



Extension of RTFP Compliance Deadlines

Jurisdiction: City of Happy Valley

Date: September 4, 2012

Contact: Michael D. Walter, AICP

Telephone: 503 783-3839

Email michaelw@ci.happy-valley.or.us

Requests for extensions of Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) compliance deadlines, as authorized in Title 6 of the plan, must be filed with Metro's Chief Operating Officer (COO) on this application form.

Metro Code, 3.08.620, sets forth the criteria and procedure for Metro consideration of extensions of compliance deadlines. The criteria, from Metro Code 3.08.620(B), are as follows:

The Chief Operating Officer may grant an extension if: (1) the city or county is making progress toward compliance or (2) there is good cause for failure to meet the deadline for compliance.

Please complete this application form and submit it to the Chief Operating Officer with a copy to John Mermin, Planning and Development Department:

Martha Bennett
Chief Operating Officer
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

Please submit this request between October 1 - October 12th, 2012.

Part I (to be completed by the local government)

- a. Describe progress made toward compliance with the Functional Plan requirement(s) for which the local government needs more time. Provide desired date for a revised deadline (2012, 2013, 2014).

The City of Happy Valley has expended approximately \$13,000 on consulting work with Angelo Planning Group (APG) and DKS Associates toward determining the scope of work necessary to create a RTFP-compliant Transportation System Plan (TSP) Update. At this time, in very rough terms, based in part on the attached "audit" from APG and informal projections from DKS Associates, it is estimated that a RTFP-compliant TSP Update will cost the City between \$75,000 and \$100,000. This amount far exceeds the budgeted amount the City will be able to dedicate towards said TSP Update, which will likely take several years to complete. This issue is complicated by the removal of the "Sunrise Project" (also referred to as Phase II or Unit II of the Sunrise) extending from roughly 122nd Ave. to 172nd Ave. from the financially constrained RTP. The removal of this facility from the financially constrained RTP may have serious implications to the City's TSP, including the removal of the project itself, the removal of the Rock Creek Interchange Access Management Plan (IAMP) and the downgrade and potential removal of a portion of a major arterial (Rock Creek Blvd. - west of 162nd Ave.) from the City's TSP. Due to these budgetary and technical constraints, the City requests a revised deadline of 2014.

- b. Or, explain why the local government has not been able to meet the deadline set for compliance with the Functional Plan requirement(s). Provide desired date for a revised deadline (2012, 2013, 2014).

As detailed above.

Part II (to be completed by Metro)

- a. Metro staff recommendation

Memorandum

Date: June 29, 2012
To: Michael Walter, City of Happy Valley
From: Darci Rudzinski, AICP, Angelo Planning Group
Cathy Corliss, AICP, Angelo Planning Group
Cc: Reah Flisakowski, DKS Associates
Re: City of Happy Valley RTFP Audit

Overview

Pursuant to the Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP), the City of Happy Valley is scheduled to update its Transportation System Plan (TSP) in 2012. Preliminary steps in this update process are underway, including this audit of the adopted TSP and implementing ordinances, to determine the scope of the planning process.

This memorandum provides an evaluation of the adopted City of Happy Valley Land Development Code (LDC), given regional requirements set out in the RTFP for compliance with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). If a TSP is consistent with the RTFP, Metro will find it to be consistent with the RTP. Metro has provided public agencies and consultants with a draft “checklist” for reviewing local transportation system plans (TSPs), codes, and comprehensive plans for compliance with the RTFP. This memorandum uses the checklist for presenting compliance findings for City code, and in some instances for the comprehensive plan and TSP, with RTFP requirements.

Note that this audit focuses on the RTP elements that must be reflected in local ordinance language. The first section of the RTFP checklist pertains directly to developing or amending a local TSP and those requirements are not addressed here. While the table in this memorandum focuses on the City of Happy Valley Land Development Code (“LDC”), a few requirements in the table may be appropriately addressed in the local comprehensive plan or transportation system plan, in addition to or instead of in local ordinances. Responding to these requirements required an assessment of the adopted TSP and transportation policies in the Comprehensive Plan. Specifically, a review of adopted transportation policy language in the Happy Valley Transportation System Plan (last updated in 2011) and policy language adopted in the Comprehensive Plan (last updated May 5, 2009) was included as part of this audit. In addition, the Clackamas Regional Center Area Design Plan and the Sunnyside Corridor Community Plan (2008) policies were reviewed.

The following table includes the RTFP requirement and a “findings of compliance” column that indicates how the LDC addresses the requirements and what amendments that may be needed in order to better comply with the RTP. The table presents findings identifying how the LDC addresses RTFP requirements and, in some cases, what amendments to the code are recommended to better comply with regional objectives. As noted, recommendations may also pertain to TSP and comprehensive plan amendments.

In summary, the audit in this memorandum is intended to identify potential amendments to adopted policy and LDC requirements that will support the recommendations of a future TSP update. It is intended to compliment and inform the scope of work for the TSP update and to help ensure that future amendments to the TSP and supporting implementing ordinances are compliant with the RTP. The table included in this memorandum indicates that the LDC substantially complies with most of the requirements of the RTFP, which in turn is an indication of consistency with the RTP. The information in the matrix identifies where future needed TSP amendments may also require amendments to the LDC, and where amendments to code language can enhance consistency with the RTFP. The recommendations are LDC chapter- and section-specific, enabling actual draft code language to be developed in association with the implementation phase of the TSP update.