

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL/EXECUTIVE OFFICER INFORMAL MEETING

November 27, 2001

Metro Council Annex

Councilors Present: David Bragdon (Presiding Officer), Susan McLain, Rod Park, Bill Atherton, Rod Monroe, Rex Burkholder, Carl Hosticka

Councilors Absent: None.

Presiding Officer Bragdon convened the Council/Executive Officer Informal meeting at 2:08 p.m.

I. Upcoming Legislation'

Jeff Stone, Legislative Policy Officer, reviewed upcoming legislation to be considered at the 11/29/01 Council meeting. He announced that two resolutions had been removed from the agenda.

II. Introducing Bill Wyatt, Port of Portland

Presiding Officer Bragdon, introduced Mr. Bill Wyatt, Executive Director of the Port of Portland and spoke to the fact that the Port and Metro were the two regional entities in the area.

Mike Burton, Executive Officer, spoke to the relationship between Metro and the Port including land purchases, Willamette Cove clean-up, water control issues, Goal 5, and I-5 Corridor Study.

Bill Wyatt talked about the Port's regional significance and the issues they faced today, the functions and purposes of the Port. He noted how well the Port had been run. He noted the current economic impacts on the Port, the marine and channel issues, as well as the exported and imported products. He focused on the changing environment of the Port and the positive reaction to that change. He acknowledged the strong partnership with Metro. Priorities for Port include budget reductions, impacts of the economy, expansion of international air service, commercial and cargo expansion. Future planning for the Port included a focus on environmental and economic health.

Councilor McLain asked about smaller airport interests.

Mr. Wyatt responded with more detail on the Hillsboro, Troutdale and other small airports in the area.

Councilor Monroe asked about the relationship with the Port of Vancouver and other ports in the area.

Mr. Wyatt said they were looking at the collaborative relationships with the various ports, coordination among the ports, and the competitive nature of the marine business.

Councilor Monroe spoke to the bi-state movement and the need for increased cooperation, he focused on the need for regionalism.

Councilor Atherton asked about combining the Port of Portland and Vancouver.

Mr. Wyatt said they had raised this issue and talked about joint understandings between the ports. He noted issues of industrial land supply and transportation.

Councilor Atherton asked about the state and local match for the channel project.

Mr. Wyatt said they would be doing everything they could to achieve funding for the project.

Councilor Atherton asked about environmental assessment issues.

Mr. Wyatt spoke to several possibilities that might occur, it was a wait and see time.

Councilor Burkholder talked about the relationship and impact of economic development. He asked how the regional agencies could come together to look at the specific economic effects.

Mr. Wyatt responded that it was important and one he planned to focus on. He spoke to a collaborative direction and the need to respond to the broader community.

Councilor Park asked about channel deepening and the exporting of agricultural products.

Mr. Wyatt responded that a majority of agricultural products were exported particularly wheat. The container industry was a major revenue producer for the Port and provided possible future revenues because of increasing congestion at other ports.

Councilor Park talked about the agricultural economy of the area.

Councilor Atherton asked if the channel deepening only effected the container business.

Mr. Wyatt said it also effected the barge business that included bulk minerals and grains. There were great opportunities with all of the other transportation intersections close to the Port.

Councilor Monroe spoke to high speed rail issues.

Mr. Wyatt said he was very interested in this issue, it was going to require some congressional leadership to accomplish the goal.

III. Blue Lake Feasibility Study

Charles Ciecko, Regional Parks and Greenspaces Director, said Council had asked for two additional items on the Blue Lake Feasibility , to have MERC do a plan and bring the consultant Eric Hovey to answer economic questions.

Mr. Eric Hovey, E.D. Hovee and Company, said Metro had asked them to identify revenue generating facilities for the park, better implementing the master plan looking at the importance of park uses, natural resources, reducing operating deficit, and public involvement. He spoke to the process and the resulting preferred concept. They looked at four strategic options. They selected general upgrades to the park and compatible new revenue facilities. The next step was an action plan that they believed was financially viability.

Presiding Officer Bragdon asked Mr. Hovey to elaborate on the partnership concepts.

Mr. Hovey said there were several different partnerships including concessionaires, facility improvements such as a golf learning center or a youth facility which could augment other facility improvements.

