- Large habitat patches (see criterion 4), while vulnerable to fragmentation, may not be as important to systemic connectivity as smaller patches or more linear habitats.
- Program options providing more protection to lower value habitat areas, which tend to be small but important connectors or stepping stones, are more likely to promote connectivity, particularly in subwatersheds with lower proportions of habitat.
- Options 1A, 2A, and to a lesser extent, 1B are likely to best protect the region's existing connectivity.
- Options 2B, 2C and 1C are likely to significantly reduce connectivity in the region.

Summary

Program options show a marked decline in protection levels, as indicated in Table 4-23 below. The options that apply more stringent treatments to a larger portion of resources, particularly high value resources, will protect a larger proportion of regionally significant resources in the long term. Table 4-23 provides a ranking of program options for this criterion.

Table 4-23.	Performance of options in meeting Environmental Criterion 3: Promotes riparian
	corridor continuity and overall habitat connectivity.

Rank	Option	Performance
1	1A	Program option 1A perform best for all three subcriteria. This option is most likely to
		promote riparian corridor continuity and overall habitat connectivity.
2	2A	For riparian corridor continuity (subcriterion 3a) and protecting subwatersheds from disproportionate impacts (subcriterion 3c) program option 2A performs best. However,
		for risk to smaller connector habitats (subcriterion 3b), 1B is the best performer.
3	1B	This option performs better for protecting small connector habitats than 2A, but does not perform as well for riparian corridor continuity and protecting subwatersheds from disproportionate impacts.
4.	2B	This program option performs at a reduced, but fairly consistent, level for all three subcriteria.
5	2C	This option greatly reduces protection levels for all three subcriteria, and is likely to result in significantly reduced regional connectivity.
6	1C	This option greatly reduces protection levels for all three subcriteria, and is likely to result in significantly reduced regional connectivity. In particular, class C wildlife habitat is 100% allow under this option.

4. Conserves habitat quality and biodiversity provided by large habitat patches

The extent to which large habitat patches are disrupted by conflicting uses will help determine habitat quality. Program options that perform better in this regard are more likely to retain the region's biological diversity.

Potential impacts on fish and wildlife habitat

Large habitat patches are primarily forested areas, but also include wetlands. Larger habitat patches are more valuable to native wildlife than smaller patches because more species are retained over time, and species sensitive to human disturbance still have a place to live. Long-term trends in wildlife populations are directly related to the area of habitat available – the larger the patch size, the longer a population can sustain itself. Larger habitat patches also retain more natural predators to keep rodent populations in check²⁶.

Habitat quality tends to be higher in large patches because negative edge effects, such as invasive species introductions and increased nest predation, are reduced. Local studies show that the complex multi-layered forest and shrub structure important to birds, small mammals and other wildlife is enhanced in larger habitat patches. Large patches also typically contain more woody debris.

Certain sensitive species and groups of species, such as Neotropical migratory songbirds and area-sensitive species, are likely to be negatively affected by less protective options. Large habitat patches are also linked, directly or indirectly, to each of the eight major ecological impact categories described in the ESEE Phase I discussion draft (Metro 2003). Thus, large habitat patches are a key component to retaining the region's biodiversity.

Measuring the criterion

Habitat patch size was a criterion in Metro's wildlife habitat inventory. Because the wildlife and riparian inventories were subsequently combined, portions of large habitat patches near waterways were incorporated into riparian Classes I and II. As a result, large patches were typically split into Class I and II riparian or Class A and B wildlife. For this criterion the wildlife model score prior to reconciling the two inventories, including patches scoring 6-9 points, was used in an effort to gauge the potential programmatic results on large habitat patches.



²⁶ See Metro's Technical Report for Goal 5, Metro 2002.

Results

For each program option, Appendix 4E shows the acreage of large habitat patches that fall under various ALP designations. The data is reported separately for vacant and developed lands, for the reasons described under criterion 1; similarly, WQRA and parks are excluded in Figure 4-42, but are included in Appendix 4E. Figure 4-42 illustrates the most at-risk acres.

Basic statistics

• The total amount of large habitat patches, as defined in this criterion, is 38,360 acres.

Baseline protection (Title 3)

- Parks comprise 14,155 acres, or 37 percent of the total.
- WQRA comprise 8,090 acres (including 3,899 in parks) for 21 percent of the total.
- Six percent of the total habitat is in Title 3 FMA, but vegetation is not protected in FMA, therefore FMA areas do not protect large habitat patches.
- Excluding parks and WQRA, there are 20,014 acres of at-risk fish and wildlife habitat illustrated in Figure 4-42.
- The acres included in Figure 4-42 are subject to conflicting uses if no increase in protection level is applied; therefore, any program option that is not allow will provide incrementally more protection on these lands.

Potential effects of treatments vary by development status

- Excluding parks and WQRA, developed urban contains 26 percent of this habitat type, while 74 percent falls under vacant.
- The high percentage in vacant suggests that vacant habitat may be disproportionately affected by program choices.
- Developed urban is vulnerable as redevelopment occurs.
- The majority of habitat lands fall in single family residential zoning.
- Current trends for smaller lot sizes render large patches in both developed urban and vacant vulnerable to loss or fragmentation over time.

Program Option performance

- Urban development values in options 2A-2C substantially reduce protection of large habitat patches.
- For both vacant and developed urban habitat, Program Option 1A and to a lesser extent, Option 1B are most likely to keep large patches intact.
- Options 2A and 2B are marginal and may result in significant large patch encroachment.
- Options 2C and 1C are unlikely to retain large patches within the system.

Summary

Program options show a marked decline in protection levels, as indicated in Table 4-24 below. Options that apply stronger protection levels to large patches have a much greater chance of retaining the integrity of these important wildlife resources over time, and thus retaining good habitat quality and biodiversity. Incremental drops in protection may have more severe consequences in this criterion than in most other environmental criteria, because each drop in protection level raises the potential for large patch fragmentation.

Table 4-24. Performance of options in meeting Environmental Criterion 4: Conserves habitat quality and biodiversity provided by large habitat patches.

Rank	Option	Performance
1	1A	Figure 4-42 indicates that this option will provide the most effective protection for large habitat patches, with protection levels of Prohibit or Strictly Limit for all habitat.
2	1B	Protection level diminished, but still good, with Strictly or Moderately Limit for all habitat. However, any reduction in protection level will increase fragmentation of large patches, particularly with trends toward higher density development.
3	2A	Protection levels slightly lower than Option 1B. Three percent of vacant, unprotected habitat would fall under Lightly Limit in this option, with the remainder in Moderately Limit (51 percent), Strictly Limit (28 percent), or Prohibit (18 percent). No Allow.
4	2B	An incremental drop in protection levels compared to 2A. Seven percent of vacant, unprotected habitat would fall under Lightly Limit in this option, with the remainder in or Moderately Limit (55 percent) or Strictly Limit (38 percent).
5	2C	Substantially lower protection levels, with six percent of vacant, unprotected habitat in Allow, 12 percent in Lightly Limit, 56 percent in Moderately Limit, and 26 percent in Strictly Limit. No Prohibit. Likely to result in significant fragmentation of large patches.
6	1C	2C and 1C are fairly similar. 1C has decreased protection levels for all habitat classes, with 25 percent of vacant, unprotected habitat in Lightly Limit and 75 percent in Moderately Limit. Likely to result in significant fragmentation of large patches.

5. Promotes biodiversity through conservation of sensitive habitats and species

The amount and configuration of fish and wildlife habitat play important roles in the region's biodiversity, and these are addressed in Criteria 1 through 4. Also important, but not implicit in the first four criteria, are species and habitats that may be disproportionately at risk due to natural scarcity, habitat loss, or other factors.

Potential impacts on fish and wildlife habitat

For the purposes of this criterion both Habitats of Concern and Class I riparian habitat are included, because high-value riparian areas are widely acknowledged to be at-risk and because these habitats are mapped comprehensively for the region. In addition, known Species of Concern sightings are included to provide a relative measure of risk to wildlife. For these already-depleted habitats and species, a small habitat reduction could deal a major blow to regional biodiversity.

Criterion 5a: Habitats of Concern.

Habitats of Concern are specific areas known to provide a unique and at-risk habitat type, a unique and vital wildlife function, or both. Examples include wetlands, Oregon white oak habitat, riverine delta and island habitat, and critical migratory pathways. Habitats of Concern are premier wildlife areas that are elevated in importance and status within the inventory; all Habitats of Concern fall in either Class I riparian or Class A wildlife. Many of these areas, such as small wetlands, are less than the two-acre minimum established for the wildlife inventory but are included as Habitats of Concern due to their regional importance to biological diversity.²⁷ Program options providing more protection to these habitats will do a better job of retaining Habitats of Concern throughout the region.

Criterion 5b: Class I riparian.

The Habitats of Concern data is incomplete because it relies on local knowledge rather than comprehensive surveys. Therefore, for the purposes of this criterion Class I riparian habitat is also included because it is a widely acknowledged at-risk habitat and is mapped comprehensively for the region. Some of the implications of Class I habitat loss are described in Criterion 1. In addition to the ecological functions described there, high value riparian habitat contains more species than most other habitats; for example, the region's riparian areas are known to support approximately 93 percent of native bird species at some point in their lives. They also support more sensitive species, such as those found in Criterion 5c. Riparian areas provide vital fish and wildlife habitat connectivity throughout the region. The more a program option places Class I habitat at risk, the more negatively it will affect regional biological diversity.

²⁷ Metro collected information on Species of Concern and Habitats of Concern for the Goal 5 wildlife habitat inventory from a variety of sources with site-specific knowledge of the region. ODFW, USFWS, the Oregon Biodiversity Project, and the Oregon-Washington chapter of Partners in Flight identify wetlands, native grasslands, Oregon white oak habitat, and riparian forests as the top four Willamette Valley habitats at risk. ODFW also lists urban natural area corridors as important at-risk habitats. Metro used these habitat types, plus other key contributors to diversity such as riverine islands and deltas and key migratory bird stopover habitats, to map Habitats of Concern.

Measuring the criterion

For each program option, Appendix 4F shows the acreage of Habitats of Concern (Criterion 5a) and riparian Class I (Criterion 5b) falling under various ALP designations. The two are reported separately and are not mutually exclusive.

The data are reported separately for vacant and developed urban habitats, for the reasons described under criterion 1. Similarly, Title 3 Water Quality Resource Areas (WQRA) and parks are reported in Appendix 4F, but excluded from Figures 4-43 and 4-44 in order to focus on the habitats most at risk of development or other conflicting uses.

Results

Figures 4-43 and 4-44 illustrate the findings in Appendix 4F for Habitats of Concern, Class I riparian habitat, and Species of Concern, respectively. Program options that are likely to protect more at-risk habitats and species are assumed to perform better than other options.

Basic statistics: Habitats of Concern and Class I riparian

• The data illustrated by Figures 4-43 and 4-44 represent the portion of the





- habitat expected to be most at risk through development or redevelopment.
 The bar charts include 19,616 acres of Habitats of Concern and 8,688 acres of Class I riparian.
- Figures 4-43 and 4-44 exclude WQRA and parks from analysis for the same reasons stated in criterion 1.

Potential effects of treatments vary by habitat class, development status, and urban development value

- There are many more acres of vacant Habitats of Concern and Class I riparian than there are in developed urban. Therefore, the degree of protection afforded by each program option will have a stronger influence on vacant than on developed urban habitat.
- Where Habitats of Concern fall within Class I riparian, they are treated similarly under the various program options but where they are Class A wildlife, they receive lower protection

levels than Class I under options 2A-2C.

• This places non-riparian Habitats of Concern more at risk than riparian Habitats of Concern.

Program Option performance

- Options 1A and 1B are most protective of Habitats of Concern.
- Options 1A and 2A are most protective of riparian Class I.
- There is a larger discrepancy in protection levels between the two most protective options for Habitats of Concern than for riparian Class I.
- Options 1C and 2C are least protective for Habitats of Concern and are likely to result in substantial further loss of these depleted habitats.
- Options 2B and 2C are least protective of Class I riparian and are likely to result in substantial further loss of these depleted habitats. Option 1C is not much better.

