

## NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE MINUTES

November 7, 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 1:35 p.m.

### 1. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the October 3, 2001 and the October 17, 2001 meetings were moved by Councilor McLain, and approved by Chair Hosticka and Councilor Atherton without revision.

### 2. STATE RIPARIAN POLICY

**Mr. Ken Helm**, Salmon Recovery Coordinator, submitted a memo for the record. He reviewed the memo, which constituted a draft letter to the state, commenting on the state riparian policy. He stated that the deadline for submitting the memo to the state had been extended to November 30, 2001.

**Councilor Atherton** asked about the use of standards. He wanted to see clear, consistent, and enforceable guidelines included. **Mr. Helm** said they would get to it eventually. The riparian policy would be carried out primarily through state agency administrative rules. They discussed agency responsibilities.

**Councilor Atherton** asked about using the state moratorium provisions to address issues of cumulative impact. **Mr. Helm** said that what he thought Councilor Atherton was saying was that we would like them to highlight more prominently the role of regional and local governments. **Councilor Atherton** said that was correct. He said especially regional and the role of standards.

**Chair Hosticka** said that the letter looked good from their point of view, with the exception of what Councilor Atherton said. **Mr. Helm** said he would add those points, and then send the letter to the state.

### 3. FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT CRITERIA

**Chair Hosticka** said that after Mr. Mark Turpel's presentation on the fish and wildlife protection program, the committee would hear public testimony.

**Mr. Mark Turpel**, Growth Management Department, said that there were two summaries of recent meetings dealing with Goal 5; the Goal 5 Technical Advisory Committee meeting on October 12, and the MTAC Report to the Metro Policy Advisory Committee meeting on October 17. Both of those summaries are part of the packet and therefore part of the record. He gave a brief summary of those meetings and the issues that were raised.

**Chair Hosticka** asked that two letters be made part of the record. One was from Dick Schouten on his own behalf, and the other from the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District. They are attached and form a part of the record. He said the public testimony should focus on criteria used to map features. Future meetings would focus on significance and regional resources.

*Chair Hosticka opened the Public Testimony:*

**Mr. Mike Houck**, Coalition for a Livable Future and the Audubon Society of Portland, said that he had testified before, and that their position on criteria was in writing on the record (submitted previously). He

said that it had not changed, and that he still urged Metro to move forward with both the upland and riparian criteria as they stand. He said that the vision statement for the Goal 5 program, was not just Goal 5, but more. **Chair Hosticka** said it was the Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Protection and Restoration program. **Mr. Houck** said that Title 3, Section 5 referred to Fish and Wildlife Habitat, not Goal 5. He felt that this was an important issue. He said that he had learned at MTAC that there was some consideration to drop the wildlife habitat and connectivity function in the mapping, and the secondary functions. He had great concern about that. He suggested that both the secondary functions and the wildlife habitat and connectivity functions needed to be peeled from the future habitat mapping so that it could be appended to the riparian resource mapping. He spoke about public input. He said that in 1995 the council had 17,000 responses from the public, and that most of that was regarding stream protection and wildlife habitat access. He also mentioned that during the RUGGO's discussion that lead to where we were today, there was 200-300 people in the chamber arguing for affordable housing and resource protection. **Chair Hosticka** responded that he was referring to the technical aspects of the discussion. He mentioned that there would be a public hearing for people who work during the day to be held on the evening of November 19, 2001 at 5:30 p.m. **Councilor Atherton** asked Mr. Houck if, when he read from the Vision Statement, did he mean that the Vision Statement was above and beyond the call of duty to protect Goal 5 resources under the state program? **Mr. Houck** responded that that was correct, and said the reason for that was that we were in a region 2040 planning process that attempted to integrate the planning goals and not lose resources. **Chair Hosticka** said that the Vision Statement that Mr. Houck was reading from was from MPAC, and not adopted by Metro Council. **Councilor Atherton** said that he thought the Vision Statement was right on.