Councilor Atherton asked about the golf learning center.

Mr. Hovee said there was a wide range of financial results. He suggested the type of operator that Metro should seek out.

Councilor Atherton asked where Metro fit.

Mr. Hovee said there seemed to be a need for a learning golf center, there could be a significant marketing opportunity.

Councilor Burkholder asked about other activity revenue sources.

Mr. Hovee said they also looked at youth activity facilities such as a skate center or rock climbing facility.

Heather Kent, Parks and Greenspaces Planning and Education Manager, spoke to other activity facilities looked at.

Councilor Park asked what steps would be taken to evaluate proposals.

Mr. Hovee responded to Councilor Park's question.

Councilor McLain asked about the detail of the review approach.

Mr. Hovee said they looked at water service issues, water quality, the details would be in the next steps taken.

Mark Williams, MERC Director, spoke to amphitheater issues. Concerning the proposed golf facility it was important to present a business case, a market perspective, the need for this type of facility, data, demand, etc.

Councilor Monroe asked about the amphitheater issue.

Mr. Williams said he didn't think it was politically feasible but there was a need. There would be neighborhood issues particularly.

Councilor Monroe asked if the airport would be a significant deterrent for this type of facility.

Mr. Williams did not think it was a deterrent. He suggested caution in making this type of decision for this type of facility. It could be a very valuable facility but suggested neighborhood issues again.

Mr. Ciecko said their primary purpose was to answer questions and get direction from council.

Councilor Park said there was need for additional research on the golf learning center.

Presiding Officer Bragdon said this was conceptual plan that doesn't commit council to follow the concept.

Mr. Ciecko said it would allow them to proceed and look at this concept but the plan could be amended.

Councilor McLain spoke to the history of the Blue Lake Master Plan.

Presiding Officer Bragdon summarized where they were. He suggested that this should come forward to council.

Councilor Hosticka said the one issue was the water quality issue.

Presiding Officer Bragdon suggested the master plan be brought to full council.

IV. Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection, Significant and Regional Resources

Councilor Hosticka summarized the process the Natural Resources Committee had gone through and that the committee was ready to make recommendations to full council. He spoke to the science of the significant and regional resources. The public was supportive of Metro making a determination, local jurisdictions had also made their comments. He wanted some judgement from the council as to what they would like to do with the recommendations. He defined significant and regional resources.

Councilor McLain said she was interested in the legal perspective.

Councilor Hosticka noted the draft resolution (a copy of which is included in the meeting record).

Ken Helm, Legal Counsel, spoke to the draft resolution, it provided a chronology, direction about the product that the council would need to make concerning a decision on regional significance. He noted the relationship of the Functional Plan and Goal 5. He talked about the maps and inventory narrative. A significant determination was a Goal 5 requirement. He also noted Functional Plan requirements within the body of the resolution and that regional resources concerned an administrative rule.

Councilor Monroe asked about regional resources and stream issues.

Mr. Helm responded to his question. Council had legal discretion to identify the extent of the network. Various advisory committees were still in process of giving input. He noted possible additions to the draft riparian corridor resolution.

Councilor Hosticka suggested going over the resolves that would be the decisions that had to be made by council.

Mr. Helm explained the resolves and the concerns the council may face.

Councilor Burkholder asked about critical habitat criteria.

Mr. Helm explained further.

Councilor Hosticka said they didn't know the mind of NMFS.

Mr. Mark Turpel, Planning Department, said NMFS's comments at the Goal 5 Technical Advisory Committee strongly encouraged recommendations on meeting regional significance.

Mr. Paul Ketcham, Planning Department, spoke to NMFS issues such as critical habitat. He felt the ecological approach was consistent.

Councilor McLain said the two controversial issues were ESA and restoration.

Mr. Turpel summarized the letter from Mike Burton focusing on decisions that the Council had to make (a copy of which is found in the meeting record) and Mr. Burton's recommendations.

Councilor Hosticka suggested that Mr. Ketcham review the Executive Officer's recommendations.

Mr. Ketcham reviewed the map recommendations, the literature review, the science technical report and that the conclusions were found to be sound conclusions according to the reviews. He explained their process for mapping and the criteria used. He noted Goal 5 TAC and WRPAC recommendations on riparian corridors, resource sites and significant resources. Regional resources had not been determined yet.

