

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

Wednesday, July 17, 2002  
Council Chamber

**Members Present:** Susan McLain (Chair), Bill Atherton, David Bragdon, Rod Park

**Members Absent:** Carl Hosticka (Vice Chair) (excused),

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Chair McLain called the meeting to order at 1:06 p.m.

**1. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 26, 2002 and JULY 3, 2002  
NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

**Motion:**

Councilor Atherton moved to adopt the minutes of the June 26 and July 3, 2002 Natural Resources Committee regular meetings.
---

**Vote:**

Councilors Atherton, Park and McLain voted to adopt the minutes as presented. The vote was 3 aye/ 0 no/ 0 abstain and the motion passed. Councilors Hosticka and Bragdon were absent from the vote.
---

**2. MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR.**

Chair McLain reviewed the work for this July 17 meeting (see memo included in the agenda packet with the permanent record of this meeting).

**3. RESOLUTION NO. 02-3192, FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE  
GREENSPACES MASTER PLAN AND UPDATING THE REGIONAL TRAILS AND  
GREENWAYS PLAN.**

Charles Ciecko, Manager, Regional Parks and Greenspaces, explained the resolution and acknowledged local partners and trail advocates as well as staff's work. He explained that this is the first major amendment to the Regional Trails and Greenways portion of the Greenspaces Master Plan which was adopted in 1992. He reviewed the criteria used to consider regional status and stressed that the lines on the map are conceptual. He said they had received letters from most of the affected jurisdictions and they were supportive of these amendments. Heather Nelson Kent, Parks and Greenspaces Planning, explained that the orange lines on the draft Regional Trails and Greenways map indicate the new trails or substantive changes to existing trails. She distributed an amended Exhibit "A" with explanations of the 19 trail nominations and the 5 proposed changes (see copy of the exhibit and the map included with the permanent record of this meeting). She commented that once the council has approved a package of amendments to the regional trails plan, the map would be revised once again to reflect the changes, and they would re-publish a regional trails plan brochure. She said they would also continue to work with Clark County and Vancouver Parks to refine the trail map on the north side of the Columbia River. Chair McLain commented that the blue trail line on the map might be confusing in that it could look like a stream. Mel Huie, Parks and Greenspaces, Open Spaces, detailed the substantive changes and talked about the 18 trail nominations.

## **Minutes of the Metro Council Natural Resources Committee Meeting**

Wednesday, July 17, 2002

Page 2 of 12

Chair McLain opened a public hearing on Resolution No. 02-3192.

Mike Houck, Audubon Society of Portland, Coalition for a Livable Future, 5151 NW Cornell Rd., Portland, OR 97210, testified in support of Resolution No. 02-3192. He was pleased that the connections with Clark County would be shown on the final version of the map. He emphasized that the regional trails system is equally as important as the open spaces land acquisition.

Kelly Puntaney, City of Vancouver and Clark County, Trails and Greenways planner, P.O. Box 1995, Vancouver, WA 98660, was supportive of a true bi-state regional system of urban trails that included Clark County. He distributed handouts regarding a proposal for 50 miles of urban trails to connect 14 Lewis & Clark Notable Sites in the Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan area (see Lewis & Clark Discovery Greenway Trail Legacy Program, A National Urban Trails Model Partnership Project and a Lewis & Clark Discovery Greenway Trail map included with the permanent record of this meeting). Chair McLain commented that they had tried to always include Clark County and would continue to do so.

Mr. Houck said it is critical for folks who had come to testify on the agenda item regarding the Goal 5 Fish and Wildlife habitat work to be more aware of other things that Metro and local governments were doing that complement the regulatory program being contemplated through the Goal 5 effort.

Barbara Walker, 40 Mile Loop Landtrust, 1891 SW Hawthorne Terrace, Portland, OR 97201, said she could not be more sincere in thanking all who worked on this together. She said access to greenspaces and regional parks is very important to people who use them. She said this would allow everyone to partake of everything in the region. She added that connections to the Washington side were important. She said highlighting the Lewis & Clark Discovery Greenway on the map make a huge difference in getting funding for that project because they could show it was regionally done.

