

## NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE MINUTES

September 19, 2001

Metro Council Chamber

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

Also present: Councilor Bragdon

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

### 1. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the September 13, 2001 meeting had not been distributed in time for the Councilors to review them and were, therefore, deferred to the next meeting.

### 2. RESOLUTION NO. 01-3095, FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONFIRMING THE APPOINTMENTS OF SYLVIA MILNE, ALETA WOODRUFF, AND REBECCA BANYAS TO THE REGIONAL PARKS AND GREENSPACES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Mr. Ron Klein**, Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces, said that the Parks Advisory Committee consisted of 11 members. Each council district had a representative, as does each of the 4 surrounding counties. They solicited interested citizens who would be passionate about serving and supporting the parks department. They received 20 requests for applications, 5 of them came back, and three were before the committee for council conformation. Sylvia Milne was an incumbent serving in District 2. Her professional focus was in youth social services. Aleta Woodruff was a former proofreader and editor for Stanford University. Rebecca Banyas was a public art consultant.

**Motion:** **Councilor McLain** moved Resolution 01-3095 with a do-pass recommendation.

**Chair Hosticka** asked if, in terms of the criteria for appointment, there were people who could not be nominated by virtue of other offices they may hold. **Mr. Klein** responded that yes, during the formation of the Parks and Greenspaces department, the structure of the committee was made citizen-based. **Chair Hosticka** asked if that would apply to board members of the park district. **Mr. Klein** said that a former member, John Griffith, who was on the committee and whose term was expiring, also ran and was successfully elected to the THPRD board of directors, so it was a smooth transition from one to the other.

**Vote:** **Resolution No. 01-3095** vote was 3/0, motion passed unanimously. **Councilor McLain** will carry the Resolution to Council.

### 3. RESOLUTION NO. 01-3097, FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONFIRMING THE APPOINTMENT OF CARRIE PAK AND ROBERT STORER TO THE WATER RESOURCES POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Chair Hosticka** said that there was an amendment to the resolution, which is attached and forms a part of the record. **Mr. Mark Turpel**, Growth Management Department, said that the resolution asked for consideration for appointing two people. Unfortunately, one of those people accepted another job offer. Therefore, staff prepared a revised resolution for consideration, with only Carrie Pak listed. She was the Storm Water Manager for the City of Gresham, and a registered professional engineer. **Councilor McLain** said that Ms. Pak had indicated that they would try to get an alternate for the other position identified as soon as possible. Councilor McLain said that Ms. Pak had attended two meetings already, but had not been able to vote. She said that she wanted to go forward with the resolution so that Ms. Pak could vote at the next meeting if necessary.

**Motion:** **Chair Hosticka** moved to adopt Resolution 01-3097A which was the nomination for Carrie Pak to join the Water Resource Policy Advisory Committee, but was silent on the issue of an alternate.

**Vote:** **Resolution No. 01-3097A** vote was 3/0, motion passed unanimously. **Chair Hosticka** will carry the Resolution to Council.

#### **4. RESOLUTION NO. 01-3103, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING A CONSERVATION EASEMENT IN THE NEWELL CREEK CANYON TARGET AREA AND ENTERING INTO A BOUNDARY AGREEMENT**

**Mr. Jim Desmond**, Manager, Open Spaces Acquisitions, said that they were seeking council approval to purchase a conservation easement of over 15 acres in the Newell Creek Target area. **Chair Hosticka** asked if there was a reason why it had to be adopted formally. **Mr. Desmond** responded that state law required that public bodies formally determine that the acquisition would be in the public interest before an easement could be taken. This had to be done at one or more public hearings, at which the proposal would be accepted or rejected. He said that Metro owned properties north and south immediately adjacent to the easement, so it would fill in one of the gaps in the Newell Creek Canyon Target area. He said that the easement would give Metro full control, and limit the school district's ability to do anything with the property, except to build trails, which both Metro and the school had reserved the right to do. If they had a trail plan, Metro had to approve it, but if Metro had a trail plan, they did not need the school's approval. He felt that a partnership with the school for this potential, should it go through, was quite high. **Chair Hosticka** asked him to talk about the boundary agreement. **Mr. Desmond** said that when Metro bought the property immediately to the south, they learned that the landowner had been in a long-standing dispute with the school district over an alleged encroachment by Metro's predecessor onto the school district land. If Metro took the easement over the property, the dispute would go away. **Chair Hosticka** asked if the property was inside or outside the UGB. **Mr. Desmond** said it was inside. **Chair Hosticka** said he was trying to determine where the UGB fell on that. **Mr. Desmond** said that it snaked around Newell Creek. He said that because of highway 213 the boundary was irregular. **Mr. Desmond** felt that it had benefits from a natural resource or public use point of view. **Chair Hosticka** said that Mr. Desmond might have inadvertently set off land mines in another committee, which was discussing the issue of amending the UGB for the purpose of bringing in school property. **Mr. Desmond** said that that was not his intention. **Chair Hosticka** said that the question then arose how would Metro guarantee that it remained school property.

