

**MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL  
NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING**

Wednesday, February 27, 2002  
Council Chamber

Members Present: Susan McLain (Chair), Carl Hosticka (Vice Chair), Bill Atherton,  
David Bragdon, Rod Park

Also present: Rex Burkholder (late arrival)

Chair McLain called the meeting to order at 1:50 p.m.

**1. Consideration of the Natural Resources Committee Minutes of the February 20, 2002 Meeting.**

**Motion:**

Councilor Bragdon moved to adopt the minutes of the Natural Resources Committee Meeting of February 20, 2002.
---

**Vote:**

The minutes were unanimously adopted without revision.
--

**2. Combined Riparian Corridor Wildlife Habitat Mapping**

Chair McLain explained the purpose of this special meeting was to finish agenda items not addressed at the last Natural Resources Committee meeting.

**Developed Floodplain Mapping**

Andy Cotugno, Director, Planning Department, began by stating he and staff were prepared to present a conclusion and recommendation on the methodology regarding how to proceed with Developed Floodplains, Upland/Wildlife and Waters of the State. If there is general concurrence, the inventory can be finalized based upon this recommendation, and a resolution can be prepared for Council adoption in April. This conclusion and recommendation is based upon Committee actions taken in December and this follow-through describes “how” those actions will be taken. It was decided that Developed Floodplains be removed from the mapping. What needs to be discussed is “how” it is identified on the mapping. A suggestion for “catching up” with the Uplands/Wildlife area will be presented at this meeting. If it is not sufficient, it will take much longer and will need to be a “follow-on” activity. Further, a suggestion for concluding Waters of the State will also be presented.

Paul Ketcham, Regional Planner, Planning Department, began by reviewing the proposed methodology. He briefly addressed the highlights of the developed floodplain model. In Resolution No. 01-3141C developed and undeveloped floodplains were to be differentiated. He referenced a memorandum in the packet (which is attached to and incorporated into the permanent record of this meeting) from staff to Andy Cotugno. He said staff recommended Option 3, and briefly described it. It would utilize existing data in the Data Resource Center by beginning with the flood area layer, and use the developed lands layer (removing lands that are not truly developed, including wetlands, parks and open spaces and land cover data from riparian inventory mapping). He used five maps to demonstrate. This model works very well in highly developed floodplain areas, such as downtown Beaverton. Adjustments are currently being made through the map correction process.

Mr. Ketcham indicated that the other three options in the memorandum presented other problems, primarily involving more time-intensive processes of hand digitizing impervious surfaces on a flood area polygon basis, using 400-500 hours of staff time, and needing annual updating. It was discussed that the “words” governing the detail of the maps allows alterations and/or amendments by describing “how” they are altered and/or amended. Mr. Cotugno said the immediate reason for mapping was to move on to the ESEE analysis. Councilor Park asked if the areas considered developed but not developable, were removed from the re-developable area for ugb calculations. Mr. Cotugno replied no, re-developable was used in the Urban Growth Report based upon rate. He said when the Goal 5 process is completed, there will be a program about restrictions in the developed floodplains. The percentage of the landscape already developed is small, and upon completion of this process, a percentage number will be available. Councilor Park asked if this process had been discussed with the legal department. Mr. Cotugno said the legal department had been included in the process all along. He said there would always need to be a corrections process, no matter what methods Metro used.