**Mr. Jim Petsche**, Nike Inc., said that he also represented two other landowners. He said that Nike was on board for protecting natural resources. He referred to the paperwork and maps that he gave to the committee members, which are attached and form a part of the record. He went over his map. He felt that the aerial maps did not do justice to the particular area on the map that he was referring to. **Chair Hosticka** asked about the ditch that he had referred to. Chair Hosticka thought it had once been a natural water course. **Mr. Petsche** said that as long as they had owned the property it had been a ditch. He felt more investigation needed to be done on the criteria maps. **Councilor McLain** said that the committee had not yet decided on anything yet. She said that the information that he brought to them was excellent for that next stage of determining what was significant and what was not. She said she also thought it was more than a ditch, and possibly was an area that needed to be restored. **Chair Hosticka** said it brought up the point that they needed a map correction process. **Mr. Petsche** said that public notification should be more than the Let's Talk flyer. **Councilor McLain** said that the committee would be sending out another notice to property owners when they got to the stage where the committee was dealing with specific properties.

**Mr. John Marine**, property owner, said that it was a confusing issue. He submitted a map for the record and the committee's review. It is attached and forms a part of the record. He mentioned that the trees on the criteria map for his property were no longer there, and therefore the map was erroneous. He said that the north piece of the property was where the correction needed to be made. He said that the City of Hillsboro had been prepared to give him an offer for that land, but when they received the aerial map showing trees still on that site when they were, in fact, gone, they became concerned. He wanted to have the matter cleared up. **Chair Hosticka** said that he was trying to reconcile the two maps. He said that Mr. Marine's map did take into account protection of the water area, and that the development was away from the water. He said that the issue looked like it might fall under the heading of map correction. **Councilor McLain** said this was excellent information for the next step of the process. **Chair Hosticka** said that the legal impact of the proposed development of that property needed to be discussed. Hillsboro did not have an acknowledged Goal 5 program. So, until the time that the council had a state acknowledged program they would have to operate under the existing laws. When they get the program done, sometime next year, then they would proceed. Between now and then he should be able to proceed. **Mr. Marine** said he was very confused. He thought Metro had to bless the Goal 5 program that Hillsboro had. **Mr. Helm** said that

Hillsboro did have an acknowledged Goal 5 program which was in periodic review. Generally state law indicated that when you file for development, and your application was complete, then you follow the local rules in place at that time. Metro's program was not yet in place and therefore did not have regulations that apply to his land. So the City of Hillsboro regulations would apply to his property. **Mr. Marine** asked for a letter describing the situation. **Chair Hosticka** agreed. **Mr. Helm** said that maybe a general memo might be better in case of other requests. **Councilor McLain** said that the memo would be helpful to individuals as well as to the cities, and would demonstrate where the committee was in the process. **Councilor Atherton** asked Mr. Marine if he had purchased the land in several different parcels. He asked if the southern parcel was zoned commercial. **Mr. Marine** said no. **Councilor Atherton** asked if the northern parcel was zoned for farm and forest. **Mr. Marine** said that it was residential.

**Mr. Tom Wolfe**, Trout Unlimited, said that he agreed with what Mike Houck had said. He felt the criteria were good. They were concerned about urban streams across the country. He felt that Metro was coming up with a plan to protect them. He urged the committee to go forth with the criteria.