**Councilor Atherton** asked about the details of the map. **Mr. Desmond** described sections of the map to him, pointing out the school property, highway 213, and the easement area. He said that the bigger vision was to connect a trail from the Clackamas Community College and the environmental center, John Inskeep Learning Center, to Newell Creek. That was still in a conceptual phase and there would not be sufficient funds in the bond measure to make that entire connection. But it was a long-range goal. **Councilor McLain** said that she thought that by providing a conservation easement Metro was preserving, protecting, and producing connectivity between the properties. She said that there would also be a trail, eventually. **Mr. Desmond** said she was correct. A conservation easement would do two things. The owner would retain ownership, so the school district would continue to be the owner of the property, but the easement put permanent restrictions on the property. The school district can't build, cut timber, or clear-cut. Metro would gain certain rights to put a trail there if Metro chose to. **Councilor McLain** said that she couldn't see any down sides to this. The school recognized a good partnership. If there was something tricky with the easement then she would want to know. **Mr. Desmond** said there was nothing tricky to worry about. **Councilor McLain** said she thought it looked good.

**Councilor Atherton** said that the cost seemed a bit steep for easement purposes. He wanted to know if Metro was setting a new benchmark. **Mr. Desmond** said that they had an appraisal done. He explained that they analyzed the market value of the property before and after the easement was put on. They took into account that the school district cannot build on the property, they cannot cut the timber, they cannot put a

street or a home there, and then determined the remaining value. It was reviewed by two independent appraisers for Metro and another one hired by the school district. All three appraisers agreed that it was a fair value. **Councilor Atherton** said that the easement looked to be at least 2 acres wide and 8 acres long. He thought that normal easements were a little skinnier than that. **Mr. Desmond** that the shape of the parcel was somewhat linear, but it was 15 acres total. **Chair Hosticka** asked him to repeat the price. **Mr. Desmond** said it was \$159,000, which worked out to roughly \$10,000 an acre. He also said that one home site on a 15 acre parcel would be worth that, and the timber value would be close to that also.

**Chair Hosticka** asked if there was a motion.

**Motion:** **Councilor Atherton** made the motion to adopt Resolution 01-3103.

**Vote:** **Resolution No. 01-3103** vote was 3/0, motion passed unanimously. **Councilor Atherton** will carry the Resolution to Council.

## 5. GOAL 5 RIPARIAN CRITERIA: DRAFT REGION-WIDE MAP

**Chair Hosticka** asked if anyone wanted to address the issues before the committee. No one came forward. He then said, referring to Goal 5 Riparian Criteria, that it was a punctuation point in the long process. The committee had seen some pilot mapping of the criteria, the staff had spent the summer working on the maps, and the staff had now completed the region-wide map for committee review.

**Mr. Mark Turpel** said that he had some introductory materials on a power point presentation, but he felt that it was not needed after all. He also had a letter from Executive Officer Mike Burton, which forms a part of this record. He summarized the letter.