Summary

Habitats of Concern and Class I riparian habitat are closely associated with declining or sensitive species in the region, and these habitats have declined greatly in extent and quality. It will be important to consider the relative rarity of the remaining habitats addressed in this criterion, because substantial further loss may result in regional species extirpations or potential Endangered Species Act listings. More protective options are more likely to prevent or minimize these undesirable results.

Table 4-25	Performance of options in meeting Environmental Criterion 5: Promotes biodiversity
	through conservation of sensitive habitats and species.

Rank	Option	Performance
1	1A	This option provides the highest protection levels for both Habitats of Concern and
		Class I riparian by assigning a Prohibit designation to all acres.
2/3	1B / 2A	Option 1B is important for Habitats of Concern, which includes more than twice as
		many acres as Class I riparian. However, Option 2A performs best for Class I riparian,
l		and at a higher protection level than 1B provides Habitats of Concern.
4	2B	This option performs better than 1C or 2C for all Habitats of Concern, and for
		developed urban Class I riparian. However, for vacant Class I riparian it is difficult to
		discern whether Option 2B or 1C is more protective.
5	1Ċ	Substantially lower protection levels, but consistent among development status and
		resource type, with all acres falling within Moderately Limit.
6	2C	Protection levels lowest of all options, with nine percent Allow in unprotected Habitats
		of Concern and 17 percent Allow in unprotected Class I riparian. Likely to result in
		substantial loss of sensitive habitats and sensitive species.

Evaluation of energy criteria

The analysis of energy criteria is intended to compare the potential effects of the six program options on energy use in the region. Two criteria will assist in this process:

- 2. Promotes compact urban form, and
- 3. Promotes green infrastructure.

Criteria were selected based on the findings in Metro's Technical Report for Goal 5 and Phase I ESEE analysis (Metro 2002, Metro 2003). The energy criteria discussed here are applied using data already collected in the Social, Environmental, and Economic Phase II ESEE analyses.

The summary of each criterion includes a table ranking the programs in order of performance, from most to least energy-efficient as relates to each criterion. The criteria provide important new information about how each program performs relative to the others, and will aid Metro, its partners, and the public in designing an energy-efficient fish and wildlife habitat protection program.

1. Promotes compact urban form

A compact urban form conserves energy by reducing transportation-related energy output and infrastructure needs, reduces the spatial extent of vegetation loss, and reduces the spatial extent of the urban heat island effect.²⁸ The amount of fish and wildlife habitat protected or partially protected by each regulatory program option and the zoning type and development status influence whether the option increases the need for Urban Growth Boundary expansions.

Importance of urban development priorities

The region's 2040 Growth Concept is designed to provide a compact urban form through efficient land use, a well-planned transportation system, and protection of natural areas. The second energy criterion below addresses natural area protection.

The extent to which a program option supports development priorities influences the ability to maintain a compact urban form, thus conserving energy by reducing transportation and infrastructure energy output. While program options 1A-1C consider only habitat value, program options 2A-2C incorporate the importance of land value, employment density, and the 2040 Design Types.

Importance of substitutability of lands

The Goal 5 rule requires Metro to consider the effect a Goal 5 program may have on the inventory of buildable lands. Any changes in density requirements may be difficult to reallocate within the current Urban Growth Boundary.

Some land uses can be more easily re-allocated, or substituted, to other parts of the region than other land uses. This can relate to a number of factors such as scarcity, lot size requirements, and the physical characteristics needed for certain land use types. For example, residential land

²⁸ See Metro's Economic, Social, Environmental and Energy Analysis (ESEE), September 2003.

comprises a majority of the region's vacant zoning and housing can be built on relatively small parcels in a variety of landscapes. As a result, residential lands to a certain extent can be flexible in how they are located on a site, and more sites may be available compared to other land use types. However, Metro cannot force existing residential neighborhoods to accommodate density increases.²⁹

Conversely, industrial lands are much more difficult to relocate, and there is a regional shortage of industrial sites to meet our needs over the next 20 years. Industrial sites typically require flat terrain, access to transportation facilities, and some industrial sites need large contiguous parcels. Mixed use zoning, a highly energy efficient land use, can also be difficult to place in alternative sites if it doesn't meet market needs. Commercial land placement affects driving distance and infrastructure requirements.

Thus these land uses may be less substitutable within the existing Urban Growth Boundary than other land use types. New restrictions imposed by a program may limit the capacity for meeting housing and employment needs, and may increase energy use associated with the need for Urban Growth Boundary expansions and related transportation and infrastructure needs.

Measuring the criterion and results

As outlined above, urban development priorities and the substitutability of lands are both important to maintaining a compact urban form. Each of these is addressed in other ESEE criteria. Therefore no new data was collected for this criterion, and the results are available through other ESEE criteria:

- "Supports urban development priorities" (economic criterion 1), and
- "Reduces impact on types/location of jobs and housing" (social criterion 2).

Economic criterion 1, "Supports urban development priorities," assessed program performance for supporting urban development priorities. In descending order of performance, the program options for economic criterion 1 were ranked as follow: 1C, 2C, 2B, 1B, 2A and 1A.

Social criterion 2, "Reduces impact on types/locations of jobs and housing," assessed program performance for limiting new restrictions on vacant industrial, mixed use, and commercial lands (see figure xx in social section, "Treatment of vacant employment habitat land"). In descending order of performance, the program options for social criterion 1 ranked as follow: 2C, 1C, 2B, 1B, 2A and 1A.

Summary

Information pertaining to maintaining a compact urban form has already been assessed under economic criterion 1 and social criterion 2. The program performance for both criteria is similar but not identical, as summarized in the table below. For the energy criterion, emphasis was given to urban development priorities when program rankings differed (i.e., 2C and 1C), due to the importance of the 2040 Growth concept in regional planning.

²⁹ See Metro Ordinance #xxx.

Rank	Option	Performance
. 1	1C	Provides the most support (lack of development restrictions) for lands with high urban development priorities and the second-best support for allowing development on existing vacant industrial, mixed use, and commercial lands.
2	2C	Substantial support for lands with high urban development value, and excellent support for lands with medium urban development value. Provides the best support for allowing development on existing vacant industrial, mixed use, and commercial lands.
3	2B	Good support for urban development priorities and allowing development on existing vacant industrial, mixed use, and commercial lands.
4	1B	Moderate support for maintaining a compact urban growth form. No prohibit treatments for urban development priorities, but significantly stronger impact than 2A or 1A. For vacant industrial, mixed use, and commercial lands, performs at a slightly reduced level compared to option 2A.
5	2A	Slightly less support for urban development priorities than 1B due to a small proportion of prohibit treatment. For vacant industrial, mixed use, and commercial lands, provides slightly more support than option 1B.
6	1A	Promotes compact urban form the least. Substantial restrictions possible on high urban development priorities and on development potential for existing vacant industrial, mixed use, and commercial lands.

 Table 4-26. Performance of options in meeting Energy Criterion 1:

 Promotes compact urban growth form.

2. Promotes green infrastructure

Trees and other vegetation reduce energy demand by moderating stream and air temperature increases, flooding, and air pollution associated with energy use.³⁰ Fish and wildlife habitat that are considered important or necessary to support cities and suburbs can be considered a type of infrastructure: "green infrastructure." The energy benefits provided by green infrastructure are a type of ecosystem service.

Ecosystem services may be defined as the processes and functions of natural ecosystems that sustain life and are critical to human welfare. For example, trees help clean air and water, and wetlands and floodplains store water and help avert flooding. When ecosystem services are removed or diminished, a common alternative is to implement technological surrogates such as stormwater piping or water purification systems. Such solutions tend to require more energy than preserving existing green infrastructure and ecosystem functions.

Measuring the criterion and results

The amount of fish and wildlife habitat protected or partially protected by each program option, as well as the value of that habitat, help determine whether the option protects the energy-related green infrastructure and ecosystem services provided by trees, other vegetation, wetlands and floodplains. Green infrastructure and ecosystem services are strongly related.

This criterion is best assessed using a combination of three criteria from the environmental and economic ESEE:

• "Promotes retention of ecosystem services" (economic criterion 2);

³⁰ See Metro's Economic, Social, Environmental and Energy Analysis (ESEE), September 2003.

- "Conserves existing watershed health and restoration opportunities (environmental criterion 1); and
- "Retains multiple functions provided by forest canopy cover (environmental criterion 2).

This combination of criteria appropriately addresses energy concerns. No new data was collected, and the detailed results are available through the relevant criteria in the environmental and economic sections.

Ecosystem services are addressed in economic criterion 2, "Promotes retention of ecosystem services." In that criterion, areas with more ecological functions and/or areas with functions closer to streams, wetlands, or floodplains ranked higher than areas with fewer functions or with functions further away from water features. Economic criterion 2 ranked identically to environmental criterion 1: 1A, 2A, 1B, 2B, 2C, and 1C.

Although green infrastructure is addressed in all environmental criteria environmental criterion 1, "Conserves existing watershed health and restoration opportunities" and criterion 2, "Retains multiple functions provided by forest canopy cover," are particularly relevant to energy use. These are the resources that protect existing ecosystem functions.

Environmental criterion 1 assesses the performance of program options in conserving existing watershed health and restoration opportunities based on protection levels for fish and wildlife habitat. In descending order of performance, the program options for environmental criterion 1 were ranked as follow: 1A, 2A, 1B, 2B, 2C, and 1C.

Environmental criterion 2 estimates how well each program option would protect existing forest canopy cover, identified in the Phase I ESEE analysis as a key energy-related feature. This is an important separate measure because although all forest is ecologically important to the region, not all forest ranks as high-value fish and wildlife habitat. In descending order of performance, the program options for environmental criterion 2 ranked as follow: 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 2C, and 1C.

Summary

Information pertaining to retaining green infrastructure and ecosystem services has already been assessed under economic criterion 1 and environmental criteria 1 and 2. The program performance for all three criteria is similar but not identical, as summarized in the table below.

Rank	Option	Performance
1	1A	Provides the most protection for all habitats and best protection to forest canopy cover
		and ecosystem services.
2	2A	Protection level substantial for high-value riparian habitat, and good for other habitat
		classes. Ecosystem services also reliect this ranking. However, 15 provides better
		protection for upland wildlife flabitat. Options 2A and 1B fairly similar for forest canopy.
3	1B	Substantially reduced protection for all riparian habitat compared to 1A and 2A.
		Ecosystem services also reflect this ranking. For wildlife habitat, performs better than
		2A. For forest canopy, fairly similar to option 2A.
4	2B	Options 2B, 2C and 1C ranked identically for habitat, tree canopy, and ecosystem
		service protection. Moderate performance for higher riparian and wildlife classes, but
		protection drops significantly for lower habitat classes. Similar findings for forest canopy
		and ecosystem services.
5	2C	Places nearly 40 percent of all forest canopy at risk through low or no protection levels.
_		I ow protection levels for all resources. May result in substantial loss of riparian and
		upland habitat functions, ecosystem services, and forest canopy over time.
6	10	Places posity balf of all forest cappy at risk through low or no protection levels. Low
0		Fraces healty han of an orest canopy at his through to grow the protocolor of rise and
		protection revers for all resources. Wost likely to result in substantial loss of ripalian and
	L,	upland habitat functions, ecosystem services, and forest canopy over time.

Table 4-27. Performance of options in meeting Energy Criterion 2: Promotes green infrastructure.

Evaluation of federal Endangered Species Act

The Endangered Species Act's (ESA's) ultimate goal is to recover species and conserve the ecosystems upon which they depend so they no longer need regulatory protection.³¹ Twelve salmon species or runs are listed as either threatened or endangered in the Columbia River and Willamette River basins. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries is the federal agency responsible for these species.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) has jurisdiction over terrestrial species and aquatic species that spend the majority of their life cycle in fresh water. Listed species under their jurisdiction that currently or historically occurred in the Metro region include bald eagle, bull trout, golden Indian paintbrush, Willamette daisy, water howellia, Bradshaw's lomatium, Kincaid's lupine, and Nelson's checker-mallow. The FWS was petitioned to list pacific lamprey, western brook lamprey and river lamprey in January 2003; processing of the petition has not yet been completed and is currently on hold. Additionally, several candidate species and species of concern are also known to occur in the Metro region. Although these species do not currently receive ESA regulatory protection, efforts to conserve these species may help to sustain existing populations and preclude the need for future listings.