**Mr. Brent Curtis**, Tualatin Basin Natural Resource Coordinating Committee, submitted a letter and attachments for the record. They are attached and form a part of this record. He gave an in-depth description of the information in his packet for the committee. His group felt that there were some issues with the existing criteria choices, and they suggested various methods to improve, or count the criteria differently. **Chair Hosticka** said that they would have to find some consistent language to identify what the Goal 5 program really was. **Mr. Curtis** reviewed the attachments in his packet for the committee. **Chair Hosticka** asked how much would it affect the discrepancy if they took the MTAC recommendation to call developed flood plains secondary? **Mr. Curtis** said that he did not know. **Chair Hosticka** asked if it was fair to say that there was a large difference between what he called the Goal 5 riparian area, and what Metro mapped as having functional attributes. **Mr. Curtis** said yes. **Chair Hosticka** said that was useful information (referring to the attachments in the packet). He said that the quality of criteria ranking was not fully captured by the numerical score, and that they would look at his suggestions as to how to capture that. **Councilor McLain** said that what she heard was that he did not have any changes to the fundamental criteria, but to review some of it. **Mr. Curtis** said that they way he would put it was that they did not believe that Metro had met the minimum legal requirement under Goal 5 to have an inventory. He said that they had not identified the riparian corridors, and that they really needed to do that. **Councilor McLain** thanked him for his hard work. She said that Metro always used local maps and amended those. She also said that Metro highly valued clean water service. She did not agree with taking a biologist out there. Her concern was with who was paying the biologist, and the different conclusions that they arrived at. She said she could support the idea if the cost was shared jointly. She also pointed out that what was regionally significant was what the committee was committed to determining. **Mr. Curtis** said that what they were recommending was that the committee look closely at the work. **Councilor McLain** said that he was giving an analysis of the committee's work, and that they would use what he had submitted on it. **Councilor Atherton** thanked Mr. Curtis for all the hard and impressive work he had done. He asked about the clean water act and if it applied to Waible creek. **Mr. Curtis** said he was not an expert on that. **Chair Hosticka** said that in many areas there seemed to be a lot of agreement on what they were trying to do.

**Mr. Dave Weckner**, City of Sherwood, said that he had submitted a letter for the record, which addressed the City of Sherwood's concerns. He put up a map on the wall and referred to it during his discussion. He said that they had the resources to do more of the ground-truthing on the maps. He said that comments on map errors had been forwarded to the Metro staff, but that the maps had not been changed. **Chair Hosticka** asked about the storm water facilities. **Mr. Weckner** said that Sherwood was unique in that they had no urban development in their flood planes. **Councilor Atherton** said that the City of Sherwood did not want the storm water facilities mapped. He felt that including them in the mapping would enhance their ability to meet the Clean Water Act standards. **Mr. Weckner** didn't want to dilute the argument of riparian corridors by including non-riparian areas.

**Mr. Jim Jacks**, City of Tualatin, submitted a letter for the record that addressed criteria 1-4 and 6. Their concerns stemmed from the science papers addressing research in rural areas. The distances in the functional criteria seemed to be too big. He felt that some areas on the maps were not riparian corridors. **Councilor McLain** asked him to define "disturbed area." **Mr. Jacks** said that he would rely on Metro to define the term that they used. He thought perhaps a "built" situation would define disturbed. Chair **Hosticka** asked him if he had seen the MTAC recommendation about developed flood plains. **Mr. Jacks** said yes. **Chair Hosticka** asked if that would address his concerns. **Mr. Jacks** said they would prefer that developed and committed flood plains not be mapped at all.

**Mr. Hal Bergsma**, City of Beaverton, submitted a map for the record. He discussed the map in detail comparing it to the maps completed by Metro, and focusing on the inventory, not the criteria. He said that Metro had mapped developed flood plain areas. **Councilor McLain** said that they had different functions for Goal 7 and Goal 6 than Goal 5.

**Ms. Sue Marshall**, Tualatin Riverkeepers, said that they supported the statement that Mr. Houck made, and agree with the details that he submitted. They support Metro taking a broad approach to the Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation program, and integrating the Endangered Species Act and Clean Water Act requirements. **Councilor Atherton** said that he supported her testimony that ditches and degraded streams needed to be protected too, because they affect water purity. He asked if she thought that they could meet the standards of water quality in the Tualatin basin. **Ms. Marshall** said that she didn't know. She felt that if they didn't do it in the Tualatin basin, then it wouldn't happen anywhere. **Chair Hosticka** asked that if we raised the dam was there enough in-stream water rights to service everyone, or would water get diverted? **Ms. Marshall** said that water storage was at an all time low. She wasn't sure how to deliver water to the upper reaches. **Councilor McLain** referred the TMDL group, and the disconnect with the Basin 5 group. **Ms. Marshall** said that there really wasn't a TMDL group in the Basin at the moment, but the Department of Environmental Quality would be convening one to look at urban municipal storm water permits.