**Mr. Paul Ketcham**, Planning Department, said that the staff were responding to the Natural Resource Committee's and the Council's resolution that was passed at the end of July. They had asked that staff take the criteria that had been presented in the pilot studies for riparian corridors, and to apply them region-wide. They had also asked them to develop the wildlife habitat criteria, and to apply those to maps, and to present them to the committee. The committee had asked that those steps be completed by September. The staff had made good progress. On August 17<sup>th</sup> the staff had a special meeting of the Goal 5 Technical Advisory Committee, where they reviewed the wildlife criteria and applied that criteria in the Bronson Creek study area. That criteria was presented to the Natural Resources committee at the previous meeting. Staff was in the process of applying the criteria, based on the committee's direction, to produce a regional map of wildlife habitat. They were also in the process of developing additional criteria for wildlife habitat that was based on unique habitat information obtained from the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Service and the Oregon Natural Heritage Program. They hoped to have something to present on that in the near future. The maps presented to the committee were riparian corridor maps for the region. The maps represented the six functions that were derived for the scientific literature review, and the criteria derived from that review. He said that Mr. Houk would make a presentation on the maps. He said that the maps represented a first cut at technical corrections on the Goal 5 inventory that were received as a result of preliminary Goal 5 maps sent out in February 2000, and the more recent Goal 5 inventory map sent out in February 2001 for public review. There were other technical corrections to be made and reviewed, but primarily flood plane corrections were on the maps presented. The affected areas were the Columbia Corridor Association area, and the Port of Portland properties. There were a number of stream realignments, and wetland technical corrections. Another issue, he said, was defining a riparian area of influence, and if that should be tackled at the current stage of the process. Staff said they were ready to look at that issue whether the committee wanted them to.

**Mr. Justin Houk** went over the maps displayed. The first map had Title 3 Water Quality Areas showing potentially protected areas along streams. The next map had Parks and Open Spaces showing areas that were potentially protected because they were parks, trails, or open spaces. He read from the matrix of resolution 01-3087A. That document is attached and forms a part of the record. He said the next six maps were based

on the sub-criteria, and tried to capture the values for ecological functionality within certain areas associated with riparian corridors. The culmination of all those maps went into a composite map. The final map showed the Title 3 areas and the open spaces areas, and all the areas from the model that had resource value.

**Chair Hosticka** asked if there were any questions about the maps or the discussion. He observed that there was a lot of variability on the maps, and that reflected the high degree of variability within the region. He felt that the maps were trying to take into account that great diversity, and thought the committee and staff should keep that in mind as they went through the process of determining how to conserve, protect, and restore the riparian corridors.

**Councilor Atherton** said that the big picture view was that all the areas that had great values on the maps were the areas that people wanted to target for growth. He felt that the impact was potentially substantial. He asked Mr. Ketcham what he learned from the detailed studies. **Mr. Ketcham** said that the mapping process indicated how fragmented and impacted the stream system was, in the urban environment, especially when looking at watersheds from a functional perspective. The other thing he learned was that we still had big chunks of habitat left that could be addressed through long-term action at the regional scale. He felt that we could begin to increase functional value of degraded stream areas, and identify them better. He also said we could identify anchor habitats that help bring up the rest of the function of the system if we protect those areas, and restore degraded areas. He learned that they had developed a potentially powerful tool for managing watersheds in a more healthy way. He said that the mapping methodology took a snap shot in time, in terms of ecological function of the urban area. He thought it reflected what was out there, and provided a relative scale for what was in a degraded condition verses what was in a functional condition in our watersheds. What it didn't do was help us understand what additional steps needed to be taken to restore the water systems, streams, wetlands, and floodplains. He said the approach should be more consistent with the ultimate goal of restoration as well as protection of what remained.

**Councilor Atherton** said he had made a note about the hydrologically connected wetlands. He said that they had set an arbitrary number of a quarter of a mile. He wanted to know if that number was supported by the science in that area. He was concerned because that was a geographically diverse area, and it had a volcanic history. He said that the more he learned about underground water, how far it could travel, and the resulting impacts, he was stunned by the short range of only a quarter of a mile. **Mr. Ketcham** said that they had chosen the quarter mile measurement because that was the distance that was supported by the Oregon Fresh Water Assessment Methodology for Wetlands. **Mr. Houk** added that they had done a little work to assess where the wetlands were located. His guess was that 98 percent of the mapped wetlands fall within a quarter mile of a stream. He felt that there probably wasn't a whole lot that was being changed by using that criterion. **Councilor Atherton** said that there was an exception to every rule, and he cited a case in Clackamas County. There was a school site located in a 17-acre wetland that clearly was hydrologically connected to Kellogg Creek. Yet the Division of State Land issued a permit for fill and they went into the buffers, logged it, and they got away with it even though it was known to be hydrologically connected to Kellogg Creek, an ESA stream.