Will a Metro fish and wildlife habitat protection program meet the ESA? There is no clear answer, because program details are not yet developed and it is not possible to fully predict the outcome of any program. It is also worth noting that the full suite of factors that affect the habitats upon which these species depend will not all be addressed in Metro's Goal 5 program. For example, stormwater runoff can have significant impacts on stream health and channel complexity, but Goal 5 is not designed to explicitly or comprehensively address stormwater management.

However, the Goal 5 program will help to define the types of land uses that will be allowed within and near regionally significant habitats, ultimately determining the degree to which these habitats and their ecological functions are conserved over time. The program's non-regulatory components, particularly the degree of investment in restoration, will also play a key role. An effective Metro program that provides adequate species protection could provide a template that could serve as a model for local jurisdictions to come into ESA compliance, and may also contribute to efforts designed to prevent future ESA species listings.

The federal ESA portion of this phase of the ESEE analysis is intended to compare the potential effects of the six program options on listed fish and wildlife and related species of conservation interest such as the three species of lamprey that have been petitioned for listing. Three criteria will assist this process:

- 1. Protects slopes, wetlands, and areas of high habitat value;
- 2. Maintains hydrologic conditions; and
- 3. Protects riparian functions.

³¹ For a description of the federal Endangered Species Act, see Appendix 1 in Metro's Phase I ESEE Report.

These criteria provide important information about how each program performs relative to the others in protecting habitats and watershed health, and will aid Metro, its partners, and the public determine the general consequences to fish and wildlife species under each program.

1. Protects slopes, wetlands and areas of high habitat value

Steep slopes are vulnerable to erosion and landslides that can negatively affect aquatic resources, particularly when trees and other vegetation are removed.³² Wetlands provide important offchannel rearing habitat for young salmon and functions important to stream health. They also provide key habitat for many of the region's other known at-risk species – for example, bald eagles, northern red-legged frogs, northwestern pond turtles, and numerous neotropical migratory bird species³³. At-risk species relate to the ESA because if they continue to decline, they may become future candidates for ESA listings. Habitats of Concern include wetlands, riparian bottomland forest, stands of Oregon white oak, native grassland, important migratory pathways, and other critical habitats that potentially support listed plants and animals, as well as numerous other at-risk species. Large habitat patches retain higher habitat quality than smaller patches and provide homes to species most sensitive to human disturbance, such as neotropical migratory songbirds³⁴, and maintaining the connections between these valuable habitats is vital to supporting the region's sensitive species over time.

Measuring the criterion

Steep slopes are addressed in Metro's riparian GIS model as a primary and secondary functional contributor to Bank Stabilization, Sediment and Pollution Control. Wetlands receive primary functional value in the riparian model under the Streamflow Moderation and Water Storage and Bank Stabilization, Sediment and Pollution Control criteria, and are also captured under Class I riparian as Habitats of Concern. Areas of highest habitat value, including all Habitats of Concern and most large habitat patches, are captured under Class I riparian and Class A wildlife habitat. In addition, large habitat patches were specifically addressed in environmental criterion 2. Thus, this criterion is best assessed using a combination of criteria from the Environmental ESEE:

- Class I riparian and Class A wildlife habitat derived from the criterion entitled "Conserves existing watershed health and restoration opportunities" (environmental criterion 1);
- Promotes riparian corridor continuity and overall habitat connectivity (environmental criterion 3);
- Conserves habitat quality and biodiversity provided by large habitat patches (environmental criterion 2); and
- Promotes biodiversity through conservation of sensitive habitats and species (environmental criterion 5).

³² The ecological damage associated with excess sediments entering streams is described in Metro's Technical Report for Goal 5 (Metro 2002) and Phase I ESEE report (Metro 2003).

³³ See Metro's species list for at-risk species and their general habitat associations.

³⁴ Neotropical migratory songbirds have been identified by ODFW as an at-risk group of species. Local studies (Hennings and Edge 2003) confirm that Neotropical migrants are negatively associated with urbanization.

Results

The data tables and graphs associated with this criterion are available in the Environmental ESEE section. Option 1A provides the most protection for this criterion, but Options 2A and 1B also provide substantial protection. Option 2B provides a moderate level of protection. Options 2C and 1C are least likely to protect sensitive species over time, because substantial habitat and connectivity may be lost.

Rank	Option	Performance	
1	1A	Most protective of all variables assessed. Best option for protecting slopes, wetlands,	
		and areas of high habitat value; most likely to reduce need for future ESA listings.	
2/3	2A / 1B	Option 2A is second-most protective for Class I habitat, promoting overall connectivity. Option 1B is second-most protective for Class A habitat and large patches. Options 2A and 1B are similar in terms of protecting sensitive habitats and species.	
4	2B	Incrementally less protection for all variables assessed. Options 2A and 2B are similar in terms of protecting Class A habitat.	
5	2C	Ranks fifth for Class A, overall connectivity, and large patches. Ranks sixth for Class I and sensitive habitats. More likely to result in species depletion or loss over time, and may increase future ESA listings.	
6	10	Minimal protection for Class A, overall connectivity, and large patches. Ranks fifth for Class I and sensitive habitats. Most likely to result in species depletion or loss over time, and may increase future ESA listings.	

Table 4-28.	Performance of options in meeting ESA criterion 1:
Protects	slopes, wetlands, and areas of high habitat value.

2. Maintains hydrologic conditions

Hydrology, in part, refers to how water is delivered to streams and rivers during storms. Under natural hydrologic conditions in the Pacific Northwest, rainwater movement to streams is slowed and retained by trees, plants, wetlands, floodplains and soils. When these natural features are altered or removed and hard (impervious) surfaces are installed, rainwater is delivered quickly, in high volumes, to streams and rivers. This causes channel damage, excessive flooding, groundwater depletion, and alters habitat such that animals adapted to natural conditions are sometimes no longer able to survive there. Altered hydrology has strongly, negatively impacted the region's threatened salmon and other native aquatic species including lamprey.

All habitat in Metro's inventory is important to maintaining hydrologic conditions. In this naturally forested region, trees are particularly important to hydrology because they slow and store large quantities of stormwater.³⁵

Measuring the criterion

This criterion is best assessed using a combination of criteria from the Environmental ESEE:

• "Conserves existing watershed health and restoration opportunities" (environmental criterion

³⁵ Metro's field studies showed that the amount of tree cover, both near streams and throughout watersheds, is positively associated with stream health (Frady et al. 2002).

1), and

• Retains multiple functions provided by forest canopy cover (environmental criterion 2).

Results

The data tables and graphs associated with this criterion are available in the Environmental ESEE section. Option 1A provides the most protection for this criterion, but Options 2A and 1B also provide substantial protection. Options 2C and 1C are least likely to protect sensitive species over time, because substantial habitat and connectivity may be lost. Less protective options may lead to an increase in future ESA species listings.

Table 4-29. Pe	formance of options in meeting ESA criterion 2: Maintains hydrologic condition	ıs.
Rank Option	Performance	

Rank	Option	renormance
1	1A	This option provides the most protection and restoration opportunities for existing fish and wildlife habitat, and therefore provides the strongest regulatory approach to maintain current hydrologic conditions.
2/3	2A / 1B	Option 2A ranks second for conserving existing watershed health and restoration opportunities, but ranks third for retaining forest canopy cover. Both options could aid in maintaining hydrologic conditions, depending on the amount of habitat retained and whether new trees and habitat are added over time.
4	2B	Ranks fourth for conserving watershed health and restoration opportunities, as well as for conserving forest canopy. Unlikely to maintain hydrologic conditions over time without substantial non-regulatory investments.
5	2C	Ranks fifth for conserving watershed health and restoration opportunities, as well as for conserving forest canopy. Unlikely to maintain hydrologic conditions over time, even with substantial non-regulatory investments. Strong likelihood for increased harm to salmon habitat and increased potential for future ESA species listings.
6	1C	Ranks last for conserving watershed health and restoration opportunities, as well as for conserving forest canopy. Unlikely to maintain hydrologic conditions over time due to extensive loss of existing resources and loss of restoration opportunities. Strong likelihood for increased harm to salmon habitat and increased potential for future ESA species listings.

3. Protects riparian functions

Metro's extensive review of the scientific literature revealed that ecological functions are not limited to the areas nearest the stream. Existing riparian habitat areas protect water quality and provide key habitat to many of the region's at-risk species, including those living on the land or in water. Due to the extent of riparian habitat loss over time, all remaining riparian areas are important to stream health. Lower value areas not only contribute to watershed function, but also provide key restoration opportunities that may help improve watershed health and offset detrimental effects from future development elsewhere in the watershed.

Measuring the criterion

This criterion is derived from the riparian corridor portion of the criterion entitled "Conserves existing watershed health and restoration opportunities" (environmental criterion 1). It measures the amount of riparian habitat affected by Allow, Limit, Prohibit treatments under each program option. Class I riparian receives special consideration in Table 4-29 due to the multiple ecological functions provided in these high-value areas.

٦

Results

The data tables and graphs associated with this criterion are available in the Environmental ESEE section. It is important to note that no matter which option is selected, riparian habitat may be lost and remaining habitat degraded over time due to continued development within the UGB and the urban effects associated with development, such as increased runoff and decreased water quality. The extent to which a program protects riparian function depends, in part, on non-regulatory program elements such as restoration in existing resources and new habitat creation in key areas of importance.

Option 1A provides the most protection for all riparian habitat. Option 2A provides less protection for habitat within one site potential tree height, and Option 1B is a substantial step downward in protection levels. Option 2B is slightly less protective of riparian habitat than Option 1B. Option 2C provides a substantially reduced level of protection for Class I and II habitat, and very little protection for Class III. Option 1C provides low level protection for Class I and II, and no protection at all for Class III riparian; this option is least likely to protect riparian functions. Options 1C and 2C are unlikely to protect existing sensitive species, and will likely result in future ESA listings over time as riparian habitat is lost or damaged.

Rank	Option	Performance
1	1Å	Most likely to retain existing riparian function and watershed health. Class I and II habitat in prohibit designation, and Class III in strictly limit. Most likely to help conserve sensitive species and aid in preventing future ESA listings.
2	2A	Incrementally less protection for riparian habitat, but generally still good protection levels for Class I and II. Protection drops significantly for Class III, with the majority in lightly limit designation.
3	1B	Substantially less protection compared to Options 1A and 2A. Class III riparian in appears to be particularly vulnerable, with lightly limit designations.
4	28	Incrementally less protection than previous options. Moderate loss of high-value riparian habitat likely, with potential for negative effects on sensitive species. Protection levels drop off significantly for Class III habitat, with primarily lightly limit designation, similar to option 2A. May increase potential for future ESA listings.
5	1C	Class I receives moderately limit, Class II lightly limit, and Class III receives allow designations. Less likely to protect existing sensitive species than options above. May result in substantial loss of riparian habitat and increases potential for future additional ESA listings.
6	2C	Poor protection for riparian habitat. Least likely to protect existing sensitive species. Most likely to lead to future ESA listings.

Table 4-30.	Performance of options in meeting ESA criterion 3:
	Protects riparian corridors

Evaluation of federal Clean Water Act

The federal Clean Water Act (CWA) sets a national goal to "restore and maintain the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the Nation's waters."³⁶ In Oregon, the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) implements the CWA, with review and approval by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

The DEQ is responsible for protecting the beneficial uses of rivers, streams and lakes of the state. The DEQ carries out this responsibility in part by identifying those water bodies that are not meeting current water quality standards. This inventory is known as the 303(d) list. For waters identified on the 303(d) list, DEQ must develop total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) for those pollutants that exceed water quality standards. The TMDLs become part of implementation plans at the watershed scale intended to meet water quality standards. In urban areas, local governments are often the parties responsible for such plans, with input from watershed councils, landowners and other stakeholders.

The DEQ recently informed Metro Council that a Goal 5 program that provides shading, pollutant removal, and infiltration could protect and restore fish and wildlife habitat and help meet water quality standards in the Willamette and Tualatin Basins. Retaining fish and wildlife habitat, and the ecological functions these areas provide, is less expensive than constructing water quality treatment facilities. Potentially, the amount of Goal 5 resources preserved for protection and restoration may be an important management measure in a watershed's TMDL implementation plan.

