

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL/EXECUTIVE OFFICER INFORMAL MEETING

Tuesday, July 23, 2002
Council Annex

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

Councilors Absent: Rod Monroe (excused)

Others Present: Mike Burton

Presiding Officer Hosticka convened the Council/Executive Officer Informal Meeting at 2:09 p.m.

1. UPCOMING LEGISLATION

There was no discussion.

2. ESEE ANALYSIS AND GOAL 5

Presiding Officer Hosticka spoke to where they were in the process of Goal 5 and Economic, Social, Environmental and Energy (ESEE) Analysis. They were reviewing where they were and what was likely to happen in the next couple of months.

Councilor McLain talked about the issue of inconsistencies and inadequacies of local plans. She noted the Ken Helm, Legal Counsel, was drafting a resolution concerning this issue which would be considered at the Natural Resource Committee and then forwarded to Council by the end of August.

Presiding Officer Hosticka said the Council would be considering a resolution at the end of August that would formally adopted the fish and wildlife habitat inventory maps. He asked Mark Turpel, Planning Department, to update the Council on where we were and where we were going. Councilor Park asked why were they going to the end of August.

Councilor McLain said on the July 31st they would be having their final hearing on the inventory issues. They were hopeful to forward that resolution to Council for August 8th, if not it would be August 29th to Council.

Mark Turpel, Planning Department, explained where staff and committee were right now and where they would go from here (a copy Metro's Fish and Wildlife Protection Plan and State Goal 5 Requirements is included in the record). He talked about the three-step process, the three resolutions and the ESEE process. He said Resolution No. 02-3176 had to do with fish which had been passed on to the Council from the Natural Resources Committee. Resolution No, 02-3177 had to do with wildlife habitat and was currently being considered in Committee and would be considered at Council in August. He then talked about the technical advisory committees and their recommendations on the wildlife issue. A copy of the recommendations was included in this meeting record. Councilor McLain made a note that Goal5TAC had voted on their recommendation and it was an 8 to 6 vote. He explained further the contents of his document and said these would all be available for the July 31st Natural Resources Committee meeting at 6:00 p.m. He then spoke to a proposed resolution, Resolution No. 02-3218 which would combine the two inventory maps. It also addressed local plans.

Presiding Officer Hosticka asked about developed floodplains and what were their rankings? Mr. Turpel said all had been adopted as regionally significant. Councilor McLain added that the Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC) had asked that all of the inventory go to ESEE for analysis.

Councilor Burkholder asked if Mr. Turpel would talk about combining the maps versus keeping them separate. Mr. Turpel responded that they had originally separated them out because of a Goal 5 rule. As they moved into ESEE analysis there was a thought to combine them. There was some concern about losing data in the process. Councilor McLain said they talked about this issue in three of the meetings and dealt with clarity and organization.

Councilor Burkholder asked, by combining the map, would you lose data? Councilor McLain said they spent a lot of time on this and no data would be lost. Councilor Park said the term overlay was a better word than combine. Michael Morrissey said wasn't it true that they would eventually combine the maps? Presiding Officer Hosticka said that would be in the ESEE process not in the inventory process. Councilor Park said one of the local advocates realized what the Committee had been talking about on this issue and finally concurred.

Mr. Turpel talked about the ESEE process. Economic Technical Advisory Committee (ETAC) would be looking at the economic impacts of fish and wildlife. They had already made some suggestions. The Planning Department had suggested using the 2040 design types and growth concepts. ETAC had given them some feedback on that suggestion. They would be giving feedback to the Natural Resources Committee about how they would be proceeding on the economic analysis. Mr. Turpel said they were proposing two types of economic analysis, regional versus sub-watershed analysis. The social and energy pieces Metro staff would be doing. The environmental was largely done. They would then have questions about how to proceed from there. He said Jeff Stone, Legislative Policy Officer, had rallied support for a peer review process. They would be proposing names for that peer review. The composite of the group would be those who were expert in economic analysis. Presiding Officer Hosticka noted that there was a preliminary list of names, he asked Council to give feedback on the list and encouraged membership suggestions.

Mr. Turpel said it might take more time to formulate the peer review group than they thought. They could utilize the peer review group to review methodology as well as looking at the final product. Another effort that would be going on was coordination with the Tualatin Basin Coordinating Committee. They would be looking at the whole Tualatin Basin and making some suggestions on that basin. He noted the schedule of dates and the activities to occur. He said there were several areas where they would need to get Council guidance and went into specifics about these. There were policy questions, which would be raised which included the definition of limit. They would ask Council to look at this and give guidance.

