

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

Wednesday, July 3, 2002
Council Chamber

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

Members Absent: Bill Atherton (excused)

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair McLain called the meeting to order at 1:07 p.m. and indicated that the Clerk would be putting together a list of items that had been presented or submitted on both Resolution No. 02-3176 and 02-3177. These would be available for public review.

1. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 26, 2002 SPECIAL NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE MEETING

The minutes were not considered at this time.

2. 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 talked about consideration of Resolution No. 02-3177 and when it had been considered at committee. She indicated that Paul Ketcham, Principle Regional Planner for Long Range Planning, had created a new schedule (a copy of which may be found in the meeting record).

Mike Hoglund, Director of Regional Planning, said he wanted to introduce the topic and go over the new schedule. He said the July 31st date for testimony would be a key date. He talked about the extensive documentation they had been tracking including e-mails, letters, faxes. They were compiling all of this and putting it into a response document that was broken out into comments of support and comments of concern or opposition. Where there was a question or recommendation they would give a response by August 8th when they had to make a final decision.

Chair McLain asked if additional testimony on July 3rd, 17th or 31st meetings would be available at the August 8th meeting. Mr. Hoglund said yes, it was a rolling document. There had been a request to ensure that interested persons were mailed to. They were creating a list of about 800 persons who they would respond to. They were e-mailing Goal 5 information to those they could and send written information to those who did not have an email address to let them know what the testimony schedule would be. Chair McLain asked about the interest list and what type of notice would be used? Mr. Hoglund responded they would send out a note card but also send an email notice prior to this so people were notified as soon as possible. Chair McLain said that notice was important to get out as soon as possible.

Councilor Park had a process question in looking at the calendar and how it interconnected with Economic Technical Advisory Committee (ETAC). He assumed that they needed to get to a certain point in nailing down what was regionally significant so that ETAC would have the opportunity to examine that against the economics, so the area would potentially be balanced and protected. Conversely, if they didn't

Minutes of the Metro Council Natural Resources Committee Meeting

Wednesday, July 3, 2002

Page 2 of 11

nail it down, then ETAC would not have something to work against other than the riparian portion. If they didn't give ETAC the wildlife portion they would not be able to do their work. Was that a fair assessment? Chair McLain said they felt that they had enough of the riparian work done that they had some beginning methodology issues that ETAC would be able to function and Mark Turpel, Long Range Planning Manager, had been working hard to be sure that the material they had already acted on, the maps they had already acted on well as the methodology they had talked about at the June 26th meeting would be available to ETAC so they could begin their work. Their hope was that if they could do this by August 8th and get it down to a consideration of the package by August 29th that they would indeed have the full package that they needed for consideration. She said it was a fair assessment by Councilor Park that if we didn't finish this work up they wouldn't have the full package. They felt that the schedule reacted to that timeline. Mr. Hoglund said, as they got to Mr. Ketcham's presentation on the second piece of the Goal 5 on the combined, they would see how it was all coming together and related to the (Economic, Social, Environmental and Energy) ESEE analysis. The longer they waited to get the combined mapping so they could start doing the ESEE comparisons the further behind the schedule might run.

Councilor Park expressed concern about giving ETAC what they needed so they could have a thorough discussion so it was at least as thorough on the economic side as it was on the environmental side. If ETAC didn't have this particular piece then they could do parts of it but not in the total context, which may result in different findings. ETAC was trying to look at it differently in a holistic fashion. Chair McLain said, to ease Councilor Park's mind, what they were getting by August 29th was just the information and then they would go into thorough ETAC work package. She felt they weren't going to finish with ESEE analysis for months. What they were doing was supporting Councilor Park's position, trying to make sure all of the information was pulled together by the end of August and then ETAC would go into two to four months of thorough discussion. Councilor Park said he wanted to make sure they were on track. Mr. Ketcham added that the ETAC schedule was focused on understanding the methodology that they were going to undertake with the ESEE analysis and reviewing the methodology. The methodology review and conclusion would not realistically happen before the end of August. The consultants work would not begin until ETAC had reviewed the methodology and recommended any adjustments to the methodology. By the time the inventory work was concluded the resolutions were ripe for adoption by the Council. ETAC should have finished its recommendations on methodology so that the consultant could begin its work with a complete inventory. Chair McLain said they had reviewed and updated the schedule. She said this schedule should say "final schedule". She wanted the public to have some certainty of what would be decided by when. She didn't want any more changes. The public had plenty of time to weigh in.

