

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE MINUTES

June 20, 2001

Metro Council Chamber

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

Also present: Presiding Officer David Bragdon

Chair Hosticka called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

1. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the June 6, 2001 meeting were moved by Councilor McLain, and approved by Chair Hosticka and Councilor McLain without revision. Councilor Atherton was absent.

2. DRAFT Goal 5 Significance Criteria – Public Comment

Mark Turpel, Planning Department, updated the committee on the sequence of steps needed. The criteria is included in the meeting packet. He referenced a letter submitted at the last meeting from Executive Officer Mike Burton, urging Committee consideration of uplands as a part of this whole effort.

Councilor Atherton asked if the uplands were included in Metro's Regional Framework Plan.

Mr. Turpel said, yes, it was consistent, but Mr. Burton had expressed explicit identification with this specific effort, now.

Chair Hosticka commented that there were many questions pertinent to this work. Among them questions regarding criteria: are these correct; do we need additional; are some redundant. Also, is this the correct application of the criteria in terms of the size of areas being mapped, etc., and how do we use these criteria to determine significance, or are there other things to consider. The determination of what a significant resource is not the same determination as a regional resource or what would be a resource subject to a regional program. Those decisions remain to be addressed. **Chair Hosticka** summarized for the record, letters received. They are incorporated and attached as a permanent part of this record.

Teresa Hunzinger, Coalition for a Livable Future, presented testimony urging direction to staff to continue mapping the entire region.

Mike Houck, Audubon and Coalition for a Livable Future Natural Resource Working Group, 5151 NW Cornell Rd., Portland, OR 97210 urged the committee to direct staff to proceed with the current methodology. He provided a letter which is attached to and incorporated into the permanent record of this meeting. He said floodplains should be viewed as a primary function; under the large wooden channel dynamics, the meander zone requires more than 50 feet, and urged its increase based on the science currently available. He urged uplands be included. He stated that the everything on the maps were significant.

Brian Newman, President, Willamette Pedestrian Coalition, and Coalition of a Livable Future, supported the current methodology undertaken. He suggested areas along trails should also be considered based on a quality-based criteria.

Ross Williams, Citizens for Sensible Transportation, commented on building a human environment that provides a livable place for people.

Councilor Atherton asked Legal Counsel if an urban design issue or facilitating recreational, transportation or trail use a legitimate consideration for establishing natural areas. **Mr. Helm** answered that the Goal 5 Rule offers latitude on treatment of areas identified as a resource. Once attributes in an area are identified in keeping with the Goal 5 Rule, then in subsequent stages, types of use can be identified and considered. At this time the determination is being made. **Mr. Houck** responded that fish and wildlife, ESEE, and social objectives go beyond Goal 5 to incorporate social values that need consideration.

Tom McGuire, City of Portland Bureau of Planning, 1900 SW 4th, Suite 4100, Portland, OR 97201, testified that the City of Portland supports the application of functional science-based criteria to identify the significant resources. Cold water source in small streams is significant. He indicated inclusion of uplands.

Robert Groncznack, 809 SE Umatilla St., Portland, OR 97202, read a letter which is attached and incorporated into the permanent record of this meeting. He spoke to Metro's technical work as well as the process for developing the technical and policy decisions. He defined success as a technically sound program that has broad citizen consent. He provided copies of The Forests and Fish Report, dated February 22, 1999, and Review of the Scientific Foundations of the Forests and Fish Plan by CH2MHill, April 20, 2000. **Chair Hosticka** stated that there needs to be broader public engagement recognizing some points Mr. Groncznack made. **Councilor Atherton** supported the public involvement process.

John LeCavalier, Executive Director, John Inskeep Environmental Learning Center, 19600 South Molalla Avenue, Oregon City, OR, submitted a letter which is attached and incorporated into the permanent record of this meeting. He supported the criteria the staff used. He said this current step the committee has taken, is a balance of the political will of this committee, working with the technical expertise and will of the staff to bring together a model that says, here are the functions that will be the basis of future work. The model is good and the steps are in place to move forward with public understanding. The maps should be viewed as what was once a complete system. He urged leading from the watershed approach. **Chair Hosticka** asked Mr. LeCavalier to comment: whether the scoring focused on the individual significance of a site would be different from a watershed approach, which might show varying significances depending upon a site's relationship to other sites within its watershed. **Mr LeCavalier** agreed saying that through this process there will be some opportunities to make decisions about where it is most appropriate to put a huge amount of funding. It is always difficult to talk about that because of the importance of any sub-basin, any watershed, and any creek to the center of the community .

Tom Wolf, Chair of Trout Unlimited, 22875 NW Chestnut St., Hillsboro, OR applauded Metro's efforts with Goal 5. He said there needs to be a balance, including upland areas. Stream types all need to be seen as important for fish, as well as wildlife, with wide buffers. He stated that the public needs to be involved, but that the public process can sometimes defeat a good plan. Strong, consistent science-based plans will promote future livability.

Jim Labbe, 4805 N. Borthwich, Portland, OR, believes in the natural resource planning process. He stated the staff had done a very good job. He said this process has been going on for five years, and needs to be concluded. He supported the riparian buffers, habitat restoration potential, including the upland habitat, and that this matter is not only about fish, but about wildlife and connectivity.

William Kirchner, US Environmental Protection Agency Region 10, 811 SW 6th Avenue, read a letter which is attached and incorporated into the permanent record of this meeting. He requested there be flexibility based on the watershed analysis, and there be an informed decision regarding how large the buffers should be. He also provided a publication, Restoring A River of Life, The Willamette Restoration

Strategy Overview, February 2001, which is attached and incorporated into the permanent record of this meeting, and asked that the committee consider the information contained within it.

