

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 21, 2001
Metro Council Chamber

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

Chair Hosticka called the meeting to order at 1:41 p.m.

1. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the February 21, 2001 meeting were unanimously adopted without revision.

2. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the March 7, 2001 meeting were unanimously adopted without revision.

The Chair altered the order of the agenda items and began with item number 5.

5. Discussion of March 15, 2001 MPAC Parks Subcommittee Presentation

Jim Zehren, MPAC Parks Subcommittee Chair, presented the proposed final report of Parks Subcommittee of MPAC, which is attached and incorporated as a permanent part of this record. No action was taken at the MPAC meeting of March 15, 2001, but it will be on the agenda for approval at the next MPAC meeting of April 4, 2001. Depending upon the comments received, it could go back to the subcommittee. However, if it is passed out of MPAC, it would go to the Metro Council with a request for adoption. **Mr. Zehren** explained the document and its exhibits. **Charlie Ciecko**, Director of Parks and Greenspaces, commented that upon approval by MPAC, the implications of this document for both this committee, and the Metro Council, will affect the Regional Framework Plan, Resolution No. 97-2562B, Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, reconstituting the Parks Advisory Committee, and a variety of recommendations addressing parks. **Councilor Atherton**, asked if a regional park development charge could be assessed; and consideration be given to communities that do not assess system development charges when land is purchased in those communities? **Mr. Ciecko** responded that Metro could impose a regional SDC, however, it could be a considerable challenge. A legal opinion would be helpful. **Mr. Zehren** said a regional assessment of need would have to be done and that would be difficult. **Chair Hosticka** suggested Metro find a role in which to become engaged to help the local jurisdictions. **Mr. Zehren** said difficulties arise in dealing with regional goals versus local prerogatives. It is a dialogue that is very much needed. **Councilor McLain** expressed her appreciation for the excellent document produced by the subcommittee. She mentioned the regionally significant system, and what it was; and, Metro having a leadership role in the regional funding arena. **Chair Hosticka** asked about the reaction expected from the community about this report. **Mr. Zehren** said most likely at the next MPAC meeting substantive comments will be made. **Chair Hosticka** said this document would be used as a foundation, and presented a fairly ambitious work plan for this committee. There was some discussion about matching grant funding. **Chair Hosticka** referenced page 33, items 4.3 and 4.4 relating to Metro reporting, and performance measures, and said that this committee will seriously address this function. **Mr. Zehren** said that there currently is no data to show the progress that has been made in this region compared to ten years ago, or comparable regions, or our own aspirations.

3. Performance Measures (Natural Resource Related)

Chair Hosticka referenced agenda item 3, the page entitled *2040 Performance Measures: Policy Discussion/Potential Policy Issues*. The question is: what is the purpose of doing the performance measures. The three possible purposes were: implementation of the 2040 Growth Concept; a general report to the region about the current conditions; and the actions of the various governments. **Councilor McLain** supported the general report purpose because it included more than green space, showing the connection between green space and transportation; the management of growth and land use issues, providing a complete picture. **Chair Hosticka** added "natural resources" to the general report purpose. **Andy Cotugno**, Growth Management Department, said the first and second purposes might be best viewed as combined determining what was attempted to be accomplished by 2040 in the areas of transportation, open space, growth management and natural resources, and what progress was being made towards reaching that goal. The third suggested purpose was not intended to be a report card, but, what in the larger sense, was happening on the ground - a more focused report. **Chair Hosticka** clarified that any reports should be based on the "region's" progress, not "Metro's." **Councilor McLain** asked if the performance measures would be based on an inventory or an assessment. **Chair Hosticka** suggested she was referencing the last listed purpose - measuring the region's condition at a specific time, or a comparative statement relative to other regions, or relative to Metro's aspirations. **Mr. Cotugno** said how well Metro is doing in implementing 2040 is equivalent to the output measure (what have we implemented), and how well is it working, which is more like a condition. **Chair Hosticka** said that Metro cannot, nor should feel responsible for all the outcomes, but reporting should be done, and Metro could do it. A determination will need to be made as to whether the reports will be used as a way to assess the progress towards a goal, or trying to decide whether the region is in good condition relative to another region. **Councilor McLain** agreed and stated that this committee should attempt to set up a list of possible adjustments that may need to be decided upon as a region. **Gerry Uba**, Growth Management Department, said the last point, comparativeness, should be dealt with last. The first report should address the progress on the ground. The Council and the public will address how well things are going, and a comparison will be made between the two. He said there will be trend data available. **Councilor Atherton** asked about the role of public survey in this process. **Chair Hosticka** suggested contacting the Oregon Survey Research Lab at the University of Oregon. **Mr. Uba** said a performance measure survey of 2040 is planned for mailing out next week. There are two additional two surveys planned in the near future.