Mr. Hoglund said the other piece of this resolution was both the process side and then they wanted to open it up for questions if there were any questions on selecting the regionally significant wildlife. Chair McLain said they wanted to discuss the options. She asked that Mr. Ketcham continue his remarks of maps on the wall. There would be discussion on the maps by Committee and then they would allow public comment on Resolution No. 02-3177.

Mr. Ketcham said the Natural Resources Committee had had a presentation on the wildlife resolution regarding the options for what might be considered regionally significant wildlife habitat. He noted a matrix chart which had been reviewed by the Committee at their early June meeting (a copy of which may be found in the meeting record). In the chart there were six options for identifying regionally significant wildlife habitat. The Goal 5 Technical Advisory Committee (Goal5TAC) had recommended that all wildlife habitat that had been inventoried through modeling or through habitats of concern were significant wildlife habitat and that of that domain the areas that were receiving scores of two or higher were regionally significant wildlife habitats. Also, before the Committee was a recommendation from the

Minutes of the Metro Council Natural Resources Committee Meeting

Wednesday, July 3, 2002

Page 3 of 11

Executive Officer which was the same as the Goal5TAC recommendation. Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC) had recommended that the first part of that recommendation which was all wildlife habitats that were modeled and included as habitats of concern were significant wildlife habitats. They had yet to reach a recommendation on what was regionally significant. Those were the recommendations before Committee at this time. According to the schedule MTAC was to make a recommendation on July 17th regarding regionally significant wildlife habitat then that recommendation would go to MPAC. MPAC had already been fully briefed. The information had been provided to both committees so they could make a recommendation. Chair McLain pointed out that MPAC was Metro Policy Advisory Committee and MTAC was Metro Technical Advisory Committee. Those committees had representatives from local jurisdictions as well as citizens and other interested parties.

Mr. Ketcham said he was prepared to answer questions about their work to date. Mr. Ketcham said the maps before the Committee today included the total wildlife habitat inventory map, a delineated the habitats of concern map, regional significant options maps, and how do they reconcile the riparian corridor and the wildlife habitat inventories into an analysis map for the ESEE program. Councilor Park asked about "habitats of concern", was this a catch all for those that didn't get under the other mapping. Was that a legal term or biological term? Mr. Ketcham said the habitats of concern were not a catchall phrase for the wildlife inventory but specifically identify rare or unique habitats in the region. Rare may be because they were declining and had been identified by resource agencies such as the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife as declining habitats, which included such habitat as white oaks, native grass lands, wetlands, bottom land hardwood forests. It was a term that was used in the Goal 5 rule habitats of concern as mapped by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. They had taken the initiative to map those areas where the department had had insufficient resources to do so itself. There were some other criteria for what might constitute a habitat of concern including riverine habitats, any unique habitat areas providing life history requirements for sensitive species including herons or horn larks. These were not catchalls but enhancements of the existing inventory. It told them where the rare habitat types were; most were already covered in the model. They were already included in the wildlife habitat inventory. This gave them more information about the quality of the habitats in the model. Chair McLain said, at this point, they were looking at and considering what they believed was regionally significant and what was not. It was listed in Goal 5 as one of the requirements to be looked at. Mr. Ketcham said it was a legal as well as biological inquiry. Chair McLain said they could make choices as to whether they thought they were regionally significant or not but they needed to have them inventoried making sure they were studied and reviewed. Councilor Park asked was it the habitat that was rare or the species that used those habitats. Mr. Ketcham said it could be both and gave an example. They were not including built features such as bridges but natural environments. Chair McLain said they had to demonstrate that they were thorough enough that they reviewed all of those species and habitats. They may not be determined to be regionally significant but they had to inventory them and demonstrate where they existed. Mr. Ketcham gave an example of the great blue heron rookers. There were multiple reasons why a particular geographic area would qualify as a habitat of concern and most areas were already included in the model.

