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP); and

WHEREAS, those amendments included the addition of new protections for Regionally Significant Industrial Areas (RSIAs) under Metro Code Section 3.07.420.D that require cities and counties within the Metro region to adopt land use regulations for RSIAs that “prohibit the siting of parks intended to serve people other than those working or residing in the RSIA”; and

WHEREAS, on February 28, 2013 the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 13-4415 approving Metro’s Ice Age Tonquin Trail Master Plan, which describes a proposed 22-mile regional trail facility connecting the Tualatin River to the Willamette River and includes a preferred trail alignment that crosses through an area southwest of the City of Tualatin that is mapped with an RSIA designation; and

WHEREAS, on November 1, 2013 the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) issued an opinion in Terra Hydr v. City of Tualatin, LUBA No. 2013-016, holding that the proposed regional trail described by Metro’s Ice Age Tonquin Trail Master Plan fell within the meaning of a “park” as that word is used in Metro Code 3.07.420.D and therefore would not be allowed within the RSIA; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council has determined that the protections created in Metro Code 3.07.420.D should not be construed to prohibit trails that provide active transportation options and pedestrian and bicycle connectivity from crossing through an RSIA; now therefore,

THE METRO COUNCIL ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

1. Section 3.07.420.D of the Metro Code is hereby amended as follows:

“D. Cities and counties shall review their land use regulations and revise them, if necessary, to prohibit the siting of schools, places of assembly larger than 20,000 square feet or parks intended to serve people other than those working or residing in the RSIA. Nothing in this subsection is intended to prohibit trails from being located within an area designated RSIA on Metro’s Title 4 Map.”

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this _____ day of _____ 2014.

Tom Hughes, Council President

Attest:

Approved as to Form:

Kelsey Newell, Recording Secretary

Alison R. Kean, Metro Attorney



Date: March 13, 2014
To: MTAC and Interested Parties
From: John Mermin, 2014 RTP Project manager
Re: Overview of changes proposed in draft 2014 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

Purpose

The purpose of this memo is to inform MTAC of proposed changes included in the draft 2014 RTP, and provide an opportunity to correct any technical errors prior to the start of the 45-day public comment period on March 21. A tracked-changes and a clean version of the draft RTP as well as the project list are available to download from Metro's FTP site: <ftp://ftp.oregonmetro.gov/pub/tran/2014RTP/>.

Additionally, local agencies and the general public may formally propose additional changes to the draft 2014 RTP during the public comment period. On May 7, MTAC will be asked to review and make a recommendation to MPAC on specific changes proposed during the public comment period.

Background

In 2014, Metro is required to complete a periodic update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) in order to maintain continued compliance with the federal Clean Air Act. The Metro Council and JPACT adopted a work program in September, 2013. Because of the limited available resources and overlap with the Climate Smart Communities project, the 2014 RTP work program was scaled to focus on critical policy and project updates needed in the near term, while deferring less urgent or developed issues to the subsequent RTP update (which will also incorporate Climate Smart recommendations).

The major focus of the 2014 update has been to meet state and federal requirements, and to incorporate recommendations from the Regional Active Transportation Plan (ATP) and Regional Safety Plan. The vast majority of edits to the RTP document are technical / house-keeping. The policy edits are located primarily in the Chapter 2 biking and walking sections. These edits strengthen existing policies and provide additional detail to reflect the Regional Active Transportation and Regional Safety Plans but do not propose any dramatic shifts in policy direction. See **Attachment 1** for an overview of the changes proposed in the draft 2014 RTP.

In addition to edits to the RTP document, the 2014 work program included updating the project list. These updates were limited to projects coming from a local public process such as a transportation system plan or corridor plan. In December 2013, local jurisdictions and partner agencies submitted to Metro new projects as well as changes to existing projects.

Next Steps

As referenced above, on May 7 MTAC will be asked to review and make a recommendation to MPAC on specific changes proposed for the RTP during the public comment period. At its May 14 meeting, MPAC will be asked for its preliminary approval of the RTP pending an air quality conformity determination (and a 30-day comment period on the determination). On June 18, MTAC will be asked for its final recommendation to MPAC on the RTP.

Attachment 1. Overview of Changes proposed in Draft 2014 RTP

Chapter 1 - Changing Times

- Updated existing conditions data and maps covering topics such as road maintenance, safety, public health, rail and marine freight trends, top tier commodities, climate change, job retention and creation, recession recovery, population growth and demographics.

