

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 7, 2001
Metro Council Chamber

Members present: Carl Hosticka, Chair, Councilor Susan McLain, Councilor Bill Atherton

Also present: Councilor David Bragdon

Vice Chair McLain called the meeting to order at 1:50 p.m., since Chair Hosticka had been detained.

1. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the February 21, 2001 meeting were set aside pending arrival of the Chair.

2. Incentives for Natural Resources Protection DRAFT Request for Proposal

Heather Nelson Kent, Parks and Greenspaces, explained the draft request for proposals. She said a financial team has been assembled to seek the assistance of qualified consultants to review the research that was available to date, to solicit the good ideas out in the community, and to detail the implementation of about 10 - 15 good incentive ideas. The goal is to arrive at a package to be presented to local elected officials and other groups as good ideas to implement. The City of Portland, Oregon City, and Parks and Greenspaces have allocated funds towards participation in this effort. Within a month, a team should be selected. She was seeking Council support.

Councilor McLain said WRPAC was interested. **Ms. Kent** has received two responses from the WRPAC group. **Councilor Atherton** asked about the cost involved. **Ms. Kent** said approximately \$50,000. The RFP includes research and implementation of a strategy in working with the other stakeholders.

3. Goal 5 Related

ESEE Request for Proposal

Mark Turpel, Growth Management Department, distributed a memo entitled Request for Proposals for ESEE Analysis, a copy of which is attached and incorporated into the permanent record. The purpose of the RFP is to seek professional assistance in the preparation of the economic analysis portion of the ESEE analysis. It would be submitted to Council for approval as to the approach, with authority for execution by the Executive Officer. The analysis could be done by design type, indicating the positive and negative aspects of each type. **Paul Ketcham**, Growth Management Department, said an ESEE outline on methodology has been done by staff, in preparation for LCDC evaluation. The contract seeks expertise not available in the agency at this time. **Mr. Turpel** said the most concern relates to the science that defines the resource, and what the economic impact will be. **Councilor Atherton** asked how the cost of growth would be factored in. **Mr. Turpel** replied that both the positive and negative factors of economic cost would be addressed. **Chair Hosticka** asked if we were joining other jurisdictions on this work. **Mr. Ketcham** replied that we are working closely with the City of Portland. **Mr. Turpel** said the question before this committee related to the approach and form of this proposal. **Councilor McLain** asked if the budget could support this plan, and expressed her concern that removing an

element from an integrated review could be tricky and wanted to be sure there was a strategy to reintroduce the information. **Councilor Bragdon** asked if thought had been given to the regional significance on the economic front in terms of the significance of one site relative to another.

Mr. Turpel said this has been discussed, but at this time a conclusion has not been reached.

Mr. Ketcham said the analysis will provide a basis for these types of decisions.

Shortening Goal 5 Timeline

Chair Hosticka asked that the agenda be more specific in terms of the direction the staff needed.

Michael Morrissey, Council Analyst, said he would make it happen. This item will be placed first on the next committee meeting agenda.

Science Paper/Species List

Comments were made relative to a list of plants, animals, and insects included in the committee packet.

Chair Hosticka asked if there was something specific to add. **Councilor Bragdon** cautioned that because a species is on the list, does not mean that it will be running rampant throughout the region. **Councilor McLain** suggested that the species list be clearly identified as to what it represents and what it does not represent, so those who receive it understand its purpose.

Mr. Ketcham said a cover letter will accompany the list with an explanation.

Significance Criteria

Mr. Turpel explained a memo he distributed, which is attached and incorporated into the permanent record. He specified the last page of the memorandum, which describes a whole range of possible significance determination. Direction with regard to range and option of significance determination is being requested from the committee, as well as guidance regarding appropriate mapping features related to the significance determination on page 2. **Chair Hosticka** requested an explanation of the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) and asked which OAR's described decision criteria. **Councilor McLain** added that the multi-purposefulness of the work being done needed to be acceptable to fulfill Goal 5 standards, as well as Title 3, and will allow for federal credit where possible. **Ken Helm**, Legal Counsel, said the rules that apply to the significance determination, as drawn up by the state, lead to a point that is not well defined. The Council will have great discretion to decide what a regional resource is, and what a significant regional resource is. He suggested that recommendations and information would be coming forward from local governments and the private sector, urging restriction of what a regional resource is on all different levels and for many different reasons. **Chair Hosticka** said there needed to be listed criteria against which to identify resources. **Mr. Ketcham** said the department is currently working hard establishing the criteria. He said the science paper's link to the inventory is that the criteria should be functionally related to the resource that is to be protected. The listing decision is based on the science and the conservation plan factors in economics. **Mr. Morrissey** asked if there would be any difficulty separating different species within the same habitat? **Mr. Ketcham** responded that there will be different values to different streams and lands. The committee will be involved in the development of this work.

4. Follow-up to Natural Resource Presentation at March 1, 2001 Council Meeting

Mr. Helm distributed a report entitled, Watershed and Fish Conservation, Protection and Restoration Activities, and a copy of Resolution No. 99-2815A which are attached and incorporated into the permanent record. **Chair Hosticka** raised the question of Metro's position as an advocate, as indicated in the report. The choice of the word "advocate" may not be the best choice describing Metro's role. Adhering to language in the Goal 5 Vision Statement would be best. **Councilor Atherton** introduced for discussion Metro's role in watershed issues, and the current moratorium statute. **Chair Hosticka** said the committee would keep it in mind. He said we should continue to work with the National Marine Fisheries Service ("NMFS") as a leader in that role. **Councilor McLain** asked if that included being a leader in all 12 of the NMFS' areas, or being proactive in the few that we have prepared. **Chair Hosticka** said it would be better to go step-by-step. **Mr. Helm** said discussions are underway with NMFS, and an analysis should be completed by April, 2001. **Councilor McLain** said Metro already is very active in the restoration and education program grant, and that this program continues to be utilized. **Chair Hosticka** said it would be good for the committee to see the 27 actions that governments and individuals should undertake to improve water quality, as listed in the report, so the committee could make recommendations to be introduced at the legislative session. He said Metro needs to be proactive, outward oriented, be seen as a policy leader, facilitator and catalyst in this project.

5. Performance Measures (Natural Resource Related)

This item will be carried over to the next meeting.

6. Councilor Communication

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Mannhalter
Council Assistant

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF
March 7, 2001

| Document Number | Date | Document Description | RES/ORD |
|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| 030701.01 | March 5, 2001 | Request for Proposals for ESEE Analysis | |
| 030701.02 | March 5, 2001 | Significance Determination, Metro Goal 5 Inventory | |
| 030701.03 | 2000 | Watershed and fish conservation, protection and restoration activities | |
| 030701.04 | September 30, 1999 | Resolution No. 99-2815A | |