**Mr. Ketcham** said that was a reference to our regulatory state program for wetland protection. He said that there had been an article in the Oregonian about a month ago on a consultant's report to the Division of State Lands about wetland protection administration in the state of Oregon. The mitigation requirement for allowance was shown to be very ineffective. This finding for mitigation of allowance for destruction of wetlands was mired in national findings because the National Academy of Sciences study on wetland loss in the United States also corroborated that same point. He said that we continue to lose wetlands, and that the mitigation employed to compensate for wetland loss was not very effective. What Metro could do in that process would be to help identify where the wetlands were, and how they functionally relate to streams. This might help educate the general public and policy makers about the importance of wetlands, and the need to be more conservative in the alteration and/or destruction of those areas. **Councilor Atherton** said that, related to the case he mentioned before, what seemed to be particularly egregious was that they had settled on a process of buffer averaging. So, not only had they filled the wetland and created a buffer, which was

intended to save the wetland, but then they averaged the buffers to the point that they were really narrow where it really counted, and really wide where it didn't matter. He said that the staff's data was fantastic to the point that it reinforced the need to be more aggressive and hard-nosed, and real, about the regulatory schema Metro had set up. **Mr. Ketcham** said that the wetlands were covered in a number of places in the criteria. He said that wetlands should figure high on the ranking scale of ecological function.

**Chair Hosticka** asked if there were any other comments on the maps. **Councilor McLain** asked when they were thinking about what they had discovered on the maps were they keeping in mind Title 3, and what had already been required for water quality and flood mitigation? She also wanted to know if they had found anything they thought was not consistent with Title 3. **Mr. Ketcham** said that they had done some preliminary non-quantitative analysis. He said he thought the maps depicted, in a qualitative sense, where there was overlap. Title 3 areas were depicted as being already protected for fish and wildlife analysis. They did not include flood areas under Title 3 because they did not assess cut-and-fill positions as adequately addressed in fish and wildlife concerns. The Title 3 water quality resource areas on the compilation map encompassed some of the core area values under the ecological criteria for fish and wildlife. Since those Title 3 areas were closest to the stream, those areas got rated the highest for ecological criteria for fish and wildlife. However, what they learned through the process of comparing those two items, was that Title 3 water quality covered a much smaller proportion of the actual area providing for riparian function for fish and wildlife values. He said that was a common theme, except where Title 3 areas extended beyond 50 feet because of steep slope considerations. There you saw more substantial coverage of water quality areas, and overlap with fish and wildlife areas. But, where there were no slopes it was fairly minimal. Some corridors could be seen as having substantial protection through acquisition or Title 3 water quality. Other areas were left vulnerable outside of those existing, protected areas.

**Councilor Bragdon** said that since the maps were snapshots of what actually existed, did they point in any way towards restoration opportunities, or were restoration opportunities identified through some other means? **Mr. Ketcham** said the ecological mapping of those areas provided sign posts and indicators of areas that could benefit from restoration actions. So, it was a necessary tool for them to understand the greater picture of restoration. In and of itself, however, it was not a satisfactory tool for enabling Metro to carry out a restoration program. **Mr. Turpel** said that at the last meeting the subject was brought up of possible areas of influence. That would be a way of identifying at least potential areas for restoration. **Mr. Ketcham** said that areas that were already developed, where substantial public investment would be required, would be Tier 3 work restoration. The second category might be areas that retain ecological function, where there were still green areas along the stream. Replanting along the stream for more structure, such as mixed conifer forest, hemlock, cedar, and so on, to get more habitat value along the stream, would be feasible because there would be no development there. The first category might include areas that had current ecological function, but were depressed because of intrusions of exotic species, such as ivy, and Himalayan blackberry. He said that the mapping process helped more to identify the second and third categories. **Councilor McLain** said she thought the inventory revealed things about restoration that we didn't previously know. She said that due to the process of determining the difference between a flood plain and flood way, we had learned that it was possible to identify certain levels. She said that another important element to consider was making sure we do it at the right time. The first question she had was when should it be mapped, in relation to the distinction on what Goal 5 required. Secondly, she asked, if we put some of that information down in the inventory, was it going to harm our definitions, or our area of basic protection?

**Mr. Ketcham** gave a non-legal response by saying that the area of influence was driven from an ecological perspective of stream and wetland function. It was an area of the landscape where activity occurring in that area could either positively or adversely, affect the function of that stream. He said that identifying areas of influence at that stage of the process would be an extension of the ecological criteria process that they were mapping. The issue of regulation, or incentives, or programmatic issues, would be activated in the next step of the process, through the Goal 5 process. After making a decision of what was a regional resource, and what was a significant resource, the next step would be to do a comprehensive analysis of the conflicting uses in various regional zones. Then after doing an analysis of conflicting uses, determine where the impact

areas were, so that the council could find developed areas that were impacting the values of the resources that Metro was trying to protect. The analysis would allow the council to determine if a conflicting use in an impact area was less or smaller than an area of influence. This would allow staff to say here was a potential area of influence that was supportable by the science, which would help the larger community understand that developed areas were influencing the conditions of those streams by the very fact that they were there.