Chapter 2 - Vision

Miscellaneous updates

- **Section 2.5 Regional System Concepts and Policies**
 - Added links to metro webpage to view zoomable version of RTP system maps.
 - Updated use of the terms “system” and “network” for consistency. “System” now consistently refers to sum of the combined modal networks. “Network” refers to each individual modal network, e.g. the bicycle network is part of the transportation system.
 - Updated mobility corridor schematic (Figure 2.3 (formerly 2.8)) showing general location of mobility corridors throughout the region.
 - Added reference to mobility corridor strategies in the Appendix.
 - Updated description of Mobility Corridor Atlas.
 - Updated Arterial and Throughway Network map and System Design map to reflect TV Highway Corridor Plan: TV Hwy now classified as “Major Arterial” instead of “Principal Arterial, and “Regional Street” instead of “Throughway”.

Freight

- **Section 2.5.4 Regional Freight Network Vision**
 - Updated numbers of exports and jobs, and projected volume of trade in region.

Safety

1. **Section 2.3 Goals, Objectives and Targets for a 21st Century Transportation System, and Section 2.3.1 Performance targets**
 - Updated the Safety goal/objective language and performance measure based on the recommendations of the Regional Safety Workgroup to reference “fatal and severe injury crashes” rather than “fatalities and serious injuries”
 - Updated baseline data to reflect 2007 – 2011, the first five years of consistent Metro-wide data.
2. **Section 2.5.1 Regional System Design and Placemaking Concept**
 - Updated Table 2.6 Arterial and Throughway Design Concepts to clarify typical number of planned lanes on major arterials as “up to 4 through lanes with turn lanes” and minor arterials as “2 to 4 through lanes with turn lanes.”
3. **Section 2.5.2 Arterial & Throughway Network Vision**
 - Added text to support Policy 1 - described that medians and access management should be used on streets with 4 lanes or more where feasible. Medians would include openings for turn lanes and access points, as appropriate. Most of the region’s fatal or severe injury crashes occur on roads with 4 or more lanes. Multilane roads have a higher rate of fatal and severe injury crashes, but medians are one of the most effective safety countermeasures, having been demonstrated to reduce injury crashes by 20% - 40%. Access management has also been proven to be an effective countermeasure on multilane arterials.
 - Added text to support Policy 1 - described the need for attention to safety on these facilities, and suggested proven countermeasures including engineering, enforcement, and

education. Also indicated need to develop objective performance measures for region's arterials.

4. Section 2.5.6 Regional Pedestrian Network Vision

- Added text to Policy 2, clarifying that a well-connected network of pedestrian facilities includes safe street crossings.
- Added a paragraph to support Policy 2, noting the importance of frequent well-designed pedestrian crossings, particularly on multi-lane arterials.
- Added text to support Policy 4, describing importance of safe crossings at transit stops.

5. Section 2.5.7 Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) Vision: Added text to support Policy 4, describing improved roadway safety as a benefit of travel behavior changes.

Active Transportation

1. Section 2.3 Goals, Objectives and Targets for a 21st Century Transportation System

- Updated Fiscal Stewardship goal language and objective language (Maximize Return on Public Investment) to reflect need to make decisions guided by data and analyses.

2. Section 2.3.1 Performance Targets

- Updated the baseline data for the active transportation mode share target. Active transportation performance and findings will be updated based on new modeling results prior to the public comment period which begins March 21.
- Redefined the Basic Infrastructure target to be something that is measurable.

3. Section 2.5 Regional Concepts and Policies

- Updated Figure 2.2 (formerly 2.7) Regional Mobility Corridor Concept to reflect that "Parkway" can refer to a Pedestrian Parkway, a Bicycle Parkway or both.

4. Section 2.5.1 Regional System Design and Placemaking Concept

- Updated references to Metro's Livable Streets Handbooks to refer to Active Transportation Plan (ATP) design guidance and provided new schedule for revising the handbooks.
- Updated cross sections in Table 2.6 Arterial and Throughway Design Concepts to include bicycle/pedestrian parkways and regional bikeway/regional pedestrian corridor; (*NOTE – this would be completed prior to the public comment period - time permitting*).
- Added reference to recommended design guidance for regional pedestrian and bicycle network facilities.
- Added reference within "designs for stormwater management and natural resource protection" to trails and noted the Regional Conservation Strategy as a resource.