Councilor Hosticka asked about the inventory, significance and anticipating the results of further analysis, was there a legal or policy distinction between putting something on an inventory and then allowing conflicting uses or not having it on the inventory at all? What was the legal interpretation of the impact of that or policy interpretation of that. Mr. Ketcham responded that we were inventorying habitat based on specific criteria. If those were biological or ecological criteria were satisfied, then that particular landscape feature was added to the inventory. It was a policy decision on the Council to determine which of those features were regionally significance. If they were to remove areas from the inventory based on economic values or land uses occurring then they would have to have different criteria to guide the

Minutes of the Metro Council Natural Resources Committee Meeting

Wednesday, July 3, 2002

Page 4 of 11

inventory process. So far they had not used those kinds of criteria. Councilor Hosticka said Councilor Park had raised the issue of falcons on the bridges. A similar question came up in the Tigard area. There was a school with a sports field completely surrounded by riparian and wildlife habitat and the wildlife used the sports field when nobody was there. Was this a habitat that we should list on the inventory or was it something that they knew that there was a use there but they were not going to try to protect and it shouldn't be on the inventory? Mr. Ketcham said there was a difference between an area, which had landscape features and where there were none. On the other hand, if there was a school field approximate to a stream and connected to low structure areas that were greater than two-acre contiguous patch, that would be inventoried as potential wildlife habitat. He gave reasoning for this inclusion in the inventory. At the ESEE stage, it would be a relevant factor to consider land use, the conflicting uses, and the priority of those land uses relative to the resource values. That was the direction they were heading in. Ken Helm, Senior Assistant Counsel, said what you were doing when you created this inventory was creating a batch of evidence showing where habitat was or where you had wildlife usage. From a legal point of view we were trying to identify location, quality and quantity as a baseline requirement. This cut two directions, if you didn't have sufficient evidence on one of those three indicators you could be challenged legally for putting it on inventory and if you had all three indicators, you could equally be challenged for leaving it off, particularly for reasons that were unrelated to those pure location, quality and quantity. He thought about the inventory question in the same way we think about listing endangered or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act. The listing criteria under the federal act were supposed to be purely scientific. There were other parts of the Act where other considerations could make differences to that listing but the listing itself was supposed to be purely scientific. Here the Committee had already chosen a purely scientific way of identifying the inventory. A lot of the comments they had heard over the last three years came from the direction of multi-use of the land. Challenges to local inventories had been fairly rare and unsuccessful. The more successful litigation had come to ESEE analysis. They needed to be careful there. What they were doing when they nailed down that inventory was they were geographically stating the universe that they would subject the ESEE analysis to. Chair McLain said they couldn't hear that too often, they were required by law to make sure that they had reviewed the universe and then when you start talking about conflicting uses, programs, economic, social, energy and environmental considerations, that was when you start talking about the trade-offs and making choices. The inventory needed to be complete.

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

Terri Ellett, 1630 N.E. Gertz Rd., Portland, OR was here at the last meeting and was disturbed by what was transpiring particularly the gentleman from Audubon Society who said they had their heads in sand by not know what was going on. The people in her neighborhood had been following the City of Portland and they were unaware that there were two distinct governmental bodies were attacking the same problem from different ends. When they were notified of the Natural Resources Committee meeting last week, they felt that they had been sucker punched because they thought both bodies working on same thing and both were doing the same thing. She personally had not finished reading the material but what she had read was that it appeared that they were going back to the time of Lewis and Clark. She hoped that was not true because her house would be under water. She had not seen anything on how they were going to treat the drainage district. City of Portland's plan did not treat the drainage district well. She lived on Gertz Road by Marine Drive, which was a dike. When they had the flood of 1996 she called the City of Portland and they said if you have any problems call us we will let you know what was happening. She called and City of Portland said there were no dikes on Marine Drive. She hoped Metro treated the drainage district better in their plan than the City of Portland had planned to treat them. Their goals were laudable but she hoped they took into consideration the owner's welfare, both emotional and financial. She said our houses were our social security. The stewardship that the residents had given these areas was