Jayne Cronlund, Three Rivers Land Conservancy, P.O. Box 1116, Lake Oswego, OR 977035, strongly supported the whole amendment package including the revised sections that had been added. She felt the process was very well done.

Chris Hathaway, Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership, 811 SW Naito Parkway, Suite 120, Portland, OR 97204, spoke in support of the resolution. He said the Lewis & Clark water trail was truly a bi-state, regional effort, extending from Bonneville Dam to the Pacific Ocean on both sides of the Columbia River and linked natural areas and parks with a focus on environmental education.

Richard Meyer, City of Cornelius, Community Development Director, P.O. Box 608, Cornelius, OR 97113, spoke of the merits of the regional trail program which acted as a lever to foster local greenspace and pathway planning.

Ric Catron, City of Gresham, Parks & Recreation, spoke in support of the resolution and said trails bind communities together. He was pleased with the trails already in his area and encouraged approval of the map as presented.

Aleta Woodruff, Metro Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee, 2143 NE 95<sup>th</sup> Place, Portland, OR, spoke about the Sullivan's Gulch trail. She suggested it should not end east of Maywood Park but connect somehow to Rocky Butte. Chair McLain urged her to share her ideas with staff.

Chair McLain closed the public hearing.

**Minutes of the Metro Council Natural Resources Committee Meeting**

Wednesday, July 17, 2002

Page 3 of 12

**Motion:**

Councilor Atherton moved to recommend Council adoption of Resolution No. 02-3192.

Councilor Atherton said he was quite excited about this resolution. He felt it was an incredible opportunity for the recreational activities of people in urban areas. He felt trails offered some of the best opportunities for people to connect with nature. Councilor Park commented work like this is what makes this region a good place to live. He said it would be exciting to see the connections develop. Chair McLain thanked the people who have been involved

**Vote:**

Councilors Atherton, Bragdon, Park and McLain voted recommend Council adoption of Resolution No. 02-3192. The vote was 4 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain and the motion passed. Councilor Hosticka was absent from the vote

Chair McLain will carry the resolution to the full council.

Mr. Huie added that there would be a ground breaking ceremony on Friday, July 19<sup>th</sup> for the OMSI to Springwater corridor trail.

**5. RESOLUTION NO. 02-3207, FOR THE PURPOSE OF AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER TO PURCHASE CONSERVATION AND TRAIL EASEMENTS OVER THE LUCKLOW AND WHITE PROPERTIES IN THE NEWELL CREEK CANYON TARGET AREAS.**

Mr. Ciecko reviewed the resolution would clear the way for two conservation and trail easements in the Newell Creek canyon target area. Jim Desmond, Regional Parks and Greenspaces, explained that it had been determined early in the refinement process that the best location for a public trail through the Newell Creek canyon would be on the east side along this former railway bed to avoid some of the sensitive habitat on the western side of the highway. He said the goal of this resolution was to connect down to the Clackamas College, John Inskeep Environmental Learning Center, who had been extremely supportive of an eastside trail alignment. He was pleased that these landowners had agreed to the easements.

**Motion:**

Councilor Bragdon moved to recommend Council adoption of Resolution No. 02-3207.

**Vote:**

Councilors Bragdon, Park, Atherton and McLain voted to recommend Council adoption of Resolution No. 02-3207. The vote was 4 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain and the motion passed. Councilor Hosticka was absent from the vote

Chair McLain will carry the resolution to the full council.