### **Uplands/Wildlife**

Wildlife Habitat Inventory has a revised approach, according to Mr. Ketcham. Staff supports the scientific soundness and basis for the inventory. After the wildlife habitat mapping was distributed last summer, it was revised providing more precise definitions of the wildlife patches. The previous wildlife patches were based on satellite imagery which used 25-meter square pixels. Applied on the ground, inaccuracies resulted. The revised model continues to be based upon the prior model, using the same criteria, but utilizing a change in the definition of “wildlife patch.” The change was to continue using the data in the riparian corridor model because it had incorporated hand-digitized forest canopy delineations and other land cover type data, as well as having received extensive public review. The grant from the US Fish and Wildlife Service received last summer to conduct field research to validate Metro’s wildlife model resulted in substantiation and validation of the model being used. Removed from the criterion was the species richness criterion because it had a weak correlation to the model. The model does not account for lower canopy level because regardless of the understory conditions, the patches have wildlife value and could enhance the value if the understory is more diverse. A patch that does not have a structural understory could still be helpful to wildlife. Where there is an isolated wetland, a two-acre minimum was applied to the wetlands; where there was a patch divided between a forest area and wetland, the patch was larger, but not two acres each; where there was only forested area, and no wetland, then the forest patch had to be at least two-acres.

### **Waters of the State**

Mark Turpel said that Resolution No. 01-3141C required examining more extensive length of streams. The investigation revealed additional data, which if added to the riparian corridor model and inventory, created some timing issues. He recommended that upon completion of the information, it could be added to the data base, but not be dedicated as significant or regional resources, rather referred back to the identifying jurisdictions for further research in their local programs. Mr. Cotugno added that they should stay local issues. Mr. Turpel suggested the committee view the impact of the proposal affecting Goal 5 in two parts: Section 090 - riparian corridors, directly affecting waters of the state; and, Section 110 - wildlife habitat, its proximity to water, which could also be impacted. Councilor Hosticka asked how many of the tiny streams are already in designated areas. Mr. Turpel said, using a wall map, that the riparian corridor shows values from 1-30, with small areas of purple, which define piped underground water, mostly tiny bits and pieces randomly on the westside, and buttes in Clackamas County. Mr. Ketcham said in some areas the boundary has been extended a mile or so outside of the urban growth

boundary so data collection can be applied to the riparian and wildlife model, and further to the urban growth boundary study areas and the productivity analysis.

<b>Motion:</b>	Councilor Hosticka moved to give direction to staff based upon the Information presented.
----------------	---

<b>Vote:</b>	The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.
--------------	--

### 3. ESEE Scope and Request for Proposal

Chair McLain explained that the discussion would involve the ESEE analysis' details with regard to criteria and the four parts of the analysis. Mr. Cotugno distributed the second proposed Request for Proposal (RFP) draft. The final RFP will be brought to this committee at its next meeting, and if approved, it will be released, allowing the consultant solicitation process of four to six weeks, to begin. Mr. Turpel explained, in addition to the RFP draft, the "Overall ESEE Project Scope" draft has some minor revisions from its original version. The RFP draft, specifically calls out the consultant's task, focusing on the economic portion of the ESEE analysis. Both drafts are attached to and incorporated into the permanent record of this meeting.

Mr. Cotugno commented that using identified 2040 hierarchical design types, the industrial areas have been emphasized for protection from large box retail, emphasizing freight access, etc., and the same thing with regional centers and town centers. There is a higher order placement with priority for transportation investments, higher standards for parking, density, etc. Once the framework has been created following the 2040 hierarchy, there should be the ability to consider site-specific details. The regional basis establishes a consistent set of rules. There are also a consistent set of exceptions, applicable on a site-specific basis. This is known as the regional assessment versus the sub-watershed assessment. Employment centers are considered a higher order place because, although important for economic base, but will also be recognized as a lower density place, with the ability to have more of a setback from a stream because of the lower density. Circumstances will alter the allowable setbacks. The key is gradation of place importance, or economic importance, or social importance. The 2040 design types is the starting point for those gradations. The Chair moved the conversation along. There will be more discussion at the Community Planning meeting.

Chair McLain opened the public hearing.

Ann Gardner, Schnitzer Investment, 3200 NW Yeon, Portland, OR 97219, requested the Scope of Work be reviewed by someone in the economics profession; requested that the business community be invited to participate in the progress of this analysis; and, encouraged the work ahead be done correctly.