5. Section 2.5.2 Arterial and Throughway Network Vision

- Updated text to support Policy 1 – revised definition of "complete streets" to reflect national complete streets coalition definition.
- Updated text to support Policy 1 - added reference to the need to consider traffic speeds, volumes and volume of heavy trucks in pedestrian and bicycle design.

6. Section 2.5.3 Regional Transit Network Vision

- Added policy to "Improve pedestrian and bicycle access to transit" to reinforce the need for integration and to be consistent with current RTP bicycle and pedestrian policies.
- Added reference to SMART Master Plan being consistent with policies.
- Added reference to bicycles in Table 2.7 - What Works and Doesn't Work to support Direct Transit Service.

7. Section 2.5.5 (new section) Regional Active Transportation Network Vision

- Added a new section describing the integrated pedestrian and bicycle and transit networks. Bicycle and pedestrian network visions are now a subsection of new section.

8. Section 2.5.5.1 (formerly 2.5.5) Regional Bicycle Network Vision

- Reordered bicycle policies to match the order of the pedestrian policies.
- Updated regional bicycle network vision and policies to be consistent with the five policies

- recommended in the ATP.
 - Updated functional classifications within the regional bicycle network. Trails are no longer a functional classification but are identified as a facility type. The Bicycle Parkways concept was introduced in the last RTP update. It is the highest functional class. Community Bikeways are eliminated as a functional class and replaced by Regional Bikeways. Bicycle Districts have been added and are the same as the Pedestrian Districts.
 - Updated Figure 2.18 (formerly 2.22) regional bicycle network map with new routes and new functional classifications, based on local partner input within the ATP.
9. **Section 2.5.5.2 (formerly 2.5.6) Regional Pedestrian Network Vision**
- Updated regional pedestrian network vision and policies. Policies are refined to be consistent with the five policies recommended in ATP, e.g. adding language to reflect themes such as “comfort” and “safety”; adding new policy to equitably serve all people.
 - Updated the Regional Pedestrian Network Concept (Figure 2.20 (formerly 2.24)) with a cross section or diagram that better illustrates the regional pedestrian concept (*NOTE – this would be completed prior to public comment period, time permitting*).
 - Updated regional pedestrian network map with added new routes and new functional classifications. The pedestrian network map has functional classifications for the first time: Pedestrian Parkways, Regional Pedestrian Corridors. Pedestrian Districts have not changed.
10. **Throughout Chapter 2**
- Replace the word “amenities” when referring to elements of the pedestrian, bicycle and transit networks (such as bus shelters, benches, crossing elements, lighting) with words such as element or feature, to reflect the importance of these elements for a fully functioning, comfortable and safe pedestrian, bicycle and transit travel environment.
 - Add “multi-use path” to accompany “trails” to reflect interchangeable nature of terms.

Chapter 3 - Investment Strategy

- **Section 3.3 What are the Current Sources of Revenue**
 - Updated sources of revenue.
- **Section 3.4 What’s our Budget?**
 - Updated size of revenue targets
 - Updated description of Columbia River Crossing Funding Assumptions (costs and revenues) based on ODOT staff recommendations.
- **Section 3.5 What Investment Priorities are included in the Federal and State RTP Systems?**
 - Revised tables, figures and supporting text describing composition of projects included in federal and state RTP systems - based on updated draft project list.
 - Deleted tables, figures and supporting text reporting community building vs. mobility corridor projects since Metro did not use that framework for soliciting projects in the 2014 RTP update.

Chapter 4 – Mobility Corridor Strategies (moved to Technical Appendix)

- The mobility corridor strategies chapter has been moved from the draft RTP to the Technical Appendix. Metro is underway with an update to the Mobility Corridor Atlas, which will begin to merge elements of this chapter, including RTP projects into its design. The latest Mobility Corridor Atlas will be released this summer after the adoption of the 2014 RTP. The Atlas is a key component within Metro’s federally required congestion management process. Further description of the evolving Mobility Corridor atlas and the integration of information from chapter four will be included within the RTP Appendix.

Chapter 4 - Performance Evaluation and Monitoring (formerly Chapter 5)

- This chapter is on hold until transportation modeling is completed. This chapter will be updated based on new modeling results prior to the public comment period which begins March 21. Additionally, a TPAC/MTAC workshop will be held at Metro on March 17th (Council Chambers, tentatively 2-4pm) to share results system performance results.