Minutes of the Metro Council Natural Resources Committee Meeting

Wednesday, July 3, 2002

Page 5 of 11

the reason they had what existed now. Some of the residents had lived there many years and by taking care of the property and allowing things to grow they had helped Metro with protection of the habitat. She hoped if Metro decided to put these areas in protection, that they compensated the people. She suggested just buying the property at fair market value so people could get on with their lives.

Peter Neketin, 8771 S.W. 71st Place, Portland, OR 97223 said he was on the Steering Committee of a local ad-hoc citizens group in the Garden Home Community Committee. He was speaking for himself. His committee happened to be involved in a discussion regarding possible development of a parcel that was shown on their community plan as wildlife habitat. He was enthusiastically supportive of the attempts to identify and protect wildlife habitat. He knew that there was a great deal of public support for those efforts. He supported Resolution No. 02-3177. He agreed with the previous speaker. He said he was concerned that any costs, which ultimately may be necessary, would be distributed equitably. If society in general was to benefit from preservation of wildlife habitat perhaps the cost to such preservation should not be borne solely by those property owners. He said this without any illusion as to the difficulties at the present time. He was embarrassed because he was not sure where we were on implementation of the identification and inventory of non-buildable lands. He believed that if they were not up to speed on that he wanted to encourage all due haste there. He felt it was appropriate to mention in the present context because there may be a good deal of overlap. Chair McLain asked him to identify his definition of unbuildable lands. Mr. Peter said he could give his personal definition. Chair McLain asked if he was talking about wetlands or environmentally sensitive lands? Mr. Peter said he was talking about wetlands, steep properties that could not be developed without exceeding the standards for street grades. Chair McLain said she wanted to make sure they were on the same boat with his comments. Chair McLain said the Title 3 properties dealt with flood mitigation and water quality. That protection dealt with steep slopes and floodplain areas. They had some experience with that through the last program. If he was in the City of Portland they did those all together.

Councilor Park said Mr. Peter supported a compensation mechanism. They had all struggled with this. He talked about zoning and value of properties. In this particular stage they were looking at how they protected the livability of the region. The compensation mechanism was the trickiest part. He was curious if Mr. Peter's had any suggestions. Chair McLain said they had both talked about acquisition and had already purchased over 7000 acres. They didn't want to put the testifiers on the spot but if they had suggestions she encouraged those suggestions. Ms. Ellett said she didn't have a specific answer, but when many of them had purchased the property, the zoning was different and now the City wanted to change the zoning. The property owners were caught. They had property bordering the slough. According to the City of Portland's plan, they wanted 175 feet. That took the house. They said if it burned down you couldn't rebuild. They had to pay taxes on this land. Who paid the liability? Chair McLain appreciated the testifiers' comments. They were not yet in the program or ESEE conflicting-use stage. In the Title 3 program, sometimes it was acquisition, incentives, or regulations. Ms. Ellett said City of Portland's seemed to be just regulation. Chair McLain said they would keep them apprised of the process. Mr. Peter responded that he did not have any solutions to the compensation mechanism. Mr. Hogle said they had a buildable lands inventory database which got down to a very large scale. The latest inventory accounted for undeveloped land such as slopes and wetlands.

Chair McLain called for further conversation on options or on choices as far as what should be regionally significant habitat areas. Councilor Hosticka said the reason he raised his question was based on a letter that they got from Tualatin Basin Coordinating Committee suggesting as they did in the riparian area that although there were some anomalies in the maps that they thought might need to be corrected, they were relatively comfortable with us going forward designating the inventory. The ESEE stage was when they would want to do further refinements. If that was the case, he was not as concerned about where they

Minutes of the Metro Council Natural Resources Committee Meeting

Wednesday, July 3, 2002

Page 6 of 11

drew the lines, as they would have been if it were more important to the actual results on the ground as to what happened to the land. Chair McLain called for further comments and then said this was a work session and this will be on the next agenda as well. They would be working toward meeting the schedule and having a recommendation for the advisory groups as well as the Committee by the July 31st date.