The federal CWA criterion compares the potential effects of the six program options on the importance of fish and wildlife habitat to the region's water quality. Four criteria will assist this process:

- 1. Protects steep slopes and wetlands;
- 2. Protects resources within 150 feet of streams;
- 3. Maintains hydrologic conditions (see ESA criterion 2); and
- 4. Protects forested areas throughout the watershed.

Some of the criteria used to assess program performance related to the CWA are similar to those assessed for the federal ESA, because existing fish and wildlife habitat also protects water quality. These criteria provide important information about how each program performs relative to the others, and will aid Metro, its partners, and the public in determining the relative consequences to water quality under each program.

1. Protects slopes and wetlands

Steep slopes are vulnerable to erosion and landslides, particularly when trees and other vegetation are removed.³⁷ Wetlands collect and treat soil runoff and help control stream bank

³⁶ For a description of the federal Clean Water Act, see Appendix 1 in Metro's Phase I ESEE Report.

³⁷ The ecological damage associated with excess sediments entering streams is described in Metro's Technical Report for Goal 5 (Metro 2002) and Phase I ESEE report (Metro 2003).

erosion to help meet turbidity, sedimentation, and nutrient TMDLs. Wetlands collect and treat pesticides, heavy metals, and other toxic pollutants to help meet TMDLs for these pollutants. Wetlands also collect and store water to provide base flow in streams during summer low-flow months, which helps meet temperature TMDLs.

Measuring the criterion

Steep slopes are addressed in Metro's riparian GIS model as a primary and secondary functional contributor to Bank Stabilization, Sediment and Pollution Control. Wetlands receive primary functional value in the riparian model under the Streamflow Moderation and Water Storage, Bank Stabilization, Sediment and Pollution Control, and are also captured as Class I riparian as a Habitat of Concern.

This criterion is best assessed using a subset of one of the criteria from the Environmental ESEE. Class I and Class II riparian habitat derived from the criterion entitled "Conserves existing watershed health and restoration opportunities" (environmental criterion 1) captures all wetlands and the majority of vegetated steep slopes near streams. As in the ESA criteria, the extent to which restoration is included as part of any Goal 5 program will help determine its effectiveness in protecting water quality.

Results

The data tables and graphs associated with this criterion are available in the Environmental ESEE section and associated appendices. Option 1A provides the most protection for Class I and II riparian habitat. Option 2A provides incrementally less. Options 1B and 2B fall in the middle. Options 1C and 2C perform poorly in protecting these habitat areas, and are likely to result in future 303(d) listings and TMDL requirements due to unprotected steep slopes and wetland areas.

Rank	Option	Performance
1	1A	Highest protection level for all Class I and Class II riparian habitat; most likely to protect
		steep slopes and wetlands. For every program option, restoration will still be
		needed to meet temperature and other standards.
2	2A	Excellent protection for Class I habitat. Good protection for Class II habitat, but
		definitely a step downward from 1A, with about two thirds of Class II in moderately limit
		designations and the remainder in Lightly Limit. Where steep slopes occur in Class II,
		may increase erosion and sedimentation and degrade water quality.
3	1B	Incrementally less protection for Class I and Class II habitat.
4	2B	Somewhat less protection for Class I and II habitat compared to Option 1B, but most
		habitat areas still receive strictly or moderately limit designations.
5	1C	Substantially reduced protection for steep slope areas and wetlands. Likely to result in
		non-compliance for existing TMDLs and future 303(d) listings and TMDL requirements.
6	2C	Poor protection for Class I resources (particularly in Developed Urban areas), and
		dismal protection for Class II. Highly likely to result in degraded water quality, non-
		compliance for existing TMDLs, and increased future 303(d) listings and TMDL
		requirements.

Table 4-31.	Performance	of options	in meeting	CWA criterion	1: Protects sl	opes and w	etlands.

2. Protects resources within 150 feet of streams

The importance of riparian areas in maintaining water quality is well documented.³⁸ These areas provide shading to help meet temperature TMDLs, collect and treat soil runoff, and control stream bank erosion to help meet turbidity, sedimentation, and nutrient TMDLs. Riparian areas collect and treat bacteria in runoff to help meet bacteria TMDLs and collect and treat pesticides, heavy metals, and other toxic pollutants to help meet TMDLs for these pollutants. Like wetlands (and generally including wetlands), riparian areas collect and store water to provide base flow in streams during summer low-flow months, helping to meet temperature TMDLs.

Measuring the criterion

This criterion is assessed using the riparian corridor continuity portion of the criterion entitled "Promotes riparian corridor continuity and overall habitat connectivity" (environmental criterion 3a). It measures the amount of habitat within 150 feet of streams affected by Allow, Limit, Prohibit treatments under each program option.

Results

The data tables and graphs associated with this criterion are available in the Environmental ESEE section. Option 1A provides the most protection for Class I and II riparian habitat. Option 2A, 1B and 2C provide incrementally less protection for areas within one site potential tree height, respectively. Options 1C and 2C perform very poorly in protecting these habitat areas, and are likely to result in future 303(d) listings and TMDL requirements due to habitat loss closest to streams, as well as non-compliance with existing TMDLs.

Rank	Option	Performance
1	1Å	Excellent performance for conserving existing habitat within 150 feet of streams, with primarily Prohibit plus some Strictly Limit designations. This option is most likely to assist in meeting current TMDLs and preventing future non-compliance issues. For every program option, restoration will still be needed to meet temperature and other standards.
2	2A	Substantial step downward from 1A, but still good protection levels. About half of the habitat within 150 feet of streams receives Prohibit treatment, with the remainder falling within the three degrees of limit. Loss of any habitat within this zone, particularly without restoring key areas, is likely to decrease water quality and increase CWA non-compliance issues.
3	1B	Incremental step downward from Option 2A. Increases likelihood of water quality issues and CWA non-compliance.
4	2B	Relatively small step downward from Option 1B, with similar repercussions possible.
5	1C	Very poor protection for near-stream habitat. Unlikely to conserve existing resources or retain restoration opportunities within 150 feet of streams. Highly likely to degrade water quality, resulting in non-compliance with current TMDLs and necessitating future 303(d) and TMDL listings.
6	2C	Similar to Option 1C, but slightly worse.

Table 4-32. Performance of options in meeting CWA criterion 2:Conserves habitat within 150 feet of streams.

³⁸ See Metro's Technical Report for Goal 5 (Metro 2002) and Phase I ESEE Report (Metro 2003).

3. Maintains hydrologic conditions

This criterion is described and measured in ESA criterion 2. Altered hydrology is a leading cause of degraded water quality. The key negative effects associated with altered hydrology are described in Metro's Technical Report for Goal 5 and Phase I ESEE documents (Metro 2002, 2003). Program options for this criterion rank as follow, from best to worst in terms of maintaining hydrologic conditions: 1A, 2A/1B, 2B, 2C, and 1C.

4. Protects forested areas throughout the watershed

Trees are vitally important to the region's water quality, as demonstrated through local studies and as recognized by DEQ.³⁹ Trees provide infiltration to recharge both groundwater and down gradient streams, providing base flow for streams during summer low-flow months and helping to meet temperature TMDLs. Trees are especially effective in reducing sedimentation and erosion, runoff speed and volume, excess nutrients, and water temperature, thereby helping to meet nutrient, sediment, turbidity, and temperature TMDLs.

Measuring the criterion

This criterion is measured using Environmental criterion 2, "Retains multiple functions provided by forest canopy cover."

Results

The data tables and graphs associated with this criterion are available in the Environmental ESEE section. Option 1A provides the most protection for the region's upland and riparian forests. Option 1B provides substantially less protection, with Option 2A close behind. Options 1B and 2B fall in the middle. Option 2C performs very poorly in protecting forest canopy, and is likely to result in future 303(d) listings and TMDL requirements due to unprotected steep slopes and wetland areas.

Rank	Option	Performance
1	1Å	Protects by far the most canopy cover of any other program option for vulnerable forested lands in both vacant and developed lands. This option is most likely to aid in current Clean Water Act compliance and help prevent future 303(d) listings and TMDL requirements. For every program option, restoration will still be needed to meet temperature and other standards.
2	1B	Substantially less protection than option 1A, but still performs better than the remaining options. However, options 1B and 2A appear relatively close in terms of potential effects on the region's forest canopy, and therefore, water quality. No Allow designations mean that all forested habitat would be afforded at least some level of protection.
3	2A	Similar to 1B, with slightly less protection.
4	2B	Little Allow, but overall protection levels lower than options 1B and 2A. Potential for significant forest loss and increased water quality issues.
5	2C	Low protection levels for forest canopy, with 38 percent of vacant and developed urban in Lightly Limit or Allow. Likely to result in significant forest canopy loss over time. Highly likely to degrade water quality, resulting in non-compliance with current TMDLs

Table 4-33.	Performance of options in meeting CWA criterion 4:
Prot	ects forest canopy throughout the watershed.

³⁹ Metro's field studies showed that the amount of tree cover, both near streams and throughout watersheds, is positively associated with stream health (Frady et al. 2002).

		and likely necessitating future 303(d) and TMDL listings.			
6	1C	Low protection levels for forest canopy, with 47 percent of vacant and developed urban			
		in Lightly Limit or Allow. Likely to result in significant forest habitat loss over time.			
		Highly likely to degrade water quality, resulting in non-compliance with current TMDLs			
		and likely necessitating future 303(d) and TMDL listings.			

.

•

•

Summary of analysis of regulatory options

Metro's analysis of the six regulatory program options against the 19 criteria provides a substantial amount of information for the Metro Council to use in their consideration of a program direction for protecting fish and wildlife habitat. Generally, the options that protect more habitat (Options 1A and 2A) perform similarly across criteria. The option that least protects the highest-value habitat (Option 1C) and the option with the lowest level of protection for habitat in industrial areas and centers (Option 2C) also perform similarly. However, Option 2C favors factors important for urban development by focusing on the economic concerns, while Option 1C reduces protection equally for all land uses. Table 4-34 summarizes the analysis.