Chapter 5 - Implementation (formerly Chapter 6)

- **Section 5.3.1 Corridor Refinement Planning**
 - Updated table and text describing corridors recommended for refinement planning: removed East Metro Connections plan; added recommendations from TV Highway Corridor Plan and described that the Hillsboro to Forest Grove segment still needs to be addressed; revised text describing corridor plans underway, but not yet complete (Southwest Corridor plan and Portland Central City Loop)
- **Section 5.3.2 Project Development**
 - Added summary of recommendations from East Metro Connections Plan.
 - Refined other sections based on recent project development work - Columbia River Crossing project, I-5/99W Connector Study and Sunrise Project.
- **Section 5.4 Congestion Management Process**
 - Updated to reflect current requirements and activities.
- **Section 5.6 Amending the RTP**
 - Updated to clarify what's needed to demonstrate consistency with RTP when making findings for RTP project amendments.
- **Section 5.7.2 Alternative mobility standards**
 - Referenced 2011 Oregon Highway plan and Transportation Planning rule amendments
- **Section 5.7.3 High Capacity Transit System Expansion Policy (SEP) Guidebook**
 - Deleted this section since the guidebook was completed and adopted in 2011.
- **Section 5.7.4 Climate Smart Communities Scenarios Project**
 - Updated to reflect current status of project.
- **Section 5.7.5 Rural Arterial Policy Refinements**
 - Deleted section since the documentation from the Urban Reserves process adequately covers the transportation changes needed in the reserves areas.
- **Section 5.7.6 Greater Portland Pulse**
 - Updated description to reflect current status of project.
- **Section 5.7.7 Community Investment Strategy**
 - Updated to reflect current status of initiative and change of name from Community Investment Initiative (CII) to Regional Infrastructure Supporting our Economy (RISE).
- **Section 5.7.8 Regional Transportation Model Enhancements**
 - Updated to reflect recently completed (and future) model enhancements.
- **Section 5.7.10 Urban and Rural Reserve Planning and Green Corridor Implementation**
 - Updated to reflect outcomes of urban and rural reserves process.
- **Section 5.7.14 Regional Active Transportation Work Program**
 - Updated to reflect completion of Regional Active Transportation Plan and description of the implementation activities funded by the Metro Council.
- **Section 5.7.15 Best Design Practices in Transportation**
 - Updated to reflect updated scope and time frame of proposed activity.
- **Section 5.7.16 High-Speed Rail**
 - Updated to reflect current status of planning activities.
- **Section 5.7.17 Regional Safety Planning Work Program**
 - Updated to reflect recommendations of Regional Safety Plan.

- **Section 5.7.18 Congestion Management Program Data Collection and Monitoring**
 - Updated to reflect current activities.
- **Section 5.7.19 Environmental Justice Methodology & Criteria**
 - Deleted section since RTP staff has developed a new methodology to perform an analysis of RTP projects. Investments will be programmatically evaluated to the census geographies of identified Environmental Justice Communities (including people of color, low-income people, elderly, children, people with limited English proficiency.) The programmatic evaluation is assessing whether regional investments would cause a disproportionate burden to or unintentionally discriminated against environmental justice communities.

2014 RTP Project list

The updated draft RTP project list includes approximately 1,200 projects (an increase from the 1,071 projects in the last RTP) including a large variety of types and sizes. The project list includes a large number of relatively inexpensive projects and a handful of large-scale projects. The following summary provides a snapshot of the scale of projects on the draft list:

Throughways (freeways)

- 2 projects greater than \$1B
 - Columbia River Crossing and Hwy 217
- 7 projects from \$100 to \$300M
- 27 projects from \$750K to \$100M

Transit

- 3 projects greater than \$1B
 - SW Corridor High Capacity Transit
 - Vancouver light rail
 - Milwaukie light rail
- 7 projects from \$100 to \$400M
- 69 projects from \$325K to \$100M

Roads & Bridges

- 5 projects from \$75M to \$265M
- 89 projects from \$20 to \$75M
- 237 projects from \$5 to \$20M
- 212 projects less than \$5M

Active Transportation (biking and walking focused projects)

- 55 projects from \$10M to \$80M
- 87 projects from \$5 to \$10M
- 267 projects less than \$5M

Freight

- 12 projects from \$25M to \$100M
- 24 projects from \$5 to \$25M
- 17 projects less than \$5M

Transportation System Management & Operations (TSMO)

- 7 projects from \$10M to \$90M
- 23 projects from \$1 to \$10M
- 35 projects less than \$1M