The chair summarized the dialogue by stating the first question would assess how the region is doing on issues that Metro addresses - primarily, livability issues. Regarding the last question listed, it was decided that conditions as they currently exist with trend data up to this time would be considered. The third question should not be limited to what Metro has the authority to address, but rather is about what is happening in the region, not just what Metro has done. Citizens' perception of the quality of life in the region was the important indicator. The fourth question regarding outcomes over outputs was discussed, the distinction being that an outcome is a condition that exists regardless of what Metro does, and output is the effort an organization is making or that people in general are making to try to affect those conditions. Discussion was held identifying page 9 performance indicators. **Mr. Uba** stated that the first two questions on page 1 were keys used to identify the indicators on page 9. **Chair Hosticka** asked why the indicators used the word "change," and if "measure" might be substituted. **Mr. Uba** agreed. **Councilor Atherton** asked about miles of parkway trails, not roadway sidewalks. **Mr. Uba** replied it was in Fundamental #2, (page 1), number 6 - Vibrant Place to Live. **Chair Hosticka**

suggested producing a statement of principles for further review. He asked each member to look through the suggested indicators and weight them against the statement of principles for further, future discussion. **Councilor McLain** asked if there was a time sensitivity. **Mr. Uba** said the department hoped to begin gathering data at the first of April with completion at end of June. **Michael Morrissey**, Council Analyst, mentioned that the policy principles page references the performance indicators as 2040 performance indicators, asked if the policy basis for this work was grounded, largely, if not exclusively, in the 2040 growth concept. **Chair Hosticka** said if regional livability and 2040 are the same, then it doesn't matter. If there is a difference, then it needs to be discussed. **Mr. Morrissey** said 2040 is a kind of livability that past Council's have defined in terms of center, corridors and green, and such things. Some key aspect of 2040 should be measured with this work. **Councilor McLain** said a performance measure check is being undertaken to continue to do certain responsibilities. Both a short term and long term review would be done. The Tier 1 performances were around the land use area, specifically 2040. Tier 2 addressed the larger picture, to include the other livability issues. **Chair Hosticka** suggested a thought: 2040 was an answer to a number of questions. If the only measure is the progress toward that answer, perhaps the question should be how are we doing in achieving what it is that 2040 was supposed to help us achieve (what was the livability question). **Councilor McLain** stated what we ultimately want is review of the Future Vision. She asked if we had time to do the larger picture, or do we need to do the first step around the smaller task. **Mr. Cotugno** said the work program has been set up to do a first step in a confined timeframe, tied to the periodic review schedule, which is intrinsically tied to how we are doing with 2040. There are lots of ways to define livability. **Mark Turpel**, Growth Management Department, said there are a couple of open-ended questions on the planning commission survey, and the results of the surveys might broaden the perspective. **Chair Hosticka** said this item will be carried over for conclusion at the next meeting. **Mr. Cotugno** requested any suggestions by members be directed to Mr. Uba.

4. Goal 5 Related - Shortening Goal 5 Timeline

A document entitled *Draft, Program Recommendation by March 2002* was distributed to the committee. The Chair suggested the following questions:

What is the current time line? What resources do we need to keep the current time line? What resources do we need to speed the current time line up?

Andy Cotugno, Growth Management Director, explained the timeline, stressing its importance. He said March 2002 is a milestone because it ends the program development phase. The second milestone is reaching closure in July 2002, and whatever time after that to actually go through the adoption process. To keep the timeline, the current staff assignments are funded positions. About \$75,000 has been determined necessary for consultant support and peer review. It is not clear at this time if we have all of that money. It is still under review. A budget amendment will be needed to fully fund that activity and maintain this schedule. The environmental impact component adequately covered, but an economic impact component is still needed. The peer review provides the credibility check. The schedule is predicated on 50% use of the Salmon Coordinator position, which is currently vacant. **Councilor Atherton** asked if there was funding available from the Transportation Department budget? **Mr. Cotugno** said the transportation grants cannot pay for natural resource activity. The Greenstreets Project, nearly concluded, states techniques of using streets to reduce the impact of streets on the natural environment. But, transportation resources cannot be diverted. Task Descriptions on page 2 of the memorandum in

the packet to Mr. Cotugno from Paul Ketcham outlines 5 resources needed. The first two could use the salmon coordinator funds if they are dedicated to a substitute position, but the last 3 items are not as yet funded, but would accelerate the timeline if they were funded. There are unpredictables that can affect this schedule. **Councilor McLain** stated that slippage can occur which might cause problems with this timeline. **Councilor Atherton** asked if it were possible to obtain support from the Port of Portland. **Lise Glancy** Port of Portland, said they are currently facing a large budget shortfall. They are supportive, but have limited resources. **Councilor McLain** stated that partnering should be explored. **Chair Hosticka** stated that the timeline could be faster, but this time line is able to be supported by this committee.

6. Councilor Communication

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

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Mannhalter
Council Assistant

:pm
i:\minutes\2001\natural resources\032101.nr.doc

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF
March 21, 2001

Document Number	Date	Document Description	RES/ORD
032101.01	March 7, 2001	Draft Final Report of MPAC Parks Subcommittee	
032101.02	January 3, 2001	Draft Program Recommendation by March 2002 - Metro Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection Plan	