Chair McLain close the public hearing.

3. COMBINED RIPARIAN CORRIDOR AND WILDLIFE HABITAT MAP

Mr. Ketcham spoke to the materials in the packet and the additional materials in the back of the chamber. There was a memo dated June 13, 2002, revised from himself to the Goal5TAC describing three primary options with a variation for a fourth option for how they would combine both the riparian corridor and the wildlife habitat inventories. The reason they were doing this was that they needed an analytical tool for reconciling differences in the scoring approaches used in the two inventories so that when they got to the ESEE analysis they had an analytical tool they could use to value natural resources and compare them with economic values in the region. This was an information item to committee; they would be receiving recommendations from various advisory committees on how they should reconcile the two inventories. Goal5TAC had already made a recommendation on how to combine the inventories. They were recommending Option 3 with an adjustment. No other advisory committees had given recommendation on how to combine these inventories. MTAC was poised to make that recommendation July 17th. Chair McLain asked on which option? Ketcham said on any option. He briefly described the options and reviewed the maps on the wall. He talked about the chart which detailed acreage (a copy of which is found in the meeting record). He noted that about 93% of the wildlife habitat inventory were located within the boundaries of riparian corridors. The question was how they reconciled the two inventories. He spoke to scoring on each of the maps and the difference in scoring. Mr. Ketcham talked about the three options before the Committee and the chart, which described what percentage of the inventory, fell into the various classes. Councilor Bragdon asked was the habitat inside the Urban Growth Boundary was of higher quality than what was outside of the boundary. Mr. Ketcham said Forest Park skewed the value, it was 5000 acres. Mr. Ketcham then talked about Option 2 and compared it to Option 1.

Councilor Hosticka said he didn't get what the point of this was, why were they classifying things. It seemed that they were jumping ahead. Michael Morrissey, Council Analyst, said he was thinking the same thing. He believed the end result of this exercise probably allowed some differentiation for the purpose of ESEE. If when the Council agreed that there was regionally significant riparian to be mapped and regional significant wildlife to be mapped, he believed that the result of the classification schemes didn't say that anything was not significant. Was this all geared to making ESEE a more comprehensive and sophisticated process? Mr. Ketcham said yes, it was an analytical tool for the ESEE analysis. However the combined inventory classification scheme was rooted in the natural resource values. It was a relative scale of values of what was regionally significant. He gave more specifics about the values. They needed some tool in which to compare and contrast economic values. Councilor Hosticka said the scoring system talked about how many and what types of functions were performed. We were leading ourselves to believe that the scoring system told them how valuable the areas were. He said even when they started out they didn't intend to use that scoring system for this. He said the problem was there were things that weren't captured by the scoring system that they might want to take into account when they were trying to assess the importance of any particular habitat area. It seemed to him that they were losing information rather than gaining it. He hoped they had a way to regain information as they did when they did the habitats of concern. Chair McLain observed that Options 1 and 2 were very complicated. This was a situation where we were trying to fine tune or hone a tool. They were making comparisons, giving it a low, medium and high category, putting it into a bucket. Were they going to protect valuable, very