**Mr. Ken Helm** said that the provision in the Goal 5 rule that required local jurisdictions to identify an impact area was fairly broad. There was little direction about how it should be done. He would say, from a strictly legal perspective, that simply acknowledging that there was a scientific concept for an area of influence, and that we wanted to attempt to show it on a map, was a very different planning procedure than identifying the impact area. He said that Metro could be very clear that we were not identifying an impact area right now, but simply an additional piece of information to show on the map. **Chair Hosticka** said that it would be useful to have an entirely separate map showing areas of influence, before including it on the composite map. He thought that with the separate map in comparison to the maps already completed, we could make some determinations later on as to how we were going to treat those areas. Because otherwise, he said, we add one more layer of complexity to the map, the discussion, and the politics of the issue. He thought we might not know what we were getting ourselves into, and we don't want to send a signal that we were already embarking on that until we made a firm decision.

**Councilor Atherton** talked about Tryon Creek and areas of influence. He felt that Tryon Creek should be restorable. He said that there was a problem with fish passage due to the sewers leaking into the stream. He said that it was the volume and velocity of flow that was destroying the stream structure. He said that the creek was a prime target for restoration, and that it would not be done unless they took into account the areas not targeted yet, the areas of influence. **Councilor Bragdon** said that when we start talking about zones of influence it really was anywhere that a raindrop falls. He said that there was probably a different legal definition, but that once you start talking about the zone of impact, due to rainwater and storm conditions, it really exists everywhere. **Mr. Ketcham** thought that was a good point, and that someone could effectively argue that the whole watershed was an area of influence. The staff was thinking more of conditioning how we would define an area of influence, and narrowing that definition to one that was consistent with how they had mapped the functions of streams. Drawing on the same literature used to establish the criteria, they hoped to define a defensible area of influence for wetlands. From that basis they could define an area of influence that would be a particular distance from a stream, and that would have a higher potential for influencing directly the nature of the aquatic system, and the wildlife area, than a distance farther away. **Mr. Turpel** said that while it may not be a Goal 5 specific activity, it was on the work plan. He thought that if Metro simply concentrated on the areas along the riparian corridor, and that even if they did the very best job, as long as they were still piping high volume, high temperature, and highly polluted water into those areas, the full benefit of those investments would not be realized. **Mr. Ketcham** said that perhaps it was a two-tier zone of influence. Tier one would be the areas closest to the stream for which we could demonstrate from the literature a more direct impact. Tier two would be farther away from the stream but would affect the quality of the water flowing into the stream.

**Councilor McLain** said she thought the issue was timing, as well as a question of what do we want to see on the map. She thought she heard the chair say that he wanted to do the very best job with the inventory to make it simple to understand. She felt that it was the inventory that the committee would be making some choices on, especially in regards to what was regionally significant. She wanted to see a good definition of what the inventory meant, as well as second good definition of what was regionally significant. She said that the committee acknowledged that there were varying areas/degrees of influence. She thought it should be clearly stated in the scientific paper, and all related literature. She wanted to be sure that the committee got good comments from staff legal, and other staff, on what would make it easiest for us to defend and explain. She said she was okay with all their comments being addressed as we go, but she did want to make sure that the documentation and the mapping, that the committee must use to show that they had done all the steps for Goal 5, was very clear. **Councilor Atherton** said that he agreed with everything she said except one word in her last sentence, which was "all that we had done for Goal 5." He felt that even though that might be a

public relations issue, go ahead and adopt the maps, and protect those areas which were clearly, as Paul said, first Tier. His concern was to also make it clear that the area of influence, i.e. the watershed, was the next step, and that it had to be done in combination with the other, otherwise it wouldn't work. He thought it became more of a best management practice area, as Mr. Turpel had pointed out. Maybe the storm water goals would get at it, but he hated to sell it as **all**; that by somehow adopting this, Metro was going to save the wildlife, because they wouldn't.