**4. RESOLUTION NO. 02-3177, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING CRITERIA TO DEFINE AND IDENTIFY REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT WILDLIFE HABITAT AND ADOPTING A DRAFT MAP OF REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT WILDLIFE HABITAT AREAS.**

Chair McLain explained the steps to the process for defining regionally significant habitat. She commented that this step, the wildlife inventory, is step one. She said over the next year, when they got to step two, there would be opportunity to talk about the Environmental, Social, Economic and Energy

## **Minutes of the Metro Council Natural Resources Committee Meeting**

Wednesday, July 17, 2002

Page 4 of 12

(ESEE) analysis conflicting uses, and later, step three would allow a look at which programs would be most beneficial for the inventory. She reiterated that they would consider not only regulations, but acquisitions, conservation easements and trails, as well as other important parts of the program.

Mark Turpel, Long Range Planning, said the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) that morning had voted to move that the criteria as well as any site ranked 2 or greater be considered as regionally significant. He said the Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC) had met the previous Monday and had also recommended that the criteria be adopted. He noted a summary of comments which staff had organized from previous hearings (see memo re: Public comments, staff responses, Regional Fish and Wildlife Inventories included with the permanent record of this meeting) and said it was their intent to continue to summarize any comments received for the record. Councilor Park asked for clarification of the scoring differences between "ones" and "twos". Mr. Turpel responded that the shape and size of the patch, location and proximity to water are very important considerations.

Chair McLain opened a public hearing on Resolution No. 02-3177.

Mike Houck, Audubon Society of Portland, Coalition for a Livable Future, 5151 NW Cornell Rd., Portland, OR 97210, urged adoption of this resolution. He felt it was important that the public realized this was only to adopt an inventory and there were still a lot of steps to go, as well as many historical steps behind. He recommended considering anything ranked two and above as regionally significant natural resources.

Greg Olson 4306 SW Galeborn, Portland, OR 97219, said he found the discussion disturbing. He said a certain amount of this land is public land, but other portions are privately owned. He said his land is not available for sale and he felt like a victim with a freight train bearing down on him. He said he has no control over what is being planned for his property. He said the maps mean nothing because they have no property lines. He said he is fearful of his government taking his land. He said there are thousands of people who do not know what is going on or the ramifications of it. Chair McLain offered staff to help Mr. Olson figure out his property on the map and answer his specific questions.

Chair McLain announced the next Natural Resources Committee meeting would be held July 31, 2002, at 6 p.m. for working people and others to have the opportunity to comment.

Mike Lehne, 7915 SE 162<sup>nd</sup>, Portland, OR 97236, commented that his research thus far has told him that while they are being told by Metro planners that LCDC Goal 5 requires his work to be done, it is not true. He said a lot of money is being spent doing something that is not being done correctly to begin with, and was probably overkill. He said there were a lot of needs in this region and spending this kind of money does not make sense. He felt the system is flawed. Chair McLain said the committee would be happy to receive comments about specific properties so the maps would be correct.

Ken Helm, Senior Assistant Counsel, responded that it was fairly clear in both of the major planning documents, the Regional Framework Plan and the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan that this Council made a proactive choice in 1996 and 1997 to do this work for the region. That was the formal statement on the record that Council was doing this unrelated to Goal 5. The other part of that and the reason for some confusion was that Goal 5 prescribed a process and the Metro Council decided to follow that process with our Functional Planning tasks so that at the end it would integrate better with local programs that had already implemented Goal 5. Yes, we were following a Goal 5 process but the policy decision was this Council's alone.

## Minutes of the Metro Council Natural Resources Committee Meeting

Wednesday, July 17, 2002

Page 5 of 12

Chair McLain spoke to the redundancy issue. They tried very diligently to make sure our resources were not redundant. We had been working very diligently with the region's partners to make sure that the work was shared and that the work burden and resources were shared. They were being diligent with the public trust in the way of resources. She pointed out that the Regional Framework Plan was developed through a visionary process with the public. They asked the public what do you value and what were your bottom lines of far as values. She thanked the public for showing up today. She announced that there would be a Natural Resources Committee meeting on July 31<sup>st</sup> at 6:00 p.m.