Minutes of the Metro Council Natural Resources Committee Meeting

Wednesday, July 3, 2002

Page 7 of 11

valuable or highly valuable on all levels of both riparian and wildlife? The staff was trying to give them some general tools to start with and then they would hone in on the specifics. On the areas of functions they knew that they were different for riparian and wildlife corridors. They had to be done distinctly, they can't be integrated at the beginning because you had to show distinctly that you did riparian and distinctly that you did wildlife but at the end you had to come up with a program that dealt with both. The questions that were asked were good. It was reminding them that they had to do specific data and then they had to combine that data and come up with how they were going to use it for regional significance. Mr. Ketcham continued with Option 3. In terms of Councilor Hosticka's question and combining the inventories. It was not meant to lose or subtract from the inventory process that had been done so far but to be representative of the scaling systems we used to derive the original inventories to begin with. Councilor Hosticka clarified what he meant, what they were essentially doing was taking system where they had 30 ways of looking at the world and nine in another way and breaking it down into three. This was what he meant by losing information. In the process when they got to the end, they were going to have to start adding it back in. He expressed concern that questions of justification might be raised. The answer to the questions would be ripe with opportunities to question their motivations at this point. He suggested that in creating the maps they don't portray it in a way that allowed people to use it in their decision making. Mr. Ketcham said none of this was lost in their inventory process. By classing their inventories so they can reconcile their scoring differences, none of that base information was lost. It was still there in all of the data layers. It was still accessible if a specific question came up as to why in ESEE analysis a particular decision was recommended. Chair McLain said the point was and the wisdom we have tried to pass on today was the fact that the technical work looked arbitrary. They had to explain it. She suggested that the wisdom was to make sure when they were explaining this, they made sure that people knew that all of the data was there and retrievable. When they came to the decision time, they would have to put the line somewhere. They wanted it to be technical, biologic, legally sound and not political. Councilor Park reserved comments until after Option 3, which illustrated Councilor Hosticka's and his concerns.

Mr. Ketcham continued with Option 3. Chair McLain said that was perfect example of explaining differences. Mr. Ketcham said there was a difference and the difference was that the areas that were scoring 18 or more were there areas that were receiving three primary values or more. He compared Options 1 and 2 to 3 and explained further the differences. Councilor Bragdon said he was having a hard time following this too. There was a point where they needed to move beyond the descriptive part of the analysis into making relative value judgements. That was part of the discomfort here. Earlier stages were descriptive. Chair McLain agreed, she said they felt the same way when they were dealing with the riparian areas. Mr. Hogle said what was going on here was they needed to have some useable classifications and categories to come up with some fairly straight forward decision rules for when they had the environmental functions on one side and the economic functions on the other side. If you thought about where they were starting to head on the economic side, they were looking at the 2040-land use types. There were about nine of those, which could be grouped. The way they were thinking this would work was that the Committee would have some level of higher priorities set of resources. In the instance where you were matching an environmental concern against the economic concern you would have ground rules that said this was either a protect, limit or allow. That got them to a point where you stopped and took a look at it. You were taking away information and making generalizations. Then they felt that through the sub-watershed analysis and other analysis on the economic side you had to go back in and take a look at what were they missing with the ground rules and then start to make your real decision on protect, limit and allow. From that you went to a program area. The hard part was having three random primary values that were all critical and all worked together. What this was saying was you were trying to maximize the functional values to the degree possible. Chair McLain said that was a good explanation but she thought that all four of the Committee members were asking to be convinced that 24 to 30 was the A,

Minutes of the Metro Council Natural Resources Committee Meeting

Wednesday, July 3, 2002

Page 8 of 11

or 18 to 30 was the A or that there were some choices that had been made that were logical and sensible and science based.

Councilor Park talked about his concern. They started with a scoring system based on how many primary functions and secondary functions. That got converted into a number. Then they converted a number into letters based upon a range. Then as they moved through this if they got three Option 3, they were looking at class A as being back to numbers, 18-20. He was not sure why they were doing all of this conversions of back and forth, and trying to create ranges. It was either three, four, or five primary functions on one side and "x" amount on the other side in terms of the upland piece. Then you look at them and make a decision. He was not sure why they were making those conversions back and forth and making judgement calls because by the time you get to the process anyone trying to follow this would try to figure out where did you make all of these extra steps and other judgements along the line of converting the scoring system. Chair McLain said she would defend them on one point. When they did it the first time they only had the riparian to deal with. The difficulty and complexity of this time was riparian and wildlife integration because of the different functions for each and the complexity of adding the other element. Councilor Park understood that if they both scored high on riparian and uplands then it was probably something they were going to identify as significant. Chair McLain said what they did here today was to give staff a reality check that when we do this technical work we had to present it in such a way that it was easy to understand and follow. They understood what Mr. Ketcham said, they were trying to understand if it was valuable to them. Councilor Hosticka responded to Councilor Park. He was taking a little responsibility as former chair of Natural Resources because he was the one who wanted a bunch of colors on the map, he wanted a lot of categories because he was concerned that the one size fits all issue that people brought up was a legitimate concern that they were not responding to the diversity of the human and natural environment. Part of the problem on a regional scale was how you have a system that takes into account all of that diversity. He was still struggling with why we were collapsing it back down and whether or not they couldn't come up with a way of analyzing that kept all of the diversity in the analysis.