Lise Glancy, Port of Portland, 121 NW Everett, Portland, OR 97208, stated the Port of Portland has been consistent in supporting Metro's criteria and inventory, and also expects the same level of analysis to be focused on the ESEE balancing portion of the program. The latest draft of the Scope of Work looks significantly strengthened. She encouraged clear communication on the work program regarding decision points and dates for complete community inclusion.

Randy Miller, Voluntary Chair, Ambassador Program, Portland Development Commission, Portland, OR 97205, supported the issues previously raised in public testimony.

Beverly Bookin, CREEC, 1020 SW Taylor, #760, Portland, OR 97204, *tape recording not audible.*

Cindy Catto, Public Affairs Director, Associated General Contractors, 9450 SW Commerce Circle, # 200, Wilsonville, OR 97070, and MTAC representative for AGC urged the business community be involved in this process. She stated her concern regarding MTAC being the vehicle for evaluating this work because the work is arduous, this work requires an in-depth look at the economic analysis piece, and places a large burden on the five MTAC participants who represent the business community to obtain the input from the business community not at the table. She suggested a different task group be assigned this work. Further, she suggested the RFP include the "lost jobs" analysis; and, increased operating costs.

Kelly Ross, Home Builders Association, Portland, OR, agreed with the previous speakers. He said reliance on MTAC might not be sufficient for an in-depth economic analysis. He suggested a peer review panel be considered. He said he hoped housing would be given consideration in terms of the way housing costs are considered by new employers moving into the region, as well as the industry itself which rivals the high-tech sector in this region.

Jane Leo, Portland Metropolitan Association of Realtors, 5100 SW Macadam Ave., Suite 360, Portland, OR 97201, supported the testimony provided at the meeting. She urged going well beyond MTAC because there is a large segment of our community not involved in the discussion, and they need to be. She asked that single-family dwelling be elevated beyond the "D" status.

Chair McLain closed the public hearing.

Chair McLain said at the next committee meeting a response would be provided to staff regarding the approval of the RFP. She urged everyone to review it and she will be discussing it with the Executive Officer. Chair McLain said the next meeting would provide the opportunity for in-depth review of this material.

### **Adjourn**

There being no further business to come before the committee, Chair McLain adjourned the special meeting at 3:47 p.m.

Submitted by

Pat Mannhalter  
Council Assistant

**Attachments to the Public Record for the  
 Natural Resources Committee Special Meeting, February 27, 2002:**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Doc Date</b>	<b>Document Description</b>	<b>Doc Number</b>
Waters of the State	2/27/2002	Memorandum to Susan McLain, Chair, Natural Resource Committee from Andy Cotugno, Planning Director	022702nr-01
Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection – Ensuring Adequate Economic Involvement	2/26/2002	Memorandum to Mike Burton, Executive Officer from Andy Cotugno, Planning Director	022702nr-02
Overall ESEE Project Scope		Draft Overall ESEE Project Scope	022702nr-03
Request for Proposals		Draft Request for Proposals for an Economic Analysis for Metro’s Economic, Social, Environment, and Energy Consequences Analysis in the Development of a Regional Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection Plan	022702nr-04
Modeling Developed Floodplain	2/7/2002	Memorandum to Andy Cotugno from Justin Houk and Lynnae Sutton	022702nr-05

**Testimony Cards:**

All regarding the ESEE scope and process

- 1- Ann Gardner, Schnitzer Environmental, 34200 NW Yeon, Portland, OR 97219
- 2- Lise Glancy, Port of Portland, 121 NW Everett, Portland, OR 97208
- 3- Beverly Bookin, CREEC, 1020 SW Taylor, #760, Portland, OR
- 4- Randy Miller, Ambassador Program, PDC, Portland OR
- 5- Kelly Ross, Home Builders Assn.
- 6- Cindy Catto, Associated General Assn., 9450 SW Commerce Circle, #200, Wilsonville, OR 97070
- 7- Jane Leo, Portland Metropolitan Assn. of Realtors, 5100 SW Macadam Ave., Suite 360, Portland, OR 97201