Councilor Park asked Mr. Helm for clarification. In order for Metro to exercise that ability to do the Goal 5 program, did it not required an affirmative action by the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) to asked that it be taken up as a regionally significant concern. Without that action, because a program already existed at a local level, we would not be able to enter into this particular area. That vote by the local jurisdictions created the ability for Metro to move ahead to the next step. He said it was important to note that there was a coherent region-wide program. This was not being done despite local jurisdictions. It was being done because of the wish of local jurisdictions for a coordinated approach to deal with these areas that overlapped between jurisdictions and property lines.

Mr. Helm said Councilor Park was exactly right. The minutes of those MPAC meetings indicated the vote unanimously supporting the entire the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan which included the water quality work that the Council accomplished and this Goal 5 work.

Chair McLain said the conversation dealt with basin and watershed, you couldn't do it by jurisdiction because you wouldn't be including the whole biological environment that needed to be considered. The unanimous vote came because they recognized the fact that water and other elements of Goal 5 issues did not know just jurisdictional lines. The cities and counties were required to do Goal 5. The coordination factor was difficult and was an appropriate regional perspective. That was what Metro was trying to do with the three-step process.

Chair McLain closed the public hearing.

Councilor Park asked about the combined map and when they were covering that item. Chair McLain said they would cover that discussion in the upcoming portion of the meeting.

Councilor Atherton asked Mr. Turpel about the use of the score of 1, alternative A. His greatest concern over the whole program was how it fit in our charter mandate requirement for carrying capacity process for the region. As we move along and think about that process, in his mind, one of the key purposes of this program was to find how we got the signals when we were exceeding our carrying capacity and trying to get those signals before it was gone. This concerned him if we failed to map those important areas that had the score of 1. It didn't necessarily mean that we had to direct a program to those scores of 1 but at least be able to track those areas and relate it back. He was worried that we weren't going to get the signals. Would it be useful to make sure we mapped those areas and tracked those as part of the program?

Mr. Turpel replied that there was a number of different ways that that could be approached. For instance, if these areas that only received a 1 were not included, in the future, they could still track what was happening to those areas. Did they remain more or less intact, how many acres had we lost? That was one possibility. Another possibility would be to simply say lets take it to the next step, lets include those as those areas that were analyzed for the Economic, Social, Environment and Energy consequences and then make the decision about what the Council thought was the appropriate direction to take. At the program

## **Minutes of the Metro Council Natural Resources Committee Meeting**

Wednesday, July 17, 2002

Page 6 of 12

stage there might be an education program such as pesticide reduction. There might be education, incentive, non-regulatory or regulatory things that could be applied. Those were all decisions that the Council would have to make. The department had tried to provide a scientific foundation for saying, yes, these areas have some contributing value, greater or lesser dependent upon ranking, however, that needed to be balanced. It was difficult to say that the loss of one small area may not be significant but the cumulative effect of all of those various areas became a big deal. There was a judgement call that had to be made by the Council but there were several options for how you could direct staff to address those issues.

Chair McLain pointed out that the draft of June 4, 2002 described the rating system. If they were to accept the recommendation of some of the advisory groups, this set up a framework to continue inventorying them whether they chose to protect them after the ESEE analysis or not. They had a description of them and they had a reaction from staff through using scientific criteria of how it effected wildlife and fish. The actual framework had been set up to continuing tracking. She hoped to review this draft and the conversation they had heard from public today and the advisory groups advise and come back on July 31st to talk further about what the recommendations would be to staff and to this Council on the inventory for wildlife.

### **6. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ON WILDLIFE INVENTORY COMBINED MAP PROCESS RATING SYSTEM.**

Chair McLain said the reason she had called out this issue was that it had garnished quite a bit of discussion at the July 3<sup>rd</sup> Committee meeting. She had asked Mr. Helm to write a memo about how they concluded the inventory step and how then did they go forward to that next step in an appropriate way. It was her hope that they would direct staff today that they wanted all raw data that was included in the riparian and wildlife work to go forward into ESEE. She said they needed to hear from the advisory committees, Goal 5 TAC and ETAC, on the riparian and wildlife pieces. This sounded like step 2, the ESEE analysis. She asked Mr. Helm to review his memo (a copy of which was included in the meeting record).