Chair Hosticka summarized a letter received from Dean Marriott, City of Portland, Environmental Services, which is attached and incorporated into the permanent record of this meeting.

Councilor McLain reminded the committee about the agreed upon watershed approach. Is looking at significance and regional significance a one-step or two-step process? Is there one criteria or two regarding significance and regional significance? The fact that something is small does not mean it is not functionally important. We are in the inventory step, and these maps are technically sound. Habitat areas and upland areas need to be kept together as a practical matter. Public involvement needs to be done at the right time. She addressed staff saying the inventory step was in good stead, remembering the initial promise to a larger cause, federal ESA regulations and requirements, as well as the social aspects of dealing with the people along the streams.

3. DRAFT Resolution, For the Purpose of Directing Staff to Apply Functional, Science Based Criteria Identifying Possible Fish and Wildlife Habitat on Region-wide Maps and Reporting Back to the Natural Resource Committee for its Review.

Chair Hosticka introduced the draft resolution to potentially be discussed at the committee's July 18, 2001 meeting, and asked for its review by committee. **Councilor Atherton** asked, regarding the uplands question, if the cumulative impacts of development were going to be effectively addressed. **Mr. Turpel** responded that testimony had been heard regarding the uplands for wildlife be considered, and another component would be the stormwater impacts which needed to be addressed. **Paul Ketcham**, Planning Department, said the functional living flesh needed to be added to what is left of the skeleton. The building blocks to address the cumulative effects are the riparian corridors, the uplands, and impervious surface issues. **Councilor Bragdon** commented on testimony: there was a question of floodplain protection – how does the stream flow moderation and water storage function relate or overlap with protection of floodplains? **Mr. Ketcham** said floodplains contribute to the water storage function. How does the scientific literature define the flood plain? The response is the 100-year floodplain, according to the scientific literature, does come up as an appropriate proxy for floodplain function. The 100-year floodplain may have to be included in the definition of floodplain. **Councilor McLain** suggested both should be used. **Mr. Turpel** said the floodplain could be used in different ways depending upon the function. **Mr. Ketcham** said that under large wood and channel dynamics the area subject to flooding has been included as a primary value. The secondary functional value for channel dynamics is the 100-year floodplain, which has lower functional value than those areas that were flooded in 1996. He stated that the criteria used could be revised to include both, however the implications of a revision would be that the 100-year floodplain be elevated to primary importance. **Councilor Bragdon** further asked whether significance and regional resource are one and the same. In Mr. McGuire's testimony earlier, he said they are both the same. Washington County has submitted that they are different. The Goal 5 Vision Statement talks about flexibility to pursue alternative collaborative management approaches to meet the standards of the program. Councilor Bragdon's point was flexibility to meet the standards of the program; to meet certain objectives, not flexibility for the sake of flexibility. Continuing to base work on a functional outcome is the important part. **Chair Hosticka** said that we began with the functions and worked toward the map. The focus was on function. **Councilor McLain** said flexibility will happen through the program elements, incentives as well as regulations, and the different approaches used to reach our standards.

5. Councilor Communication

Willamette Restoration Strategy Overview

Mr. Helm, Legal Counsel, using the Figure 2 map, stated the conclusions of the strategy are very applicable to what we do here in Portland. The summary included 27 critical actions which will improve the basin in general. They do not need to be done simultaneously, but can be done at any time, by anyone able. Because WRI's future funding is questionable, it would be possible for this plan to be marketed and taken to its next phase. There is an opportunity for local governments to do some of this on their own. He suggested Metro can assist with items 9, 10 and 11, and others. He will provide an update as the Legislature concludes. **Mr. Houck**, Audubon Society, contributed to this report. He referenced Figure 4, stating an anti-urban bias. Conservation and restoration of native habitats are primarily on public land outside the metropolitan region.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Mannhalter
 Council Assistant

:pm

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF
 June 20, 2001

Document Number	Date	Document Description	RES/ORD
062001.01	June 11, 2001	Letter to Chair Hosticka from Tom Brian, Chair, Tualatin Basin Natural Resources Coordinating Committee	
062001.02	June 18, 2001	Email to Councilor Atherton, Councilor McLain and Chair Hosticka from Jere W. Retzer	
062001.03	June 20 2001	Letter to Mark Turpel from Richard A. Baranzano	
062001.04	June 19, 2001	Email to Paulette Copperstone from Ron Bunch	
062001.05	June 18, 2001	Email to Chair Hosticka from Laura Hill, on behalf of the Rock Creek Watershed Partners	
062001.06	June 14, 2001	Letter to Chair Hosticka from Mike Houck, Audubon Society of Portland	
062001.07	June 20, 2001	Statement to Natural Resources Committee by Robert P. Groncznack	
062001.08	February 22, 1999	Forests and Fish Report	
062001.09	April 20, 2000	Review of the Scientific Foundations of the Forests and Fish Plan by	

		CH2MHill	
062001.10	June 20, 2001	Letter to Chair Hosticka from John LeCavalier	
062001.11	June 20, 2001	Letter from William Kirchner, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, Oregon Operations Office	
062001.12	February 2001	Restoring A River of Life, The Willamette Restoration Strategy Overview	
062001.13	June 20, 2001	Memo to the Natural Resource Committee from Dean Marriott, Director Environmental Services, City of Portland	

\\mrc-files\files\oldnet\metro1\council\depts\minutes\2001\natural resources\062001.nr.doc