Councilor McLain said restoration was an issue that needed further review. She hoped that this would be part of the ESEE process as well.

Mr. Turpel said at the program stage this would be most clear such as grants, reconstruction of culverts, rather than regulatory. Councilor McLain said both allow and prohibit were terms that were clear but limit could not be thrown away to the program stage. She felt this should be dealt with earlier than the program stage. Councilor Atherton talked about tracking impacts. Mr. Turpel responded that by creating an inventory they had some way of measuring changes or tracking over time. The maps were able to say this is the current resource and cumulative actions could have a major impact even though one in and of itself may not.

Presiding Officer Hosticka said, during this process in the Fall, what would the Council see of that? And from the Council, what do they want to see? On public involvement during that period, how would the

Council be involved? Councilor Bragdon said the technical work was going to be helpful. He noted the misimpression of the public at the last Natural Resources Committee meeting.

Mike Burton, Executive, Officer, said they were going to recommend that the Goal 5 be finished as soon as possible. He guessed that once they had that work done, they would have to adjust the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) process. He said these factors might influence future adjustment to the boundary. He talked about what they had learned from the City of Portland process. Metro needed to continue to remind the public where they were in the process, this was a developing ongoing process and these decisions had not been made yet.

Councilor Park explained that if Goal 5 work was not completed by the time they made decisions about UGB they would have to make sure there were protections for the land that was brought in. Presiding Officer Hosticka suggested a formalized process about protection of those lands that we bring in. Councilor Atherton explained what he thought citizens would perceive. Presiding Officer Hosticka said the idea of protecting the inside with green areas would continue in the process of bringing land into the UGB. Councilor Atherton talked about population increases in the next 20 years.

Councilor McLain said there was another element which was, how do you get to that end product? They wanted public involvement throughout the process. There were some timing issues that were different than during the Title 3 process. The Tualatin Basin needed a thorough inventory before they could begin their work. She encouraged that the next step, the technical step, had to have some time for public input. They wanted to make sure that once the technical work was understandable, the public needed to be able to review it and give input. Presiding Officer Hosticka said it would be interesting to see how we get people engaged in the ESEE process.

Councilor Burkholder asked about direction to staff today. It seemed at this point that the process would be going "underground" for technical review? Presiding Officer Hosticka suggested a pilot project concerning ranking which would be in the public view. Councilor Park said what they had done about Metroscope could be used as a model for the ESEE analysis. Councilor McLain said she thought Councilor Park had a good suggestion. She talked about what the Committee could be doing while information was being reviewed by the technical groups. She said staff should be updating the Committee on issues that have come up. She talked about the timeframe and the separation of work between this issue and the UGB. Councilor Burkholder asked about the timeline (a copy of the proposed calendar was included in the meeting record). Mr. Turpel responded that once the technical groups make their recommendations they would better be able to tell Council what the timeframe was. Councilor McLain said by the draft timeline they would get to the program stage at the beginning of March 2003. Presiding Officer Hosticka asked when they expected the peer review to begin their work? Mr. Turpel responded in September 2002.

3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Burton said there was an opinion piece that he had written and was asking for feedback from Council.

4. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor Park asked about the rollout schedule?

Presiding Officer Hosticka said Jeff Stone would be the point person for people who wanted to talk to someone about the UGB. Councilor Park explained further his role. After we get Mr. Burton's recommendation, it was still the Executive Officer's staff who would answer questions; they would use the normal procedure. Mr. Burton said the important thing was to establish a record. Councilor McLain talked about the system and suggested fine tuning the process.

Metro Council/Executive Officer Informal Meeting

07/23/02

Page 4

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Presiding Officer Hosticka adjourned the meeting at 3:10 p.m.

Prepared by

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF JULY 23, 2002

ITEM #	TOPIC	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION.	DOCUMENT NUMBER
II	FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT (GOAL 5) UPDATE	7/23/02	PACKET OF INFORMATION PREPARED FOR THE METRO COUNCIL CONCERNING ESEE AND GOAL 5. PACKET INCLUDES MAPS, GOAL5TAC RECOMMENDATIONS, MTAC REPORT TO THE MPAC, WRPAC RECOMMENDATIONS, SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND METRO'S ESEE APPROACH	072302CE-01
II	TIMELINE	MAY 1, 2002	REGIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT PROTECTION PLAN TIMELINE (INVENTORY AND ESEE ANALYSIS) FROM APRIL 2002 TO MARCH 2003	072302CE-02
II	THREE STEP PROCESS	JUNE 2002	METRO'S FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT PROTECTION PLAN AND STATE GOAL 5 REQUIREMENTS	072302CE-03