Mr. Helm reviewed the memo date July 10<sup>th</sup> that was in response to questions by Chair McLain. The question was what did they need to do to wrap up the inventory both from the point of view of satisfying Goal 5 and our own Functional Plan requirements. The two resolutions and inventories were on the verge of being finished up. There were some final decisions about the extent of the inventories in terms of geographic scope that needed to be finished and those decisions would indicate what this Council believed was regionally significant riparian corridors and wildlife habitat that they would take into the next phase. After they adopted those resolutions, there would be a draft inventory that was 99% done that was still subject to correction from public partners information that could change up until the time that Council adopted the final program through ordinances that amend the Functional Plan and the Regional Framework Plan. What those resolutions did was demonstrate that the base requirement of Goal 5 had been established for inventory. They had sufficient information on location, quantity, and quality of those identified resources to include them in the inventory. That was the basic requirement that needed to be met. There was sufficient evidence in the record on those items for these resources to do that. In his legal estimation they were on the verge of finishing the inventory. Another step that they could take prior to the ESEE analysis was to combine the inventory maps for the riparian corridors with the inventory maps for wildlife habitat. The Goal 5 rule permitted local governments to do this. You could do this without considering any rating system what so ever. It could be as simple as an overlay map. That would facilitate one ESEE process on both types of resources at the same time. You could use the map to identify the

## Minutes of the Metro Council Natural Resources Committee Meeting

Wednesday, July 17, 2002

Page 7 of 12

impact areas and the conflicting uses. Those were the very earliest steps within the ESEE process. They were not inventorying steps.

Then, additional requirements came out of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan. There was an important step that needed to be completed before we moved into the ESEE process. It was one that the Council had identified for itself as work. It was an agreement with the local governments in the region to look at other Goal 5 plans that had already been adopted. Then, identify if there were inconsistencies or inadequacies in the data or protections in those plans and do the regional ESEE analysis only on areas where the Council had identified that the data or the protections were inadequate or inconsistent. The Council had a choice here. The interpretation of this section of the Functional Plan was important. The Council could determine that there were inconsistencies between Goal 5 programs, inadequacies between local programs or both. They had three ways to entering into the ESEE process through looking at these local plans and all of those would be reasonable interpretations of Metro Code and they could move forward on that. It was his understanding that the staff had developed a base document that compared these local plans. It was his recommendation that they bring those to Committee, take public comment on them and adopt their conclusions and any supporting documentation in a resolution just as they had for other small steps along the way. That helped staff memorialize decisions that the Council was making along the way as they moved to a final program.

Chair McLain summarized Mr. Helm had described two very important issues that she wanted considered. She wanted them introduced today. The staff could bring back documentation or resolution that would help get the work done as part of the work plan and as part of making sure that our own Code was met. There had been discussion about the difference between inconsistencies and inadequacies. That was another piece on those local plans that they needed to consider. Her personal take on this was that no one liked to be called inadequate. If they had choices between inconsistent and inadequate, she would like to spend more of their time talking about inconsistencies. She had asked staff to respond to that comment and to talk about how they could follow that guideline, how and why they would want to develop a review of inconsistencies versus inadequacies. There was an ability to do one, both or either. With the approval of the Committee, it was her request to asked Mr. Helm to bring forward that work in the form of a resolution which would give the Committee some options, ideas and an opportunity to discuss those issues. She said she thought it was important that the Committee carefully reviewed this memo and that if any councilor needed a briefing before the August 31<sup>st</sup> meeting that they request this from staff.

Councilor Park asked for clarification on steps proceeding the ESEE analysis. It said that the Goal 5 rule did not require Metro to take any further steps with regard to inventory, however, the rules allowed them to conduct a single analysis for a site containing more than one significant Goal 5 resource. That went back to item #8 on the resolution on a combined map. He was trying to make sure that a combined or reconciled map that showed multiple Goal 5 resources on a particular site did not actually enter into the ESEE stage as they had decided that area received more consideration than another. How would this be accomplished so that they didn't influence the next step, so they truly concluded an inventory step?