**Mr. Jim Hilborn**, Attorney, representing Mr. & Mrs. Sweet, submitted a small map to the committee for the record. Mr. and Mrs. Sweet own two parcels of land in Hillsboro, and they had a pending sale on it. The buyer was worried about the title of the property, and wanted to develop it. They urged that the committee consider the impact of an overlay on the parcel. **Chair Hosticka** said that when they do the ESEE analysis they would look at the impact on contiguous properties.

**Mr. Tom Hughes**, Mayor of Hillsboro, said that there were some discrepancies between their maps and Metro's maps. He wanted to offer up comments and suggestions pertaining to the criteria. He submitted extensive maps and materials for the record. He discussed the materials submitted for the committee's review in detail. **Chair Hosticka** asked Mayor Hughes if he knew what prompted the people to come down and make the testimony that they did. **Mayor Hughes** said that Valerie Counts would be able to respond to that. **Ms. Counts**, Hillsboro Planning Department, said that they had sent out a mailing to property owners who would be affected by their Goal 5 inventory. This mailing invited them to come to several open houses and public hearings. **Chair Hosticka** said that from the testimony that he had heard, it seemed that people thought that the committee was at a point of doing something that would immediately affect their land. **Ms. Counts** said that she did not think that it was represented in that manner. **Chair Hosticka** asked for a copy of that invitation and letter. **Ms. Counts** said she would have to send it later, and then referred to the packet given to the committee members, which forms a part of this record. **Chair Hosticka** asked if they had the maps to show their original inventory, and how they determined what was significant. **Ms. Counts** said yes they had the maps that showed the original inventory. **Chair Hosticka** then said that the committee had not yet determined what was significant, and when Metro did then the comparison may not be so different. **Ms. Counts** said that they were doing the best they could to comment on the point that had been reached. **Chair Hosticka** said that it looked like

criterion number 6 was a primary concern, and criterion number 2 was of secondary concern. **Councilor McLain** asked if the binder described the site, and then the comments on the criteria in relation to the Metro score. **Ms. Counts** said yes. **Mayor Hughes** asked Ms. Counts if there was a map of the northern reaches of McKay Kirk included. **Ms. Counts** said yes, and then mentioned that it seemed some areas had not been included on Metro's maps. **Councilor McLain** asked if they were talking about McKay Creek, near the girl scout camp. **Ms. Counts** said yes. **Chair Hosticka** said that the committee appreciated the suggestions. **Mayor Hughes** said that they had some concerns with the mapping, but that they applauded Metro's effort.

**Ms. Patty McCoy**, Columbia Corridor Association, had two comments. She submitted a letter for the record. One concern was that there was not enough time to review the upland maps, and they requested an extension on the upland portion only. She said they were thrilled with what Metro had done on the riparian work. The second concern regarded the significant and regionally significant criteria. She said that the white paper issued by Metro did not put specific recommendations on the table. When there was a specific proposal out for review, 60 days would not be sufficient to make the process valid. They formally requested that Metro extend the comment deadline on significant and regional resources. **Chair Hosticka** said they should not wait for the recommendation before they make suggestions. It was deliberately left a little open-ended in order to receive ideas before formulating the recommendation.

**Ms. Cindy Catto**, Association of General Contractors, also representing the Commercial Real Estate and Economic Coalition (CREEC), said that the groups she was representing shared the concerns articulated by the Tualatin Basin group regarding the differences between Metro's functional criteria and what Goal 5 required under the law. She asked that the committee clearly declare what the riparian corridors were. They felt that the uplands piece of the program had not been properly vetted yet, and that the timeline needed some flexibility. The public notice process was also of concern to them. They wanted all affected property owners to get proper notice. She said that the Let's Talk flyer was a good PR piece, but it was not a good notice and created confusion. She suggested a formal notice be sent out. **Councilor McLain** said that they were very clearly committed to sending proper and clear notice. **Ms. McCoy** wanted to know when the notice would be sent. **Councilor McLain** said that the notice would be sent out between the ESEE analysis and starting the program phase. **Councilor Atherton** asked if her organization supported meeting the Clean Water Act standards. **Ms. Catto** said yes.