Councilor Hosticka noted the summary of the comments that had been given to the committee to date.

Mr. Ketcham explained the next steps that would be identifying regional resources. He noted WRPAC and Goal 5 TAC recommendations on the maps.

Councilor Atherton asked about hydrology protection.

Mr. Ketcham spoke to the alternatives.

Councilor Burkholder talked about the highly populated areas and riparian issues.

Mr. Turpel said they addressed Title 3 first, fish and wildlife habitat second, and then would look at storm water issues third.

Councilor McLain explained the chronology of the work.

Mr. Ketcham continued explaining the maps and the total riparian acreage considered. He further explained the option maps.

Councilor Monroe asked about urban streams and potential restoration possibilities.

Mr. Ketcham responded that the Johnson Creek Restoration Plan was a good example. He then continued explaining the option maps.

Councilor Park asked about buffers.

Mr. Ketcham said the edge of the bank was where buffers started.

Councilor McLain noted the first four options and choices to be made.

Councilor Burkholder asked what map were they receiving comments on?

Councilor Hosticka identified the support and which map they spoke to.

Mr. Ketcham spoke to the objectives and what was incorporated in the criteria.

Councilor Hosticka asked if council felt comfortable with the Executive Officer's recommendations or did the council want them to look at other items?

Councilor McLain spoke to Mr. Drake's recommendations. Three elements that the council had to make some decisions on were, one, authority, the blending of the three step process, and the findings and how that influenced the UGB process.

Presiding Officer Bragdon said the openness to map corrections was important. The suggestion of adding the other tools was important.

Councilor Burkholder said he thought it was too early.

Presiding Officer Bragdon added his comments noting this was an Informal work session. They had identified some issues.

Councilor Hosticka said they could ask MPAC for their recommendations and to present some clean alternatives.

Councilor McLain suggested that how the presentation was made would provide guidance.

Councilor Hosticka reiterated the timeline for decision making.

Presiding Officer Bragdon spoke to significance issues, the stage where we are doesn't lead to a particular conclusion concerning protection.

Councilor Atherton asked Mr. Ketcham about options. He felt Option 1 was the best chance for protecting fish and wildlife.

Councilor Hosticka said in his judgement the science and the law said they could pick Option 1.

Councilor Park asked if they could pick different levels for different areas when looking at UGB decisions. Did they want to make a conscious decision to do that. In terms of the mapping should this be considered.

V. Executive Officer Communication

There were none.

VI. Councilor Communications

There were none.

VII. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Presiding Officer Bragdon adjourned the meeting at 4:43 p.m.

Prepared by

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF
 NOVEMBER 27, 2001**

TOPIC	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NUMBER
Analysis of Local Goal 5 Data, Reports and Regulations	11/20/01	Memo from Ken Helm, Senior Assistant Council to Carl Hosticka, Natural Resources Committee concerning Goal 5	112701c-01
Draft Riparian Corridor Inventory and Significance	November 2001	Table 11. Alternatives for determining regional significance riparian corridors, pages 66-68	112701c-02
Draft Metro's Riparian Corridor Inventory	November 2001	Report on Goal 5 riparian corridor inventory	112701c-03
Summary of Correspondence and Testimony to Natural Resources Committee concerning Metro's Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection Program	11/26/01	List of Correspondence and Testimony received at or prior to 11/21/01 NR Committee	112701c-04
Metro's Fish and Wildlife Habitat Project Plan and State Goal 5 Requirement	November, 2001	Chart of Goal 5 Plan	112701c-05
Draft Goal 5 Resolution	11/20/01	Draft Resolution No. 01-XXXX For the Purpose of Establishing Criteria to Define and Identify Regionally Significant Fish Habitat and Approving a Draft Map of Regionally Significant Fish Habitat Areas	112701c-06
Letter concerning Goal 5	11/15/01	Letter to Carl Hosticka, Chair Natural Resources from Mike Burton concerning recommendations	112701c-07

TOPIC	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NUMBER
Explanation of draft of Riparian Corridor Resolution	11/27/0`	4 bullet point note concerning Goal 5 draft resolution	112701c-08
Eric Hovee and Company consulting firm overview	no date	Consulting firm qualification, Blue Lake Master Plan	112701c-09