Chair McLain said Mr. Turpel had been asked to bring a response to the Committee on that issue. Councilor Park asked if they could do multiple ESEEs or just one? Mr. Helm said they had their choice and that was exactly what that provision of the Goal 5 rule was trying to address. Many jurisdictions found in difficult to parcel out the ESEE process for individual resources and the State found it acceptable that they be put them together particularly if they shared a common land area.

Councilor Park said Mr. Helm had said at the last meeting that uplands and riparian areas may or may not be equal in terms of a legal sense. Was that a correct characterization? Mr. Helm said that was a correct

## Minutes of the Metro Council Natural Resources Committee Meeting

Wednesday, July 17, 2002

Page 8 of 12

characterization of his question. His response was that the rule didn't indicate any particular weighting between the two or any of the resources. One of the things that needed to be done was if a resource conflicted with another resource then they needed take account of that. He didn't think that would occur in the process they were currently in because the resource types that they were looking at were fairly similar as compared to others. When you get into an issue of having one Goal 5 resource conflict with another was usually when you had aggregate resources which were one of the fifteen Goal 5 resources in a riparian zone or corridor for example. Since they were not dealing with aggregate sites he was sure that would not happen for them.

Councilor Park said since we don't have to weight them equally and if we do combine a map in such a way that we can't distinguish which were which, riparian from uplands, we had in fact said they were of equal weighting. Since we were not into the actual ESEE step, that was what he was trying to avoid in combining the map or reconciling the map in such as way that we had made that decision. That was what he was trying to make sure we hadn't done.

Chair McLain said, at this point they hadn't done anything because they had in front of them the combined map issue. They had asked staff to look at this issue. It was clear at the last meeting that they said that they wanted all information to go forward, they didn't want to color, shadow or have a prejudice against the information. They wanted it to go fully into ESEE. That was what they had asked staff to come up with a way to do. They would be giving direction to staff today.

Councilor Park said he understood that, but if we do combine them in such a way that we can not distinguish them, had we in fact made that step and called it into the ESEE if we had co-mingled the inventory in such as way that they couldn't distinguish them? Mr. Helm responded that it would be his recommendation that they create a map that distinguished the two.

Mr. Turpel said they had produced a map, which simply showed those areas that were simply riparian corridors and those areas that were simply wildlife habitat and then where both of them were on the same geography. It seemed to him that there were a couple of challenges with Goal 5, one, it said at the first stage you had to figure out what was the quantity, quality and location of the resource. That was what the Committee was dealing with right now. They had provided these numerical scores, one through thirty for riparian corridor and one through nine for wildlife habitat as a way to say here was the quality as best we could judge. He thought the problem was that they jumped ahead as staff and said in addition you could use those ratings for ESEE analysis but we think that needed to be simplified. That was where the Committee had expressed concerns. It seemed to him that whatever map they ended up adopting as wildlife habitat, it was ranked for quality and inventory purposes only. We also had a riparian corridor map that was ranked for quality and inventory purposes only. Then they had a map that showed what was regionally significant for wildlife habitat and riparian corridors. He thought that what they were looking for was a clean distinction between this at the end of the inventory but as far as the ESEE analysis consequences there was a whole number of issues that the Committee had concerns about. Eventually they would get into those but they didn't have to get into them at this moment. Some of those issues would be addressed at a future time. They would show the Committee that combined map and they could see if the map did it or not and also have legal review the map to ensure that it did not commit Metro before the Council was ready to be committed.