**Ms. Meg Fernekees**, DLCD – State of Oregon, said she thought the goal for the meeting was to determine whether the draft criteria and the maps met the standard of the Goal 5. They felt that it complied with, or exceeded, the requirements of the standard inventory of the riparian corridors and for fish and wildlife (upland) habitat. **Chair Hosticka** asked if that represented the official opinion of the department. **Ms. Fernekees** said that it was, and that it was submitted for the record.

*End of the public testimony.*

**Mr. Andy Cotugno**, Director of the Planning Department, Metro, said that they were open to any factual changes that affected the maps. Many decisions needed to be made, and things could change before the end of the process was reached. **Chair Hosticka** asked if trees were removed from an area, were there standards similar to the Oregon Forest Practices Act? **Mr. Cotugno** did not know. **Chair Hosticka** said that they would investigate that. **Mr. Cotugno** said that the whole system of riparian and upland was what mattered, and that it was hard to separate the two. Criterion number 6 was raising a lot of questions, and the secondary criteria also gave people pause. He felt that they never intended to say that everything on the map was a riparian corridor, but that there were areas that needed to be accounted for. He suggested that using the first 5 criteria to adopt a significant riparian resource as a guide. **Chair Hosticka** said that was going into the next step. He wondered how to structure preliminary findings based on the input given at the meeting, and then communicate it back to those people who had made comments. **Councilor McLain** asked Mr. Cotugno if he would put that down on paper, and then it could be reviewed at another

meeting. **Chair Hosticka** agreed that if that was done, then a special meeting should be set to review it. He pointed out the memo from Ken Helm, which is attached and forms a part of the record. He asked to have Mr. Helm's memo reviewed at the Nov. 19<sup>th</sup> evening meeting. **Mr. Cotugno** talked about delineating developed flood plains as a secondary feature. He spoke to restoration of those sites, and the ESEE analysis step. **Chair Hosticka** asked if a map could be prepared that showed the MTAC recommendation to take the developed flood plains as secondary, and the first five criteria primaries as the suggested riparian corridor. **Mr. Cotugno** said that they would attempt to do that. He said that the flood plain areas would be a problem, otherwise they had the information to do that. **Councilor McLain** said that they could use the Title 3 maps, since they had been delineated. **Mr. Cotugno** said that Title 3 delineated flood plains, not the distinction between developed and undeveloped. **Councilor McLain** asked if they could compare the Title 3 information to the other map. **Mr. Cotugno** did not think so. He said that they would have to use examples to see how it would work. **Chair Hosticka** asked them to try it with a sample. He also asked if there were any suggestions on how to reconcile discrepancies on the maps due to changes in land features. **Mr. Cotugno** said that he would have to follow-up on that.

#### **4. GOAL 5 SIGNIFICANT RESOURCES & REGIONAL RESOURCES DESIGNATION**

Due to time constraints from the lengthy testimony by members of the public, this discussion was deferred to the next meeting.

#### **5. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION**

There was none.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Bardes  
Council Assistant