**Chair Hosticka** asked if the staff could prepare a map that would show areas of influence as a separate map from those shown, and then the conversation could continue about what to do about those areas as part of the Goal 5 process. **Mr. Turpel** said that was okay. **Mr. Ketcham** said it would be an informational map for the committee's consideration. **Chair Hosticka** said the committee might have the desire to do something about that, but they were not sure, at that point, what it was. He said that they do know that they want to pursue what was on the maps already, and he emphasized that they were in the process of working on that. **Mr. Turpel** asked if Chair Hosticka was also suggesting that two zones be shown. **Chair Hosticka** said that he was not suggesting that, but if somebody else wanted to, he would not object. **Councilor Atherton** thought that was an excellent point because if you were to use best management practices at Tyron Creek's zone of influence, you had a chance of restoration, whereas on some other sites, you might just be throwing your money down a rat hole.

**Chair Hosticka** wanted to talk about where they would go from there. Regarding the final determination of the information on location quality and quantity – he wondered if what they had was adequate information. The other determination to make was which of the resources on the maps were significant resources, and which were regional resources. He said that they wanted to make all those determinations before Christmas. Also, they had told people that once the maps were released, they would have the chance to comment on criteria. He thought the first question was when were those maps going to be available to the public? Even though they were now functionally and officially on the record, when could people get their hands on them? **Mr. Ketcham** said that the maps would be available electronically next week on the FTP web site. They would have the quadrangle maps available for the region. Also, they would have a regional map depicting wildlife habitat according to the criteria presented last week. **Chair Hosticka** said the public could testify on the criteria at the October 3<sup>rd</sup> and October 17<sup>th</sup> Natural Resources meetings. **Mr. Ketcham** said that they would make a broadcast announcement to all the committees. **Chair Hosticka** asked to be sure to include mailings to anyone who had given testimony previously. **Mr. Turpel** said that they would use the same list as was used to inform the public on the earlier criteria. **Councilor McLain** asked if it included people on the Columbia Corridor, Westside Economic Alliance, CPOs, neighborhood groups in Portland, and CCIs? **Mr. Turpel** said they could be added or covered if they were not already on the list. **Councilor McLain** asked that if they could not make it to the October 3<sup>rd</sup> or 17<sup>th</sup> meetings, could they still come and talk about maps another time? **Chair Hosticka** said that at some point we have to close the door on discussion on the criteria, and it was his hope to do it in the middle of October. He wanted to know if someone had the money and the interest could they go down to the resource center and get a copy of the map. **Mr. Turpel** said not at this time. He said that MPAC had tentatively scheduled a presentation of the maps for their September 26<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Councilor McLain** said that her concern was that we had an organized public involvement piece. She wanted to see a list of the meetings or opportunities for the public to testify sent out. **Chair Hosticka** said that he wanted the public to be informed of the next steps, significance and regional significance. He said he hoped that the council would be making a determination of what was a regional resource. He asked when the combination map of the uplands and the riparian corridor would be available. **Mr. Ketcham** said it should be available by October 3<sup>rd</sup>. **Chair Hosticka** said that it would be interesting to see what showed up on the upland map that was not on the riparian map, and where it overlapped. He summarized where they had reached – the maps would be available at the end of next week, the public would be able to comment on criteria on October 3<sup>rd</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup>. **Mr. Ketcham** said that they could comment on both the upland and riparian criteria. **Chair Hosticka** said his goal was to try to achieve closure on the criteria question on October 17<sup>th</sup>. He said he wanted the staff to put together a timetable that could be distributed to the public. **Mr. Turpel**

said that staff could put together a draft timeline over the next few days. **Councilor Bragdon** said that they should have a conversation with John Donovan for that. **Chair Hosticka** said they should do it as soon as possible. He said that the designation of areas as regional resources was a very crucial process that required a wide public involvement.

**6. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION**

There was none.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Bardes  
Council Assistant

:kb

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF  
September 19, 2001

<b>Document Number</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Document Description</b>	<b>RES/ORD</b>
091901-01	9/13/01	Revised Resolution No. 01-3097A for the Purpose of Confirming the Appointment of Carrie Pak to the Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee	Resolution 01-3097
091901-02	7/26/01	Resolution No. 01-3087A 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	Resolution 01-3087A
091901-03	9/19/01	Letter to Councilor Carl Hosticka, Chair to Natural Resources Committee, from Metro Executive Officer, Mike Burton about the draft Goal 5 riparian maps presented at the meeting.	
091901-04		DRAFT Regional Goal 5 Riparian Corridor Inventory Roll Out fact sheet put together by the Metro Parks Department	