Mr. Houck said he was beginning to understand the conversation about losing data and that was through the combining of the maps. He actually shared the concern. They did need to be able to distinguish the range of colors from 1 to 30 and 1 to 9. That would be very helpful during the ESEE analysis and the program development. He clarified the uplands area was wildlife. His concern was that, during the

## Minutes of the Metro Council Natural Resources Committee Meeting

Wednesday, July 17, 2002

Page 9 of 12

riparian work because of the vagaries of the planning program, they subtracted the wildlife values out of those riparian areas. His great concern especially given the fact that there was a 90% or more concurrence between wildlife and riparian inventory was that there was very little of the landscape out there that was strictly upland or riparian. The areas were very coincident. The areas that were only riparian were developed flood plains. In order to do an effective ESEE analysis and program development they had to have those riparian areas reflecting their wildlife values? However we get there, the only way to do the job right was going to be looking at both the riparian and wildlife values together because that was what made those areas so important was the combined scores of those areas. When they got to the program element, then, the full range of colors would be helpful. They would be able to look at it and say which areas were most important to protect and how. They took the wildlife out of the riparian. That did not reflect what was going on ecologically. It was an artifact of the planning program. They had to look at them combined from an ecological perspective.

Chair McLain said what this Committee said on July 3<sup>rd</sup> was that they didn't want to prejudice any information going into ESEE. They wanted to make sure that all information was there because they felt that having all of the information available and then simplifying it and then bringing it back could create information getting through the cracks. The other element was trying to make some sense about what were A, B, C etc. elements and was the simplified system very simple. Did it help give detailed combined information that was valuable? She suggested giving direction to staff today. Were we saying to staff carry both of those maps forward, do a combined ESEE on them and make sure when it was appropriate that the Committee talked about which of those elements trumped other elements? They would like to forward parts of that work to the ESEE analysis so it was all there and so they could talk about some of the trade-offs and priorities.

Mr. Houck said the real reason he came to the testimony table was his concern that the Committee may consider the riparian areas to be more important than the wildlife areas. He was here to say they were both equally important and whatever methodology they went forward with, both areas had to be considered as equally important.

Councilor Park said the part he didn't agree with was the fact that they were doing a combined ESEE. He agreed with creating a single map, it was not combined however it was reconciled so it reflects what was uplands and riparian so that when it goes over to ETAC that they knew what they were looking at. He was not ready to say that he wanted to do a combined ESEE yet. They had not had that discussion yet. Chair McLain concurred they were not to that step yet. She added, staff needed to know what the database was that they were forwarding to ESEE.

Councilor Park clarified that ETAC needed to know what they were looking at. ETAC couldn't do their work until the committee did that step. He was comfortable with the other as long as it was distinguishable to ETAC.

Mr. Olson asked for clarification as to why Mr. Houck was being asked to give input on this issue. It seemed to him that special interests had a hand on what was going on here. Chair McLain said they had many advisory groups and Mr. Houck served as a representative to the Goal 5 TAC. Mr. Houck was responding in that capacity.

Chair McLain asked Mr. Turpel to summarize what direction the Committee had given staff today. Mr. Turpel responded that they were not there yet as to trying to get into the ESEE analysis on what was more important than others and they were not there in terms of adopting the map yet. The wildlife habitat and the riparian corridor maps would be adopted in draft form by resolutions. Staff would then combine those

## **Minutes of the Metro Council Natural Resources Committee Meeting**

Wednesday, July 17, 2002

Page 10 of 12

two maps in a geographic sense so they could see which areas the Council concluded was areas of regional significance as far as fish and wildlife habitat for analysis of the ESEE consequences. All of the data would be available as they got into those discussions about what was more important. Right now what staff would be producing and the Committee would be considering was a map which said geographically if you combined those two maps what did that show. They were not yet getting into the ESEE analysis on what was more important or less important.