:kb

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF  
November 7, 2001

Document Number	Date	Document Description	RES/ORD
110701.01	11/05/2001	Letter to Andy Cotugno from Jim Petsche, Nike, Ruth and Kenneth Berger, CARR America by Clete Casper re: Metro "overreaching" in mapping	
110701.02	11/05/2001	Letter to Chair Carl Hosticka, Natural Resources Committee from Jim Petsche, Nike, Ruth and Kenneth Berger, CARR America by Clete Casper re: support of Tualatin Basin Natural Resource Coordinating Committee efforts	
110701.03	11/06/2001	Map, "Goal 5 Exhibit Hillsboro Costco" submitted by John Marine	
110701.04	11/07/2001	Letter with enclosures to Chair Carl Hosticka and Members, Natural Resources Committee from Tom Brian, Tualatin Basin Natural Resources Coordinating Committee re: Metro's Goal 5 Riparian Corridor and Wildlife Habitat Criteria and Mapping	
110701.05	11/06/2001	Map, Beaverton Riparian Corridor	
110701.06	11/07/2001	Letter to Andy Cotugno from Jim Jacks, Planning Director, City of Tualatin re: Comments on Functional Criteria and the Mapping Thereof	
110701.07	11/07/2001	Letter to Carl Hosticka, Chair, Natural Resources Committee from Don Wechner, Planning Director, City of Sherwood Oregon re: Sherwood's comments on Goal 5 mapping effort	
110701.08		Map submitted by Tior Hilborn, Attorney for Gerald Sweet	
110701.09	07/17/2001	Draft Exhibit A to Resolution No. 01-3087A, Attachment C entitled Metro Goal 5 Fish and Wildlife Habitat, Functional Values and Landscape Features for Identifying Significant Riparian Corridors	
110701.10	11/06/2001	Letter to Carl Hosticka, Chair, Natural Resources Committee from Meg Fernekees, Portland Metro Area Regional Representative, Department of Land Conservation & Development re: Riparian Corridor and Wildlife (Upland) Habitat Criteria and Mapping	
110701.11	10/26/2001	Letter to Carl Hosticka, Chair, Natural Resources Committee from Patti McCoy, Executive Director, Columbia Corridor Association re: extension of comment deadline on significant and regional resources	
110701.12	11/07/2001	Memo to Carl Hosticka from Ken Helm, Legal Counsel re: Regional Resources Decision Package	
110701.13	11/07/2001	Letter to Carl Hosticka, Chair, Natural Resources Committee from Mark J. Greenfield, Attorney for Jim Stranding re: Metro's Goal 5 Riparian Corridor and Wildlife Habitat Criteria and Mapping	
110701.14	11/07/2001	Letter to Carl Hosticka, Chair and Members of Natural Resources Committee from Dick Schouten, Washington County Commissioner re: Metro's Regional Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection Work Beyond Strict Requirements of State Goal 5	
110701.15	11/07/2001	Letter to Carl Hosticka, Chair, Natural Resources Committee from Robert Van Brocklin, Attorney for Show Timber Co. re: Metro's Goal 5 Riparian Corridor and Wildlife Habitat Criteria and Mapping	
110701.16	10/15/2001	Letter to Carl Hosticka, Chair and Natural Resources	

