

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE MINUTES

October 3, 2001

Metro Council Chamber

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

Also present:

Chair Hosticka called the meeting to order at 1:40 p.m.

4. REGIONAL GOAL 5 – RIPARIAN CORRIDOR & WILDLIFE CRITERIA AND MAPPING

Testimony

Mr. Mike Houck, Audubon Society of Portland, gave oral testimony regarding the Tualatin Basin Goal 5/Natural Resource Committee Letter, the riparian criteria, public notice regarding Goal 5, and the draft Timeline discussed later in the meeting. His comments were summarized in a letter addressed to Chair Hosticka and form a part of the record.

Councilor Atherton said that it seemed like he was giving political advice instead of scientific advice on the issue of the uplands habitat. **Mr. Houck** said that they were linked, however there was a state-mandated process that had to be followed.

Ms. Chris Eaton, Tualatin Basin, submitted a letter for the record, which is attached. She discussed several main points from the letter. One of which had to do with public testimony not being cut off on 10/17/01. **Chair Hosticka** responded that he heard the request, but had not yet arrived at a decision on that. She continued with her discussion on the main points of the letter.

Councilor Atherton asked about addressing the cumulative impacts in areas of influence.

Ms. Eaton said that they were concerned about putting an area of influence on the map at this stage because the draft riparian criteria were so broad that they already included some impact areas, and that “areas of influence” should be considered during the ESEE step and not the inventory step.

Councilor Atherton asked the committee if areas of influence would be addressed in Goal 5 work or deferred to stormwater work?

Chair Hosticka said that we would ask Mr. Cotugno about that. He said it was clear that a lot of thought went into the letter. **Ms. Eaton** said that they wanted more time to review the maps and criteria, and for testimony to be submitted. **Chair Hosticka** said that the maps would change, and that the big issue was that the criteria would be correctly applied. He recessed the public hearing and asked staff to discuss the maps and criteria.

Mr. Paul Ketcham, Planning Department, discussed the following maps: regional maps depicting Title 3 water quality management areas, lands in open space and parks, summary score maps for riparian corridors and wildlife habitat, and three alternative maps demonstrating integration of riparian corridors and wildlife habitat.

Chair Hosticka said it was a useful way to show how scenarios could be generated. He felt the discussion should be focused on how they would be generated. He thanked Mr. Ketcham and asked if they were available on the FTP site. **Mr. Ketcham** said that the riparian corridor quadrangle maps were currently available on the FTP site, as well as the regional summary map for wildlife habitat.

Councilor Atherton pointed to the scenario maps and asked what was the difference between the three scenarios in the Tryon Creek drainage? **Mr. Ketcham** said that the main difference among the three scenarios was how riparian corridors were defined. The first scenario defined all the landscape features providing some level of riparian function as riparian corridors, and the third level defined a more narrow range of functions as riparian corridors. Wildlife habitats were also depicted on the three scenarios. **Mr. Ketcham** noted that all three scenarios showed how the headwaters of Tyron Creek watershed had been heavily developed, which contributed to degraded habitat conditions.

Councilor Atherton reiterated his concern about upland and “sponge” areas in watersheds, and the need to manage or protect those areas, or else all work in riparian areas at the bottom of the watershed would be worthless.

Mr. Ketcham said his point was well made.

3. REVIEW GOAL 5 SIGNIFICANCE TIMELINE

Mr. Cotugno said the draft timeline was included in the packet, and it is attached and forms a part of this record. **Chair Hosticka** asked about the November 21st item on the timeline. He wanted to know when we would have to finish the discussion on criteria to make the December 13th date. **Mr. Cotugno** said that they hoped to start the discussion of the significant resources and regional resources at the October 17th meeting. At the November 21st meeting they hoped to conclude that portion of the discussion so that on December 5th the committee could take action. **Chair Hosticka** said he wanted to be sure they met the December 13th deadline, and he definitely wanted to move on to the significant resources and regional resources discussion in order to make that deadline. **Mr. Cotugno** said that if things progressed according to the draft timeline, it should happen. **Councilor McLain** expressed some concern about making sure the criteria was fully and adequately addressed. **Chair Hosticka** said that he hoped to achieve that as well, but that he wanted to stick to the time frame set out at the beginning of the process. **Councilor McLain** thought that could be done but that the discussion on the criteria could remain open at the same time that discussion commenced on the significant resources and the regional resources. **Mr. Cotugno** said that the committee needed to work off of a definitive map, with the understanding that it could, and probably would, change. **Chair Hosticka** said that this had been discussed at the last meeting too. **Councilor McLain** said that public involvement had always been a high priority to Metro, and that we would continue to make it so.