		l able 4-3	54. Summary of program op	tion analysis.		
	Option 1A: Most habitat protection	Option 1B: Moderate habitat protection	Option 1C: Least habitat protection	Option 2A: Most habitat protection	Option 2B: Moderate habitat protection	Option 2C: Least habitat protection
Criteria	Highest level of protection for all habitats	High level of protection for highest value habitat, moderate protection for other habitats	Moderate level of protection for higher value habitats, no protection for lowest value habitat	Moderate level of protection in high urban development value areas, high level of protection in other areas	Low level of protection in high urban development value areas, moderate level of protection in other areas	No protection in high urban development value areas, moderate level of habitat protection in other areas
Economic factors	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	and a state of the	per en de la companya			
 Supports the regional economy by providing development opportunities (such as residential, commercial, industrial) 	Ranks 6 th : Provides least development opportunities due to highest levels of habitat protection on residential, commercial and industrial lands.	Ranks 4th: Provides some development opportunities for residential, commercial and industrial.	Ranks 2 nd : Provides substantial development opportunities for all types of development.	Ranks 5 th : Provides minimal development opportunities because residential development in some high value habitat is prohibited.	Ranks 3 rd : Provides moderate development opportunities due to less habitat protection in all commercial and industrial areas and some residential land.	Ranks 1 st : Provides most development opportunities due to relaxed habitat protection; provides more development opportunities in commercial and industrial areas than in residential areas.
2. Supports economic values associated with ecosystem services (such as flood control, clean water, recreation, amenity values)	Ranks 1 st : Retains most existing ecosystem services across all habitat classes. Highest protection for habitat.	Ranks 3 rd : Retains moderate ecosystem services with moderate protection to high value habitat.	Ranks 6 th : Retains least ecosystem services overall for all habitat classes.	Ranks 2 ^{na} : Retains substantial ecosystem services with strict protection to high and medium value stream corridors.	Ranks 4 th : Retains some ecosystem services. Applies moderate protection to stream corridors but higher protection to upland wildlife habitat.	Ranks 5 th : Retains minimal ecosystem services due to relaxed protection in areas with high and medium development value.
3. Promotes recreational use and amenities	Ranks 1 st : Promotes the most recreational benefits by prohibiting development in highest quality habitat lands.	Ranks 3 rd : Provides moderate recreational benefits by applying relatively strong protection to the highest value habitats.	Ranks 6 ^m : Provides least recreational benefits because it applies only moderate protection to highest value habitat.	Ranks 2 nd : Promotes substantial recreational benefits of stream corridors, does not apply same protection to wildlife habitat.	Ranks 4 th : Promotes some recreational benefits, mostly on park land.	Ranks 5 th : Promotes minimal recreational benefits mostly on park land.
 Distribution of economic tradeoffs 	No rank: Privately-owned habitat land bears greater proportion of highest protection than publicly-owned habitat.	No rank: Privately-owned and publicly-owned land bears equal proportion of highest protection.	No rank: Privately-owned and publicly-owned land bears equal proportion of highest protection.	No rank: Publicly-owned habitat land bears greater proportion of highest protection than privately- owned habitat land.	No rank: Publicly-owned habitat land bears greater proportion of highest protection than privately- owned habitat land.	No rank: Publicly-owned habitat land bears greatest proportion of highest protection.
 Minimizes need to expand the urban growth boundary (UGB) and increase development costs. 	Ranks 6 ^m : Affects the need to expand the UGB the most; highest level of protection restricts development.	Ranks 4 th : Moderately affects the need to expand the UGB because of restrictive protection levels.	Ranks 1 st : Least need to expand UGB; lowest protection levels provide most development opportunity.	Ranks 5 th : Substantially affects need to expand the UGB because of restrictive protection levels.	Ranks 3 rd : Some need to expand UGB but less restrictive protection.	Ranks 2 nd : Minimal need to expand the UGB because low level of protection provides development opportunity.
Social factors		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
6. Minimizes impact on property owners	Ranks 6 th : Affects the most property owners with the highest level of habitat protection regardless of zoning.	Ranks 4 ^m : Moderately affects all property owners, but does not apply highest habitat protection anywhere.	Ranks 1 st : Affects the least number of property owners and applies lower levels of habitat protection.	Ranks 5 ^m : Substantially affects large number of property owners with strong protection, especially in residential and rural areas.	Ranks 3 rd : Affects some business landowners with moderate protection, but high protection is applied to residential and rural owners.	Ranks 2 nd : Minimally affects business landowners, but many residential and rural property owners are affected with lower levels of protection.
7. Minimizes impact on location and choices for housing and jobs	Ranks 6": Most effect on the location and choices available for jobs and housing by	Ranks 4": Moderate effect on the location and choices available for jobs and housing,	Ranks 2 ^{na} : Minimal effect on housing location and choices, some effect on job location	Ranks 5 th : Substantial effect on housing location and choices, moderate effect on	Ranks 3 ^{ra} : Some effect on job location and choices, moderate effect on housing	Ranks 1 st : Least effect on job location and choices, minimal effect on housing location and

Ì

÷.

. . . .

DRAFT: ESEE Phase II Analysis

.

April 2004

Page 138

	Option 1A: Most habitat	Option 1B: Moderate	Option 1C: Least habitat	Option 2A: Most habitat	Option 2B: Moderate	Option 2C: Least habitat
	protection	habitat protection	protection	protection	habitat protection	protection
Criteria	Highest level of protection for all habitats	High level of protection for highest value habitat, moderate protection for other habitats	Moderate level of protection for higher value habitats, no protection for lowest value habitat	Moderate level of protection in high urban development value areas, high level of protection in other areas	Low level of protection in high urban development value areas, moderate level of protection in other areas	No protection in high urban development value areas, moderate level of habitat protection in other areas
	applying high protection levels to all habitats.	applies a medium protection level to residential and employment land.	and choices. Applies lower protection levels to all land regardless of zoning.	job location and choices. Applies high protection levels to residential land, medium protection levels to most employment land.	location and choices. Applies lower protection levels to employment land, moderate protection levels to residential land.	choices. Applies lowest protection levels to employment land, moderate protection levels to residential land.
 Preserves habitat for future generations 	Ranks 1 st : Preserves the most habitat for future generations by applying high levels of protection to all habitats.	Ranks 3 ^{ra} : Preserves a moderate amount of habitat for future generations, focuses protection on higher value habitats.	Ranks 6 th : Preserves the least amount of habitat for future generations, applies lower level of protection to higher value habitats.	Ranks 2 nd : Preserves a substantial amount of habitat for future generations. Higher protection levels applied to highest value stream corridors, moderate and high protection applied to other habitats.	Ranks 4 th : Preserves some habitat for future generations. Applies some protection to highest value habitats and moderate protection to other habitats.	Ranks 5 th : Preserves a minimal amount of habitat for future generations. Habitat in areas of high urban development value is not preserved, habitat in other areas receives low and moderate protection.
9. Maintains cultural heritage and sense of place	Ranks 1 st : Provides the most protection for the highest value habitat, highest level of protection may result in need for expanding the UGB.	Ranks 3 rd : Provides moderate protection for highest value habitat, less potential for expanding the UGB.	Ranks 6 th : Provides the least protection to highest value habitat, habitat outside UGB at less risk.	Ranks 2 nd : Provides substantial protection to highest value habitat, a small portion in high urban development value areas receive moderate protection.	Ranks 4 th : Provides some protection to highest value habitat; applies low protection to habitat in high urban development value areas.	Ranks 5 th : Provides minimal protection to highest value habitat, habitat in high urban 'development values receives no protection.
10. Preserves amenity value of resources (quality of life, property values, views)	Ranks 1 st : Retains the most amenity value in the highest value habitats.	Ranks 3 rd : Retains moderate level of amenity value in the highest value habitats.	Ranks 6 th : Retains least level of amenity value in wildlife habitat, slightly more in stream corridors.	Ranks 2 nd : Retains substantial amenity value in highest value habitats, more protection for streams than upland habitat.	Ranks 4 th : Retains some level of amenity value in highest value habitat, more protection for streams than upland habitat.	Ranks 5 th : Retains a minimal level of amenity value, highest value wildlife habitat receives more protection.
Environmental factors				and the second sec		
11. Conserves existing watershed health and restoration opportunities	Ranks 1 st : Preserves most high value habitat; provides substantial protection to other habitats.	Ranks 3 rd : Preserves moderate amount of all habitats; higher protection for highest value habitat.	Ranks 6 th : Preserves least amount of habitat; moderate protection for higher value habitat; no protection for lowest value habitat.	Ranks 2 nd : Preserves substantial amount of habitat. Highest protection levels for most high value habitat, moderate protection for other habitats.	Ranks 4 th : Preserves some amount of habitat. Higher value habitats receive moderate protection levels; other habitats receive lower protection.	Ranks 5 th : Preserves minimal amount of habitat. Provides low protection levels for all habitat classes, no protection for highest value habitat in some circumstances.
12. Retains multiple habitat functions provided by forest areas	Ranks 1 st : Retains the most forest cover in both vacant and developed habitat lands.	Ranks 2 ^{na} : Retains substantial amount of forest cover in both vacant and developed habitat lands.	Ranks 6 ^{ui} : Retains least amount of forest cover, likely to result in significant forest habitat loss over time.	Ranks 3 ^{ro} : Retains moderate amount of forest cover, some protection for all forested habitat areas and highest protection for forested habitat in stream corridors.	Ranks 4 th : Retains some amount of forest cover, some protection for almost all forested habitat areas.	Ranks 5 th : Retains minimal amount of forest cover, low protection levels for most forested habitat areas.
13. Promotes riparian corridor connectivity and overall habitat	Ranks 1 st : Promotes most stream corridor continuity and overall habitat connectivity.	Ranks 3 ^{°°} : Promotes moderate retention of connectivity. Provides small	Ranks 6": Promotes least retention of connectivity and likely to result in most	Ranks 2 ^{III} : Promotes substantial retention of stream corridor continuity; moderate	Ranks 4": Promotes some retention of connectivity in stream corridors and between	Ranks 5": Promotes minimal retention of connectivity, likely to result in significantly

DRAFT: ESEE Phase II Analysis

.

April 2004

Page 139

	Option 1A: Most habitat protection	Option 1B: Moderate habitat protection	Option 1C: Least habitat protection	Option 2A: Most habitat protection	Option 2B: Moderate habitat protection	Option 2C: Least habitat protection
Criteria	Highest level of protection for all habitats	High level of protection for highest value habitat, moderate protection for other habitats	Moderate level of protection for higher value habitats, no protection for lowest value habitat	Moderate level of protection in high urban development value areas, high level of protection in other areas	Low level of protection in high urban development value areas, moderate level of protection in other areas	No protection in high urban development value areas, moderate level of habitat protection in other areas
connectivity		connector habitats with higher protection, does not preserve as much stream corridor continuity.	reduction of regional connectivity. No protection for small connector habitats.	protection for small connector habitats.	upland habitats.	reduced regional connectivity.
14. Conserves habitat quality and biodiversity provided by large habitat areas	Ranks 1 st : Conserves the most large habitat areas.	Ranks 2 nd : Conserves a substantial amount of large habitat areas, moderate risk for urban development fragmenting large habitats.	Ranks 6 th : Conserves least amount of large habitat areas, likely to result in significant fragmentation.	Ranks 3 rd : Conserves moderate amount of large habitat areas, small amount of low protection applied to portions of some large habitats.	Ranks 4 th : Conserves some amount of large habitat areas, lower protection levels applied to all large habitats.	Ranks 5 th : Conserves minimal amount of large habitat areas, likely to result in significant fragmentation of large habitats.
15. Supports biodiversity through conservation of sensitive habitats and species	Ranks 1 st : Supports the most biodiversity by applying highest levels of protection to sensitive habitats and stream corridors.	Ranks 2 ^{na} /3 ^{ra} : Supports a substantial amount of biodiversity, applies more protection to sensitive habitats than stream corridors.	Ranks 5 th : Supports a minimal amount of biodiversity, applies moderate protection level to sensitive habitats and stream corridors.	Ranks 2 nd /3 rd : Supports a substantial amount of biodiversity, applies more protection to stream corridors than sensitive habitats.	Ranks 4 th : Supports some biodiversity, applies higher protection to stream corridors than sensitive habitats.	Ranks 6 th : Supports the least amount of biodiversity, likely to result in substantial loss of sensitive habitats and sensitive species.
Energy Factors		an ang san ang San ang san ang				
16. Promotes compact urban form	Ranks 6 ^m : Promotes compact urban form the least. Highest protection levels applied to vacant land intended for urban uses (housing & jobs).	Ranks 4 th : Moderately promotes compact urban form. Some reduction in development potential on all habitat land.	Ranks 1 st : Promotes compact urban form the most. Development allowed in lowest habitats, moderate protection to other habitat lands.	Ranks 5 th : Minimally promotes compact urban form. Development opportunities reduced in all habitat areas.	Ranks 3 rd : Promotes some amount of compact urban form. Development opportunities reduced in most habitat areas.	Ranks 2 ^{na} : Substantially promotes compact urban form. Development opportunities on business land less impacted than residential land.
17. Promotes green infrastructure	Ranks 1 st : Conserves the most vegetation and forested areas.	Ranks 3 rd : Conserves a moderate amount of vegetation and forested areas.	Ranks 6 th : Conserves the least amount of vegetation and forested areas.	Ranks 2 nd : Conserves a substantial amount of vegetation and forested areas.	Ranks 4 th : Conserves some vegetation and forested areas.	Ranks 5 th : Conserves a minimal amount of vegetation and forested areas.
Other criteria						
18. Assists in protecting fish and wildlife protected by the federal Endangered Species Act	Ranks 1 st Provides most protection to sensitive habitats; most protection for hydrology and riparian functions; most likely to protect sensitive species.	Ranks 3 ^{ro} : Provides substantial protection to sensitive habitats and species. Similar to 2A, but provides less protection for hydrologic conditions.	Ranks 6 th : Provides least protection to sensitive habitats and species, hydrology. Minimal protection for riparian functions.	Ranks 2 nd : Provides substantial protection to sensitive habitats and species. Similar to 1B, but provides more protection for hydrologic conditions.	Ranks 4 th : Provides some protection to sensitive habitats; less likely to maintain hydrologic conditions or riparian functions.	Ranks 5 th : Provides minimal protection to sensitive habitats and species and hydrology. Provides least protection for riparian functions.
19. Assists in meeting water quality standards required by the federal Clean Water Act	Ranks 1 ^{st:} Provides most protection for clean water. Most protective of forest canopy, habitat near streams and on steep slopes; most protection for hydrology.	Ranks 3 ^{ro} : Provides moderate protection for clean water. Moderate protection for for slopes, wetlands, and resources near streams. Substantial protection for forested areas.	Ranks 5 th : Provides minimal protection for the natural resources important to protecting water quality. Least protection for forested areas.	Ranks 2 rd : Provides substantial protection for clean water, with strict protection for slopes, wetlands, and resources near streams. Moderate protection for forested areas.	Ranks 4 th : Some protection for slopes and wetlands, hydrologic conditions, habitat near streams, hydrologic conditions and forest. Potential for decreased water quality.	Ranks 6 th : Provides least protection for slopes and wetlands, habitat near streams, and hydrology; minimal protection for forested areas. Most potential for poor water quality.