		<p>Committee and Commissioner Lisa Naito, Chair, MPAC from Kemper McMaster, State Supervisor re: support for Metro's riparian and upland mapping criteria</p>	
<p>110701.17</p>	<p>11/7/2001</p>	<p>Letter to Carl Hosticka, Chair, and Members, Natural Resources Committee from Tom Hughes, Mayor, City of Hillsboro re: Metro's Goal 5 Riparian Corridor and Wildlife Habitat Criteria Mapping, with the following enclosures:</p> <p>City of Hillsboro List of Significant Goal 5 Natural Resource Sites Notebook Exhibit A:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Ordinance No. 5066, HCP 2-01: Significant Goal 5 Natural Resource Sites in the City of Hillsboro;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Wetland Summary Sheets;</li> <li>2. Riparian Corridor &amp; Adjacent Upland Wildlife Habitat Summary Sheets;</li> <li>3. Upland Wildlife Habitat Summary Sheets;</li> <li>4. Natural Resource Inventory Maps</li> </ol> <p>City of Hillsboro Goal 5 Natural Resources Inventory and Assessment Notebook Exhibit B:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Map of Study Area;</li> <li>B. Wetland Summary Sheets;</li> <li>C. Field Verification of Aerial Photographic Signatures;</li> <li>D. DSL Determination Files and Permit List;</li> <li>E. Determination of Locally Significant Wetlands;</li> <li>F. OFWAM Wetland Functions Summary Table;</li> <li>G. OFWAM Evaluation Sheets;</li> <li>H. OFWAM Wetlands of Special Interest/Characterization;</li> <li>I. Wetland Acreage by Habitat Type &amp; Percent by Type;</li> <li>J. Riparian Corridor &amp; Wildlife Habitat Summary Sheets;</li> <li>K. Hillsboro Study Area Vegetation List;</li> <li>L. Documentation of Goal 5 Resources in Hillsboro;</li> <li>M. DSL Correspondence</li> </ol> <p>City of Hillsboro Exhibit C: Vol. 1- Set of 35 Section Maps of City Goal 5 Inventory/Metro Functional Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hillsboro Goal 5 Comparison with Metro's Primary &amp; Secondary Riparian Functional Values, Plot Date 11/05/2001, Exhibit A;</li> <li>2. Section 1n2w15 plot date 10/19/2001;</li> <li>3. Section 1n2w14 plot date 10/23/2001;</li> <li>4. Section 1n3w24 plot date 10/31/2001;</li> <li>5. Section 1n2w20 plot date 10/31/2001;</li> <li>6. Section 1n2w21 plot date 10/31/2001;</li> <li>7. Section 1n2w22 plot date 10/19/2001;</li> <li>8. Section 1n2w23 plot date 10/19/2001;</li> <li>9. Section 1n3w25 plot date 10/19/2001;</li> <li>10. Section 1n2w30 plot date 10/22/2001;</li> <li>11. Section 1n2w29 plot date 10/22/2001;</li> <li>12. Section 1n2w28 plot date 10/19/2001;</li> <li>13. Section 1n2w27 plot date 10/19/2001;</li> <li>14. Section 1n2w26 plot date 10/22/2001;</li> <li>15. Section 1n2w25 plot date 10/22/2001;</li> <li>16. Section 1n1w30 plot date 10/23/2001;</li> </ol>	



		<p>17. Section 1n3w36 plot date 10/22/2001;          18. Section 1n2w31 plot date 10/23/2001;          19. Section 1n2w32 plot date 10/23/2001</p> <p>City of Hillsboro Exhibit C: Vol. 2- Set of 35 Section Maps of City Goal 5 Inventory/Metro Functional Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hillsboro Goal 5 Comparison with Metro's Primary &amp; Secondary Riparian Functional Values, Plot Date 11/05/2001</li> <li>2. Section 1n2w33 plot date 10/17/2001;</li> <li>3. Section 1n2w34 plot date 10/17/2001;</li> <li>4. Section 1n2w35 plot date 10/23/2001;</li> <li>5. Section 1n2w36 plot date 10/19/2001;</li> <li>6. Section 1s3w01 plot date 10/22/2001;</li> <li>7. Section 1s2w06 plot date 10/22/2001;</li> <li>8. Section 1s2w05 plot date 10/22/2001;</li> <li>9. Section 1s2w04 plot date 10/22/2001;</li> <li>10. Section 1s2w03 plot date 10/22/2001;</li> <li>11. Section 1s2w02 plot date 10/22/2001;</li> <li>12. Section 1s2w01 plot date 10/29/2001;</li> <li>13. Section 1s2w07 plot date 10/22/2001;</li> <li>14. Section 1s2w08 plot date 10/22/2001;</li> <li>15. Section 1s2w09 plot date 10/23/2001;</li> <li>16. Section 1s2w10 plot date 10/29/2001;</li> <li>17. Section 1s2w16 plot date 10/31/2001;</li> <li>18. Section 1s2w17 plot date 10/31/2001</li> </ol> <p>Map: (red, green, lime green, yellow with purple lines)</p> <p>Map: Washington County Riparian Goal 5 – Metro Riparian Resources Comparison</p> <p>Map: Washington County Riparian Goal 5/Title 3 – Metro Riparian Resources Comparison</p> <p>Map: Safe Harbor – Metro Riparian Resource Comparison</p> <p>Map: Healthy Streams Riparian Buffer – Metro Riparian Resources Comparison</p>	