Mr. Hoglund said they had 30 riparian scores and 9 wildlife scores. The point was that they were going to have a limited number of program areas. They were trying to figure out how you best line up the tradeoffs to the ESEE to get to a program step where you may have 10 to 15 different suggested programs. Councilor Hosticka said this was useful conversation for the rest. He thought that becomes an important consideration if our system was primarily prescriptive in terms of trying to define from the abstract to the concrete and trying to anticipate what's out there and then make a prescription for how they were going to deal with it. If they come down to a program which was primarily a performance based program that said we were not going to tell you how to reach these goals but these were the goals that we wanted to specify that should be met. He thought that they didn't necessarily have to go through this whole analysis. Their assessment anticipated that we were going to prescribe a program. If what we say in the end was, no, we can't prescribe because there was too much diversity but we want you to meet these goals and we were going to have a system that determined whether the goals were met, we may not need to go through that process. He said we were jumping way ahead to what the structure of the program was and saying that we had to do our analysis at this stage to anticipate what that program was going to be. Councilor Park said at some point we were going to have to make a decision as to the relative value between riparian and wildlife habitat areas, in other words, were they both equal? If they were equal in the eyes of how Goal 5 was structured? If they were equal then on the scoring system you can figure out a relatively easy multiplier factor and make them equal so you could do a combined scoring and come up with something. You would not have to have this matrix. He was trying to come up with a way that they didn't do all of these conversions. Councilor Park continued when you start doing the conversions you lose why we scored them in the first place which was to say, these areas had six primary functions and that was why it

Minutes of the Metro Council Natural Resources Committee Meeting

Wednesday, July 3, 2002

Page 9 of 11

got such a high score. He felt they were losing what they were trying to do in the beginning, which was to explain the primary functions to the general public.

Mr. Helm said where the staff was going here was primarily to respond to a rule that allowed local governments to take what ever Goal 5 resources they had inventoried, map them, and put them through one ESEE process. The goal was to avoid doing an ESEE on riparian corridors by itself and then another ESEE by itself for wildlife habitat. The rule didn't tell them much more than that except that you could do it. As to the question whether there was a relative weight between resources, his best guess in the reading of the rule, was there was nothing indicated in the rule that any resource outweighed another, particularly with two very similarly situated and related resources as these two were, you would probably not have conflicts between resources that you needed to account for so that you should assume that they were of equal value as to each other. There were other resources in the Goal 5 rule such as aggregate resources that the rules told you, when you had those types of resources you needed to balance them against other resources such as wetlands or riparian corridors because the Goal 5 resources may conflict in a way that you managed them ultimately. He did not think that was true for these resources. He pointed out that if you were going to proceed to combine the maps to facilitate the ESEE you needed to plainly understand that this was an ESEE step. At the time that the Council adopted Resolution No. 02-3177 and 02-3176, that would be the point in time where your inventory was complete. Those resolutions were designed to be watertight. They will stand on their own and represent databases. From that point on, the way you manipulated your database was up to you. Gradations were possible if they facilitated the balancing process.

Justin Houck, Associate Regional Planner, said our intent here was to organize the information, organize and reconcile. They were trying to reconcile two different schemes of doing things, how riparian corridors were rated and how wildlife was rated. They were trying to organize both of those tools in such a way that when they moved through the ESEE analysis they had a general framework in which to work. He knew there was a lot of detail they had to work with. In the combined inventory map, there were more than 80,000 unique areas that had been scored differently. That was the framework they could start with in those areas and then could answer any questions about any particular area. So when they went through the ESEE analysis, it was not out of the realm of possibility, to make a general decision, and then look closer at any of the places.