DRAFT: ESEE Phase II Analysis

April 2004

Page 140

.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

P. Lorente .

Protecting fish and wildlife habitat in the urban area is complicated, and there are many important tradeoffs to balance. Metro's consideration of several non-regulatory tools for habitat protection describes several approaches that could be developed further, building on the restoration, education, and acquisition work that Metro currently does. Metro's analysis of the six regulatory program options identifies the number of affected acres of land in each habitat and urban development class, and describes the economic, social, environmental, and energy consequences associated with various protection levels. Evaluating the performance of each option against the 19 criteria provides the Metro Council with valuable information necessary to choose which type of regulatory approach makes the most sense for the region. Non-regulatory and regulatory tools can be complementary, increasing the effectiveness of each approach. This chapter includes:

- a brief summary of the potential non-regulatory tools,
- results of the analysis of the six regulatory options,
- a discussion of the interaction between non-regulatory and regulatory tools,
- potential funding sources, and
- the next steps in the development of a regional fish and wildlife habitat protection program.

Potential non-regulatory tools for habitat protection

While there is substantial evidence of current non-regulatory efforts accomplishing habitat protection, restoration, and education in the Metro region, they have not been successful in preventing the decline in overall ecosystem health. Most non-regulatory programs are dependent on unsteady sources of grant funding, volunteerism, and good stewardship, often without recognition or reward. Each program conducts important work, but even taken as a whole over the past decade only a small portion of the habitat in the region received the attention needed. There is a much greater need for restoration dollars; technical assistance for landowners, developers, and local jurisdictions; and permanent protection for critical habitats than is currently available.

There are many types of non-regulatory tools that could be used to protect and restore fish and wildlife habitat in the region. All of these tools require some type of funding, whether to pay for staff or provide direct dollars to purchase or restore land. Many of the non-regulatory tools could be implemented at either the local or regional level. Below is a list of tools identified in this report:

- Stewardship and recognition programs
- Grants for restoration and protection
- Information resources
- Technical assistance program
- Habitat education activities
- Volunteer activities
- Agency-led restoration activities
- Acquisition

Acquisition is the most effective non-regulatory tool to achieve habitat protection. Acquisition achieves permanent protection and also preserves land to be restored at a later date. However, the high cost of purchasing land, especially within the urban growth boundary, and the dependence of an acquisition program on willing sellers limits the effectiveness of such a program.

Many of the other non-regulatory habitat protection and restoration tools considered in this report are most effective when used in combination with each other and/or along with a regulatory program. A regulatory program can provide the incentive and motivation to develop innovative solutions to land development while protecting habitat. Grants and technical assistance are the tools that could be most effective in protecting and restoring habitat, in the absence of an acquisition program. A stewardship recognition program could help promote grants and serve to educate others about innovative practices. Coordinating with existing agencies and volunteer groups that conduct restoration as well as providing funds to focus efforts could be effective in enhancing regionally significant habitat.

Comparison of regulatory options

Metro developed six regulatory options to protect land classified as regionally significant fish and wildlife habitat. Three of the options consider habitat quality (1A, 1B, and 1C) and three options (2A, 2B, and 2C) consider habitat quality and urban development value. Five possible treatments are applied in the options, identifying whether development would be allowed, lightly limited, moderately limited, strictly limited, or prohibited. The six options were evaluated based on how they met 19 criteria. Most of the criteria were based on the issues identified in Metro's general evaluation of the economic, social, environmental, and energy tradeoffs, two criteria were based on how well the options met the federal Endangered Species Act and Clean Water Act. Figure 5-1 graphically illustrates how the five treatment levels are applied in the six options as compared to the baseline regulations (Title 3).



Overall, the options that protect the highest-value habitat (Options 1A and 2A) perform similarly. The option that provides the least protection for the highest-value habitat (Option 1C) and the option with the lowest level of protection in the industrial and commercial areas (Option 2C) also perform similarly. However, Option 2C favors factors important for urban development while Option 1C reduces protection levels equally for all land uses. Table 5-1 compares the tradeoffs of applying the six regulatory options.

Op	tions 1A, 2A	Options 1B, 2B	Options 1C, 2C
•	Reduces development opportunities within the existing urban growth boundary	These options provide the middle ground between	Provides the most development opportunities within the current urban growth boundary
•	Increases possibility of expanding the urban growth boundary, potentially increasing development costs (such as streets and utility connections) Potentially adds to the cost of urban	restrictive and least restrictive options.	 Minimizes need to expand the urban growth boundary by allowing compact urban development Supports urban centers and industrial areas by not applying new regulations
•	review process, low impact development standards) Protects the most habitat and restoration		 Minimizes habitat protection and preserves the fewest restoration opportunities (but may increase future
	opportunities		cost to restore ecosystem services such
•	Preserves the most ecosystem services (such as flood management and water quality)		 Increases habitat fragmentation along streams and between streams and
•	Promotes conservation of sensitive species (such as Pileated woodpeckers and painted turtles) and at risk habitats (such as white oak forests and wetlands)		 Reduces variety of plants and animals that make up a healthy ecosystem Increases energy demand for cooling air
, •	Supports cultural heritage (such as salmon), regional identity (such as provimity to open spaces) and amenity		and water temperatures by removing trees and vegetation
	values (such as property values)		generations to enjoy fish and wildlife
•	Greatest affect on the location and choices for jobs and housing		 Minimizes property owner concerns
•	Increases property owner concerns about limiting use of land, especially single family residential		about limiting use of land, especially residential and business land

Interaction of non-regulatory and regulatory tools

A program to protect fish and wildlife habitat may be most effective if it includes a variety of tools and approaches, both non-regulatory and regulatory. Both approaches have strengths and weaknesses, for example non-regulatory tools rely heavily on funding and willing landowners, while regulations only apply when triggered by a land use action. While regulatory and quasi-regulatory tools can offer some flexibility, regulations can and often are used to achieve a baseline level of protection. Protection can be greatly enhanced by supplementing a regulatory component with non-regulatory tools for fish and wildlife habitat protection. If a program option is chosen that includes less regulatory protection then it may be necessary to apply more non-regulatory approaches and a higher level of funding if the same level of habitat protection is

desired. The following constitutes a brief summary of how acquisition and incentives can interact with and increase the effectiveness of regulatory tools.

Incentives and regulations

When used in conjunction with regulations, the opportunity of incentives to encourage fish and wildlife habitat protection on private lands cannot be overstated. Through tax benefits, regulatory certainty, public recognition, cost sharing, and other incentives, landowners can be encouraged and rewarded for protecting valuable fish and wildlife habitat on their property. Takings issues, whether actual or perceived, are important to many property owners, thus regulatory programs may be unpopular. The application of incentives, however, can provide willing landowners some kind of compensation for conserving habitat on their land. Incentives can thus be used to support compliance with regulations or to fill in protection gaps for regionally significant habitat where regulations are not applied.

The Riparian Lands Tax Incentive Program (RLTIP), for example, can potentially apply in already urbanized areas to protect regionally significant riparian corridors adjacent to private property where the standards of buffer programs may be difficult to implement. Inside the UGB, where most of the significant riparian corridor habitat is developed rather than vacant, incentives can offer a tremendous opportunity to encourage voluntary protection and restoration. Other incentives⁴⁰ can apply to new development or redevelopment where habitat-friendly development is a feasible option for stormwater management and erosion and sediment control.

Acquisition and regulations

Just as incentive programs and regulatory tools can work together to protect significant habitat, combining acquisition with regulatory and quasi-regulatory approaches can create a more comprehensive protection strategy for fish and wildlife habitat. Further, where regulatory tools and incentive programs fail to provide adequate protection, acquisition of land from willing sellers offers a last line of defense for the habitat. Acquisition, by willing sellers, can be applied to conserve some of the remaining significant habitat.

Regulatory flexibility

Regulations to protect fish and wildlife habitat limit development options on land with habitat value. Some ways in which regulations could limit development include lowered density, minimum disturbance areas, and setbacks from significant resources. Incentives can work with regulations to allow development to occur in a manner that reduces the impact on the habitat. For example, cluster development, streamside buffers, and habitat-friendly development

⁴⁰ Such as: the City of Portland's Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) Ecobiz and Ecoroof Programs, the city's Office of Sustainable Development's (OSD) G-Rated Program, and Oregon Department of Environmental Quality's (DEQ) Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Facility Tax Credit Program (NSPCFTC). BES's Ecoroof Program, for example, provides developers with sewer rate discounts for building greenroofs on new buildings or for retrofits, while the DEQ's NSPCFTC program provides cost share opportunities for other innovative LID stormwater management designs. The soon-to-be-implemented Ecobiz program will serve to further encourage the use of LID for new and redevelopment by publicly recognizing landscapers who use these designs.

techniques can all provide some level of regulatory flexibility that allows development to occur while protecting habitat.

Cluster development

Clustering and open space development are land division and development tools used to conserve land on one portion of a site in exchange for concentrated development on another portion of the site. Typically, road frontages, lot sizes and setbacks are relaxed to allow the preservation of open space areas. Clustering has the potential for regulatory flexibility because ordinances implementing these tools can be designed to establish performance standards with objective evaluation criteria for protecting resources from development.

Riparian buffer performance standards

Riparian buffers frequently establish predominantly fixed-width setback standards to protect habitat in and around streams, wetlands and riparian areas. Buffer programs tend to regulate actions rather than establish standards to achieve a specific outcome or performance. However, the potential exists to establish performance standards when implementing buffer programs and to protect fish and wildlife habitat. Some of these standards can include, but are not limited to: variable-width provisions that allow a buffer to expand and contract with the landscape; maintaining or enhancing percentages of native forest cover within buffer areas; and reducing impervious surfaces and road crossings through buffer areas.

Low impact, habitat-friendly development

Low Impact Development (LID) tools, especially those for reducing impervious surfaces and controlling stormwater, contain the most flexible standards from a performance-based perspective. Since the primary objectives of LID are to improve hydrologic conditions and increase water quality in urban watersheds, many LID ordinances, whether mandatory or voluntary, provide flexibility in the types of practices that can be used to meet these objectives. Since LID tools also focus on improving water quality, many jurisdictions specify objective criteria that can be used to evaluate the outcome or performance. Such criteria include, but are not limited to: the number and lengths of roads and other impervious surfaces reduced; percentages of tree canopy maintained or created; maintenance or reduction of stream temperatures; amount of sediment, nutrient, and pollutant loading to water reduced; and the minimization of runoff volumes.

Funding

Protecting and restoring fish and wildlife habitat costs money, with either a non-regulatory focus, regulatory approach, or a combination of the two. All non-regulatory programs would require some type of funding, either to purchase land, restore habitat, provide grants for habitat-friendly development, or to retain staff to develop a technical assistance or stewardship recognition program. Nor are regulations without cost. Staff time (regional and local) is used to develop ordinances and implement new laws and changes in development capacity may result in a reduced property tax base for local partners.

Funding for habitat protection programs could be provided by a non-specific mechanism such as a bond measure or Metro's excise tax on solid waste, or a funding source could be tied to

specific activities that impact fish and wildlife habitat. Below are several ideas for raising funds for protecting and restoring fish and wildlife habitat that could be implemented at the regional or local level.

Increase Metro's excise tax

Metro collects an excise tax on each ton of solid waste produced within the region. An additional per ton fee could be added that would be dedicated to funding the protection and restoration of fish and wildlife habitat. Such a decision would require an action of the Metro Council.