Chair Hosticka said that the question of public involvement was woven into the timeline. **Mr. Cotugno** said that they were proposing to send letters to property owners and affected citizens immediately, that notice would include “let’s talk” information. **Chair Hosticka** asked if they knew exactly when those would go out. **Mr. Cotugno** said sometime within the next month.

Councilor McLain said that Metro was committed to public involvement at a high level. She cited many examples to support this statement. **Chair Hosticka** said that he had notified the staff to notify everybody in the region.

1. & 2. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the September 13, 2001 and the September 19, 2001 meetings were moved by Councilor McLain, and approved by Chair Hosticka and Councilor Atherton without revision.

5. GREEN RIBBON UPDATE

Mr. Jeff Stone, Chief of Staff, said that the Green Ribbon Committee had become a unit and that they worked well together. They had pared down the number of sites and were getting closer to making a recommendation to the Council. It was difficult for the committee to reduce the number of sites because they

thought they all deserved to be funded. However, fiscal restraints would have to come into play. **Chair Hosticka** asked if he knew when the committee would forward its recommendation. **Mr. Stone** said that he hoped they would complete the majority of the business at the next meeting. **Chair Hosticka** said we might have to schedule a special meeting to discuss and cover that. **Mr. Charlie Ciecko**, Regional Parks and Greenspaces, said that the MPAC park committee's report had analyzed the provision of parks at all levels, and their role in the successful implementation of the 2040 Concept. The report included numerous recommendations that addressed the full spectrum of parks and related lands and facilities. Implementation of all the recommendations would represent a significant change from Metro's current role in the parks arena. One of the primary recommendations of the report was to proceed with all haste to fully implement the vision of the Metropolitan Greenspaces Master Plan. In that regard, the efforts of the Green Ribbon committee were consistent with the MPAC parks report. **Mr. Stone** added that the vision of a regional system in the Zehren report was being mirrored by the Green Ribbon Committee. It demonstrated a good mix of projects along with a regional balance. **Mr. Ciecko** also summarized other activities which were currently underway that were also consistent with the MPAC Parks Report recommendation regarding the Greenspaces Master Plan. Projects discussed included: GTAC consideration of potential amendments to the Regional Trails Plan, GTAC work regarding the identification of lands to be included in the Regional System, GTAC discussion regarding the implications of locally owned parks being included in the Regional System, and consultant work to identify potential incentives for private lands included in the Regional System or impacted by Goal 5.

Chair Hosticka thanked them for coming because the work that the Green Ribbon committee was doing was important.

Councilor Atherton asked about the financial aspects of the Green Ribbon Committee work. **Mr. Stone** said that the committee would be examining the three funding options outlined in the resolution passed by the Metro Council. They included a property tax, adjusting our excise tax, and a regional parks tax. It was not clear yet what mechanism the committee would choose, or even if it would be from a single source.

6. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

There was none.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Bardes
Council Assistant

:kb

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF
October 3, 2001

Document Number	Date	Document Description	RES/ORD
100301-01	10/01/01	Letter re: Metro's Goal 5 Riparian Corridor and Wildlife Habitat Criteria and Mapping from Tom Brian, summarized verbally by Chris Eaton	
100301-02	10/03/01	Regional Goal 5 Fish and Wildlife Habitat Fall 2001 Meetings/Decision Dates (revised)	
100301-03	10/03/01	MTAC Observations Concerning Criteria Mapping for Riparian Corridors and Wildlife	
100301-04	10/9/01	Letter to Carl Hosticka from Mike Houck, Audubon Society of Portland re: Follow up written comments to October 3 rd Natural Resource Committee Goal 5 Hearing	

i:\minutes\2001\natural resources\100301.nr.doc