Councilor Park said Mr. Helm's last comment helped the most in that they were crossing into ESEE and how they would take this information and move it ahead. He thought the critical piece came under Option 3 going from four primary functions in Option 1 to three primary functions in Option 3, what was the justification? Chair McLain that was where they started. She hoped on July 17th that Planning would provide them with not options dialogue but tell them the choices of three to five primary functions and how you supported these legally and biological. Why were they reasonable or good choices? Why was it regional or significant? As Mr. Helm pointed out, that was the conversation they needed to have right now because that was what they were doing with the inventory. When they start doing the balancing act and the ESEE analysis, then this other organization may be very profitable. That gave them a chance to weigh in on the dialogue about the balancing act between economic, environmental, social and energy. She didn't think there was any confusion or problems, she thought they wanted clarity and simplified presentations for the public. Councilor Park said at some point were we going to make policy choices? Did we weight them equally? At some time when they had to combine them to give the beginning step of ESEE, would they be weighting riparian and wildlife habitat equally? Chair McLain said that was what those options did for you. It gave you an opportunity to have that conversation. As Councilor Park pointed out, Option 1 and 2 were opposite as to how they weighted some of the wildlife and riparian factors. She asked Councilor Park if he was asking if they legally needed to do that. Councilor Park asked

Minutes of the Metro Council Natural Resources Committee Meeting

Wednesday, July 3, 2002

Page 10 of 11

when they would make that policy choice? He said that what Mr. Helm was indicating was that policy choice may have already been made for them through LCDC and Goal 5. He was not comfortable with options he was seeing here because of the relative weighting between the two. For example, when you look at some of the scoring without doing some type of re-weighting of this, you could end up with an "A" for riparian and "A" for wildlife with a score around 25. Then you could also do a riparian corridor at 30 and a wildlife at 2 for class C and end up with a higher score of 32. Yet the relative functions of those two places didn't tell him anything. What he was looking for was some kind of conversion which allowed him to say that if it was relative you ended up with a score at the low end of a class A function, if you used three primary functions, and it was on the low end of a class A under wildlife. Chair McLain said after her experience with Councilor Park and waste sheds that she thought he had a very technically sound question and he should work with Mr. Ketcham on it. She didn't think we would be able to solve this today. Mr. Hogle said Councilor Park's question came up at MTAC today and we were already planning to work on that. He said Councilor Park's thoughts would be welcome on this issue. Chair McLain suggested this conversation be one on one. She noted that this was a work session, the Committee was trying to give information to staff for what would be presented at the July 17th meeting.

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

Chair McLain said this item would be considered at the July 17th Committee meeting at the request of staff.

ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Natural Resources Committee, Chair McLain adjourned the meeting at 2:52 p.m.

Prepared by

Cheryl Grant
Council Assistant

Minutes of the Metro Council Natural Resources Committee Meeting

Wednesday, July 3, 2002

Page 11 of 11

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF JULY 3, 2002

Agenda Item No.	Topic	Doc Date	Document Description	Doc Number
3	Wildlife habitat	6/13/02	Memo to Goal 5 TAC from Paul Ketcham re: Combining the Riparian Corridor and Wildlife Habitat Inventories	070302nr-01
2	Regional significance	6/4/02	Draft June 4, 2002 Table xxx Options for determining regionally significant wildlife habitats	070302nr-02
3	Wildlife habitat	7/2/02	Revised Schedule for Adopting the Riparian Corridor and Wildlife Habitat Inventories	070302nr-03
3	Wildlife habitat	n/a	Option 1 Distribution of Draft Resource Classes	070302nr-04
3	Wildlife habitat	n/a	Regional Distribution of Riparian and Draft Wildlife Resources	070302nr-05

TESTIMONY CARDS

Terri Ellett, 1630 N.E. Gertz Rd., Portland, OR

Peter Neketin, 8771 S.W. 71st Place, Portland, OR 97223