Urban area inclusion fee

Metro manages the region's urban growth boundary (UGB), expanding it according to development needs as the region grows. Land outside the UGB is not allowed to develop at urban capacities. When the boundary expands the new lands increase in value due to the increased ability to develop. An urban area inclusion fee would capture a portion of this increase in the value of property due to inclusion within the UGB. Funds raised could be used to purchase or restore habitat land within Metro's jurisdiction. It could be targeted to lands in the expansion areas as they are developed.

The *Incentives Report* included substantial review of this tool. Based on that study, a partition fee seemed to have the best potential for successful implementation as a method of collecting revenue. A partition fee could be imposed as a flat fee uniformly applied across all land parcels on a per lot or per acre basis. Since the fee would be collected when land is partitioned (typically a one-time event), it would not be assessed multiple times on the same property. Revenue would depend on the amount of developable land brought inside the UGB, the pace of development in the expansion areas, and the proposed fee rate.

Systems development charge (SDC) program

Local jurisdictions, typically municipalities, across the state regularly apply SDCs to new development in an attempt to pay for the cost of new infrastructure. SDCs can only be charged for specified purposes, *water supply, treatment and distribution, drainage and flood control,* and *parks and recreation* all could be construed to relate to the protection and restoration of fish and wildlife habitat. SDCs are a major cost for new development, and the imposition of any additional charge is likely to be challenged in a court of law.

An SDC could be collected to fund mitigation of the environmental impacts of development on fish and wildlife habitat. Fees would be collected by the permitting agency. However, fees generated through an SDC must be used on "capacity increasing capital improvements " that "increase the level of performance or service provided by existing facilities or provides new facilities" (ORS § 223.307(2)). It may be difficult to tie protection or restoration of habitat to a capacity increasing improvement. A more legally viable argument could be made if a regional SDC was collected for stormwater management.

Stormwater management fee

Water providers (e.g., Clean Water Services, Portland Bureau of Environmental Services) collect fees for stormwater management purposes. Some of these funds are currently used for restoration activities, but Metro could encourage these agencies to devote more dollars to habitat protection and restoration. Metro could also impose a regional fee to be used for restoration and protection of significant fish and wildlife habitat to be collected by the water providers.

Bond measure

Metro could put forth a regional bond measure to raise funds to purchase or restore habitat lands from willing sellers. The 1995 Parks and Openspaces bond measure was very successful and allowed the creation of a system of regional parks and trails that will be appreciated for generations. A similar approach could be taken focused on Metro's fish and wildlife habitat inventory. The voters would need to pass a bond measure, and polling has shown that a targeted approach is most likely to be successful. Fish and wildlife habitat targets could include purchasing and restoring Habitats of Concern and floodplains. Funds could also be used to purchase properties that are significantly affected by new regulations.

Funds from outside sources

There are funds to protect fish and wildlife habitat that could be raised from other sources such as national non-profits and federal agencies. Land conservancy organizations could be contacted to encourage the purchase of targeted habitat types (e.g., Nature Conservancy, Trust for Public Land). The US Fish and Wildlife Service has funds available for restoration in urban areas, and has worked in partnership with Metro's Parks Department to provide grants to property owners and organizations to conduct restoration activities. The City of Portland received a grant from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to acquire lands in the Johnson Creek floodplain after the floods of 1996. Additional partnerships with federal agencies could be pursued. Such an effort would require staff time to develop and implement programs for protection or restoration.

Next steps

The Metro Council is scheduled to consider a program direction, including non-regulatory and regulatory components, in May 2004 after a rigorous review process during which the public, local partners, and interested stakeholder groups will have the opportunity to provide input on the best approach for protecting fish and wildlife habitat in the region. Metro will then develop a program to protect fish and wildlife habitat to be considered by the Council in December 2004. Metro's program would include a standard ordinance and may include provisions for a riparian or wildlife district plan as a means of substantial compliance.

I:\gm\long_range_planning\projects\Goal 5\Goal 5 Report REVISION\ESEE\Phase II\Phase II report.doc

EXHIBIT B TO RESOLUTION NO. 04-3440

REGULATORY PROGRAM OPTION

Based on the results of the Phase II ESEE analysis, public comments, and technical review, Metro Council recommends Option 2B as modified (shown in the table below) to form the basis for a regulatory program to protect fish and wildlife habitat.

Option 2B (modified): Low level of protection in high urban development value areas, moderate level of protection in other areas.

Fish & wildlife habitat classification	HIGH Urban development value	MÉDIUM Urban development value	LOW Urban development value	Other areas
	Primary 2040 components, ¹ high employment value, or high land value ⁴	Secondary 2040 components, ² medium employment value, or medium land value ⁴	Tertiary 2040 components, ³ low employment value, or low land value ⁴	Parks and Open Spaces, no design types outside UGB
Class I Riparian/Wildlife	ML	SL.	SL	SL
Class II Riparian/Wildlife	LL	LL	ML	ML
Class III	LL	LL	LL	ML
Riparian/Wildlife				
Class A Upland Wildlife	LL	ML	ML	SL
Class B Upland Wildlife	LL	LL	ML	ML
Class C Upland Wildlife	LL	LL	LL	ML
Impact Areas	A	A	A	A

¹Primary 2040 components: Regional Centers, Central City, Regionally Significant Industrial Areas ²Secondary 2040 components: Town Centers, Main Streets, Station Communities, Other Industrial areas,

³Tertiary 2040 components: Inner and outer neighborhoods, Corridors ⁴ Land value excludes residential lands.

Key to abbreviations

SL = strictly limit ML = moderately limit LL = lightly limit A = allow

EXHIBIT C TO RESOLUTION NO. 04-3440

DEVELOPING A REGULATORY PROGRAM

The third step of the Goal 5 process calls for the development of a program to protect habitat areas by allowing, limiting, or prohibiting conflicting uses on habitat land based on the results of the ESEE analysis. Council directs staff to address the following concerns when developing a regulatory program to protect fish and wildlife habitat:

A. Defining limit in the program phase

- Specifically define limit. As a guiding principle, first avoid, then limit, and finally mitigate adverse impacts of development to protect fish and wildlife habitat. Some of the key issues in the definition relate to expected impact on housing and employment capacity, disturbance area extent and location, and mitigation, as illustrated below:
 - Strictly Limit Strict avoidance of the habitat (especially Habitats of Concern) with maximum allowable disturbance areas, design standards, and mitigation requirements. Allow trails, roads and other public access to meet the public good (e.g. construction and maintenance of public utilities such as water storage facilities). Expect some overall loss of development capacity; consider development of a transfer of development right (TDR) program to compensate for lost development capacity.
 - Moderately Limit Avoid impacts, limit disturbance area, require mitigation, and use design standards and other tools to protect habitat (especially Habitats of Concern) while achieving goals for employment and housing densities. Work to minimize loss of development capacity; consider development of a TDR program to compensate for lost capacity.
 - Lightly Limit Avoid impacts (especially Habitats of Concern), allow development with less restrictive limits on disturbance area, design standards, and mitigation requirements. Assumes no loss of development capacity.

B. Effect on existing development and redevelopment

- Clarify that a regulatory program would apply only to activities that require a land use permit and not to other activities (such as gardening, lawn care, routine property maintenance, and actions necessary to prevent natural hazards).
- Clarify that redevelopment that requires permits could be subject to new regulations, which could depend on a redevelopment threshold determined in the program.

C. Regulatory flexibility

• Include regulatory flexibility that allows development while avoiding, minimizing and mitigating impacts on habitat in the program. Some ways in which regulations could limit development include lowered density, minimum disturbance areas, and setbacks from significant resources. Development can occur in a manner that avoids or reduces the impact on the habitat, for example: cluster development, streamside buffers, and habitat-friendly development techniques can all provide some level of regulatory flexibility that allows development to occur while protecting habitat. A transfer of development rights (TDR) program could also compensate for loss of development capacity.

D. Mitigation, mitigation banking and restoration

• Include mitigation requirements for development in habitat areas to minimize habitat degradation, and consider methods for implementing a mitigation bank and enforcement mechanisms to ensure success. Mitigation could be targeted in accordance with an overall restoration plan.

E. Program specificity and flexibility

- As part of the regulatory program, provide a specific program that can be implemented without further local analysis.
- Provide a general framework for local jurisdictions to implement, as part of the regulatory program, through standards or other guidelines, flexibility during implementation for consideration of regionally significant public facilities (such as hospitals and educational institutions), riparian and wildlife district plans, and other case-by-case decisions.
- Clarify a timeline for when the program would be adopted by local governments after acknowledgement by the State.

F. Map corrections and inventory maintenance

• Continue addressing map corrections and complete the process by the adoption of the final program and define the on-going responsibilities for maintaining habitat maps.

G. Long-term monitoring

• Develop a plan to monitor program performance in protecting fish and wildlife habitat while meeting housing and employment capacity (both regulatory and nonregulatory) to determine the effectiveness of the regional fish and wildlife habitat protection plan and identify potential adjustments to the program in the future.

///
EXHIBIT D TO RESOLUTION NO. 04-3440

DIRECTION ON NON-REGULATORY PROGRAMS

Although the Goal 5 rule does not require the consideration of non-regulatory tools to protect fish and wildlife habitat, the Metro Council has previously indicated a commitment to include incentives and restoration as part of an overall regional program to protect fish and wildlife habitat. Council directs staff to develop a proposal for implementing the most promising nonregulatory habitat protection and restoration programs to supplement and complement a regulatory program. Based on public comments and staff analysis of the effectiveness of nonregulatory programs, Council directs staff to further develop the following non-regulatory tools:

- A. *Technical assistance.* Determine if technical assistance is most effective when directed at individual owners, developers, or local jurisdiction staff, or a combination of the potential audiences. Develop a plan to implement a technical assistance program to assist in the implementation of habitat-friendly development techniques, better stewardship of habitat, and restoration on public and private land.
- B. *Grants for restoration and protection.* Develop a proposal for a grant program that could be aimed at individual property owners, public land model examples, habitat-friendly development, or green streets, wildlife crossings, and culvert replacements. Grants could also be targeted to agency-led efforts to restore habitat on public land, possibly utilizing volunteers. Identify potential sources of funding for grants. Develop a plan to define restoration priorities to effectively allocate restoration efforts and investments.
- C. *Willing-seller acquisition.* Develop a proposal for a targeted acquisition program that could work as a revolving acquisition fund. Identify a funding source for acquiring habitat land from willing sellers. Consider potential for encouraging expansion of local programs that use system development charges to purchase land that provides habitat functions for the public good (such as floodplains).
- D. Property tax reductions. Identify steps to encourage implementation of property tax reduction programs in the Metro region. There are two state programs that could be applicable within the urban area: the Riparian Lands Tax Incentive Program and the Wildlife Habitat Conservation and Management Program. Both of these programs would require county or city action to be implemented.

///

DRAFT STAFF REPORT

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO 04-3440 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING METRO'S DRAFT GOAL 5 PHASE II ESEE ANALYSIS, MAKING PRELIMINARY DECISIONS TO ALLOW, LIMIT, OR PROHIBIT CONFLICTING USES ON REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT; AND DIRECTING STAFF TO DEVELOP A PROGRAM TO PROTECT AND RESTORE REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT.

Date: April 7, 2004

Prepared by: Andy Cotugno and Chris Deffebach

CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND

The region's 2040 Growth Concept and other policies call for protection of natural areas while managing housing and employment growth. In 1998 the Metro Council adopted Title 3 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan to protect water quality and for flood management. Title 3 also included a commitment to develop a regional fish and wildlife habitat protection plan. As defined in a Vision Statement that was developed in cooperation with local governments at MPAC in 2000, the overall goal of the protection program is: "...to conserve, protect and restore a continuous ecologically viable streamside corridor... that is integrated with the urban environment." The Vision Statement also refers to the importance that "...stream and river corridors maintain connections with adjacent upland habitats, form an interconnected mosaic of urban forest and other fish and wildlife habitat..." Metro is currently developing this program, following the 3-step process established by the State Land Use Planning Goal 5 administrative rule (OAR 660-023).

In the first step, Metro identified regionally significant fish and wildlife habitat using the best available science, computer mapping, and fieldwork. In 2002, after review by independent committees, local governments and residents, Metro Council adopted the inventory of regionally significant fish and wildlife habitat lands. The inventory includes about 80,000 acres of habitat land inside Metro's jurisdictional boundary.