Chair McLain noted two handouts for the record one from Mr. John Maring and one from Storry Norman with South Garden Home Community Committee dealing with Goal 5 issues (see copies included with the permanent record of this meeting). Michael Morrissey, Council Analyst, restated what Mr. Turpel had said. The Committee would be getting an overlap map as a part of the inventory process. In a large extent there would be an overlap area which was both wildlife and riparian. The map will show the geographical area but it won't show the value of that combined area. If the Council wanted to do a combined ESEE as part of the ESEE step then at some point they would need to attribute some amount of value to the overlap area. Chair McLain reminded them they were not there yet but that was one of the beginning steps that they would make in that ESEE step.

### **7. ESEE NEXT STEP (ETAC, Peer Review)**

There was no discussion on this item.

### **ADJOURN**

There being no further business to come before the Natural Resources Committee, Chair McLain adjourned the meeting at 3:15 p.m.

Prepared by

Cheryl Grant  
Council Assistant

**Minutes of the Metro Council Natural Resources Committee Meeting**

Wednesday, July 17, 2002

Page 11 of 12

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF JULY 17, 2002**

<b>Agenda Item No.</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Doc Date</b>	<b>Document Description</b>	<b>Doc Number</b>
3	Greenspaces Master Plan	n/a	Resolution No. 02-3192 Exhibit "A", Proposed Regional Trails and Greenways Plan and Map Amendments	071702nr-01
3	Regional Trails and Greenways	7/8/02	Draft Regional Trails and Greenways map	071702nr-02
3	Regional Trails	n/a	Lewis & Clark Discovery Greenway Trail Legacy Program, A National Urban Trails Model Partnership Project	071702nr-03
3	Regional Trails	n/a	Lewis & Clark Discovery Greenway Trail	071702nr-04
4	Fish/Wildlife	7/16/02	Memo to Susan McLain from Mark Turpel re: Public comments, staff responses, Regional Fish and Wildlife Inventories	071702nr-05
7	Goal 5 Inventory, ESEE analysis	7/10/02	Memo to Susan McLain from Ken Helm re: Completing the Goal 5 Inventory and Other Steps Prior to the ESEE Analysis	071702nr-06
4	Wildlife criteria	7/17/02	Letter to Paul Ketcham from John Maring re: Property of Mr. John Marint --1N228C-00100 & 1N228DC-00300, Parcels along Dawson Creek on Sough Side of NE Airport Road, Metro Goal 5 Resource Inventory - Riparian Corridors & Wildlife Habitat	071702nr-07
4	Wildlife Criteria	6/26/02	Letter to Natural Resource Committee from Story Norman re: continued designation of Area of Special Concern S in Raleigh Hills	071702nr-08
3	Map Amendments	7/17/02	Letter to Natural Resources Committee from Gregg Everhart re: Regional Trails and Greenways Plan and Map Amendments	071702nr-09

**TESTIMONY CARDS**

Mike Houck, Audubon Society of Portland and Coalition for a Livable Future, 5151 NW Cornell Rd, Portland, OR 97210

Kelly Punteney, City of Vancouver and Clark County Trails and Greenways, P.O. Box 1995, Vancouver, WA 98660

Barbara Walker, 40 Mile Loop Landtrust, 1891 SW Hawthorne Terrace, Portland, OR 97201

Jayne Cronlund, Three Rivers Land Conservancy, P.O. Box 1116, Lake Oswego, OR 97035

Chris Hathaway, Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership, 811 SW Naito Parkway, Suite 120, Portland, OR 97204

Richard Meyer, City of Cornelius, Community Development Director, P.O. Box 608, Cornelius, OR 97113

Ric Catron, City of Gresham. Parks & Recreation

Aleta Woodruff, Metro Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee, 2143 NE 95<sup>th</sup> Place, Portland, OR

Greg Olson 4306 SW Galeborn, Portland, OR 97219

Mike Lehne, 7915 SE 162<sup>nd</sup>, Portland, OR 97236

**Minutes of the Metro Council Natural Resources Committee Meeting**

Wednesday, July 17, 2002

Page 12 of 12

**SUBMITTED CARD BUT DID NOT TESTIFY:**

Donna M. Fitchett, 8442 NE 13<sup>th</sup> Ave., Portland, OR 97211-1504