The second step of the process is to evaluate the Economic, Social, Environmental and Energy (ESEE) consequences of a decision to allow, limit or prohibit conflicting uses on these regionally significant habitat lands and on impact areas adjacent to the habitat areas. The impact areas add about 16,000 acres to the inventory. Metro is conducting the ESEE analysis in two phases. The first phase was to evaluate the ESEE consequences at a regional level. This work was completed and endorsed by the Metro Council in October 2003 (Resolution #03-3376). The resolution also directed staff to evaluate six regulatory program options and non-regulatory tools for fish and wildlife habitat protection in Phase II of the ESEE analysis. Staff has completed the Phase II ESEE analysis and is seeking direction from Metro Council on where conflicting uses within the fish and wildlife habitat areas and impact areas should be allowed, limited, or prohibited, as required in the Goal 5 administrative rule.

The Phase II analysis evaluates the ESEE consequences of possible protection and restoration options that include a mix of regulatory and non-regulatory components. Five potential

regulatory treatments are applied in each of the six regulatory options, ranging from allowing conflicting uses to prohibiting conflicting uses in habitat and impact areas. The consequences identify the effects on key ESEE issues identified in the Phase I analysis, including:

- Economic implications of urban development and ecosystem values
- Environmental effects including ecological function loss, fragmentation and connectivity
- Social values ranging from property owner concerns about limitations on development to concerns about loss of aesthetic and cultural values
- Energy trade-offs such as temperature moderating effects of tree canopy and potential fuel use associated with different urban forms.

In addition, the analysis considered how well the six regulatory options would assist in meeting the requirements of the federal Endangered Species Act and the Clean Water Act.

The third and final step of the process is to develop a program that implements the habitat protection plan by ordinance through Metro's Urban Growth Management Functional Plan. After acknowledgment by the State Land Conservation and Development Commission, cities and counties within the Metro jurisdiction will be required to amend their comprehensive plans to be in compliance with the regional habitat protection program.

Cities and counties in the region currently have varying levels of protection for fish and wildlife habitat. As a result, similar quality streams or upland areas in different parts of the region receive inconsistent treatment. In addition, one ecological watershed can cross several different political jurisdictions – each with different approaches to habitat protection. With the adoption of the regional habitat protection program, cities and counties will adjust their protection levels, to a greater or lesser degree, to establish a consistent minimum level of habitat protection.

In January 2002 Metro entered into an intergovernmental agreement with local governments and special districts in the Tualatin Basin setting forth a cooperative planning process to address regional fish and wildlife habitat within the basin. The Tualatin Basin recommendation will be forwarded to the Metro Council for final approval as part of the regional habitat protection plan.

Current Action

Based on the results of the Phase II ESEE analysis and public comment, Resolution 04-3440 presents the staff recommendation for Metro Council consideration on a regulatory approach to fish and wildlife habitat protection and requests Council direction to staff on developing a program to implement the regulatory approach and to further develop non-regulatory options.

These recommendations and the key issues for Council consideration are highlighted below.

Public comment

Metro's fish and wildlife habitat protection (Goal 5) communications and community involvement program is designed to support the technical work and Council decision-making process. Its goal is to provide effective means of informing and engaging citizens in the making of important regional habitat protection policy. Metro held public outreach events, mailed notices to property owners in fall 2001 and summer 2002, and held public hearings prior to identifying regionally significant habitat. Upon completion of Phase I of the ESEE analysis, Metro conducted public outreach and held public hearings on Resolution 03-3376.

In the spring 2004 public outreach effort there were many opportunities for citizens to be informed and participate in the decision-making process: newspaper advertisements, information materials and interactive maps (by mail, online), property owner notices (mailed), comment cards (by mail, online), non-scientific survey (keypad, online), workshops, community stakeholder meetings and special events, open houses and formal public hearings.

Generally, people were supportive of habitat protection. Very few people expressed opposition to protecting habitat in the metropolitan area. Rather, opposition expressed was towards imposed regulations, especially those that reduce the development potential or economic value of private property. Overall, there seems to be a desire for a balance between regulatory and non-regulatory program options. Support is expressed for a variety of protection tools and recognition is generally given to the need for a mixed approach to protection. For a complete summary of the comments received see the March 2004 Public Comment Report in Attachment 1.

Technical review

This resolution and staff report will be reviewed by Metro's advisory committees including Economic Technical Advisory Committee (ETAC), Goal 5 Technical Advisory Committee (Goal 5 TAC), Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC), the Independent Economic Advisory Board (IEAB), and Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC). The staff report will be updated to reflect technical committee comments.

Policy review

The Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) will review this resolution and staff report. This staff report will be updated to reflect MPAC comments.

1. RECOMMENDATION ON REGULATORY OPTIONS

Staff analyzed six regulatory options and evaluated their performance in the ESEE analysis. Three of the options apply regulatory treatments based on habitat quality alone (Options 1A, 1B and 1C), while three options (2A, 2B, 2C) apply regulatory treatments based on habitat quality and urban development value.

Habitat quality was measured during Metro's Goal 5 inventory process and was based on landscape features (e.g., trees, woody vegetation, wetlands, etc.) and the ecological functions they provide (e.g., shade, stream flow moderation, wildlife migration, nesting and roosting sites, etc.). The inventory was then classified into six categories for the ESEE analysis (Class I-III riparian/wildlife corridors and Class A-C upland wildlife habitat) to distinguish higher value habitat from lower value habitat. Class I riparian/wildlife corridors and Class A upland wildlife habitat are the highest valued habitats and include the identified habitats of concern (HOC) in the region, such as wetlands, bottomland hardwood forests, oak woodlands and other rare and declining habitat types.

Urban development values were categorized as high, medium or low. Areas without urban development value – parks and open space (both inside and outside the UGB) and rural areas outside the UGB – were not assigned a value. All other areas were assigned to categories based

on commercial and industrial land value, employment density, and 2040 design type. In the recent expansion areas, interim design types were used to determine urban development value. Areas receiving a high score in any of the three measures are called "high urban development value", areas receiving no high scores but at least one medium score are called "medium urban development value", and areas receiving all low scores are called "low urban development value." High priority 2040 Growth Concept design types include the central city, regional centers and regionally significant industrial areas. Medium priority 2040 Growth Concept design types include town centers, main streets, station communities, other industrial areas and employment centers. Inner and outer neighborhoods and corridors are considered low priority 2040 Growth Concept design types.

In Resolution 03-3376 Council directed staff to define regionally significant public facilities, including major educational and medical institutions, and recommend the appropriate urban development value rank during Phase II of the ESEE analysis to determine appropriate habitat protection levels for these land uses. Staff is still working on this issue and expects that additional consideration will be appropriate during the program development phase. This analysis could lead to modifications in the recommendation for these locations.

Based on the ESEE analysis and public comment, staff recommends Option 2B, with a few modifications, as a starting place for Metro Council consideration for fish and wildlife habitat protection. Option 2B reflects the balancing of habitat protection and development needs described in Phases I and II of the ESEE analysis. This option applies a low level of habitat protection in high urban development value areas and a moderate to strict level of protection in other areas. This option recognizes habitat values and urban development values, accounting for the goals described in the 2040 Growth Concept. Option 2B ranked third or fourth (out of six) on all the ESEE consequences described by the evaluation criteria – falling in the middle of the range of regulatory options and balancing the conflicting goals of habitat protection and allowing conflicting uses.

The Phase II ESEE analysis and public comments highlighted the importance of accounting for urban development values in the development of a regional fish and wildlife habitat protection plan. Option 2A applies a very strict level of protection to Class I Riparian, including a *prohibit* treatment in low urban development value areas. Prohibiting conflicting uses on most residential land does not address the social considerations or potential impact on housing capacity within the existing urban growth boundary. On the other hand, Option 2C applies an *allow* treatment to all habitat types in high urban development value areas while substantially limiting conflicting uses in residential lands. This option does not balance habitat protection with the other ESEE factors.

While Option 2B best balances the ESEE factors, staff has recommended areas where changes to the option could improve its performance and identified issues associated with Option 2B for further Council consideration. The 2B Option, recommended modifications and other issues for consideration are described below.

	HIGH Urban development value	MEDIUM Urban development value	LOW Urban development value	Other areas
Fish & wildlife habitat classification	Primary 2040 components, ¹ high employment value, or high land value ⁴	Secondary 2040 components, ² medium employment value, or medium land value ⁴	Tertiary 2040 components, ³ low employment value, or low land value ⁴	Parks and Open Spaces, no design types outside UGB
Class I Riparian/Wildlife	EE ML	ML-SL	SL	SL
Class II Riparian/Wildlife	LL	LL	ML	ML
Class III Riparian/Wildlife	A LL	LL	ĹĹ	ML
Class A Upland Wildlife		ML	ML	SL
Class B Upland Wildlife	LL	LL	ML	ML
Class C Upland Wildlife	ALL	LL	LL	ML_
Impact Areas	A	EE A	LL A	LL A

Option 2B: Low level of protection in high urban development value areas, moderate level of protection in other areas. (Modifications are shown)

¹Primary 2040 components: Regional Centers, Central City, Regionally Significant Industrial Areas ²Secondary 2040 components: Town Centers, Main Streets, Station Communities, Other Industrial areas, Employment Centers ³Tertiary 2040 components: Inner and outer neighborhoods, Corridors

⁴ Land value excludes residential lands.

Key to abbreviations

SL = strictly limit

ML = moderately limit

LL = lightly limit

A = allow

Recommended modifications and issues for Council consideration on regulatory option 2B

- A. No allow treatments of habitat. Option 2B applies an allow treatment in high urban development areas to Class III riparian habitat and Class C upland habitat. To ensure that existing functions are preserved and to maintain opportunities for mitigation, staff recommend that Class III Riparian and Class C Wildlife areas in high urban development value areas receive a *lightly limit* treatment instead of an allow treatment. Over eighty percent of Class III Riparian habitat is currently developed and would not be subject to new regulatory programs until redevelopment. Much of the Class III habitat is developed floodplain where low impact development techniques such as pervious pavers and stormwater runoff containment can improve nearby stream quality. In Class III areas with high urban development value, 96% is developed. If an allow decision is applied to these areas the opportunity to require redevelopment standards would be lost. Class C Wildlife habitat provides important connections between riparian areas and other upland wildlife habitats and 60% of this habitat area is currently vacant. The loss of Class C areas can subsequently reduce the quality of nearby higher quality habitats and can also reduce opportunities for restoration in the future. In Class C areas with high urban development value, 80% is vacant.
- B. *Impact areas.* Option 2B applies an allow treatment to impact areas in high urban development value areas and a lightly limit treatment to impact areas in other urban development value categories. To achieve a better balance between environmental

effectiveness and regulatory effort, staff recommends that impact areas have an allow treatment. Much of the impact areas are developed (66%), and are, by definition, adjacent to the habitat and not the habitat itself. However, development or redevelopment in these areas can affect habitat conditions. Impact areas add 15,721 acres to the inventory, about half of which (7,152 acres) is residential land. Regulatory treatments applied to the impact area affect a large number of property owners. Yet, because the land has no resource value now, regulations would have a minor effect on improving habitat values until it redevelops. Metro staff identified two types of impact areas: riparian impact areas (land with no regionally significant habitat value within 150 feet of a stream) and other impact areas (a 25-foot buffer around all other habitat areas). Land uses within the riparian impact area have a direct effect on the stream due to their proximity. This affects the ecological integrity of the riparian habitat and water quality. Land uses within the other 25-foot impact area have more of an indirect effect on the surrounding habitat, especially when conflicting uses are allowed within the habitat lands. Staff recommends that the effects of conflicting uses in impact areas be addressed in broader watershed planning efforts that apply low impact design standards and other stormwater management tools to the broader area. Staff also recommends that the areas within 150 feet of a stream be considered when developing a restoration strategy. As an alternative, Council may want to consider regulations in the riparian-related impact areas only, where the negative environmental effects of development affect stream health most directly.

C. High value habitat land. Option 2B applies a lightly limit treatment to the highest value habitat (Class I Riparian and Class A Wildlife) in high urban development value areas, while applying a moderate or strict level of protection in the other areas. Staff recommends increasing the level of protection for the Class I Riparian habitat in high urban development value lands to moderately limit and in medium urban development value lands to strictly limit. Staff also identifies the need for additional Council consideration of whether to increase protection in the Class A habitat, particularly for steep slopes and other sensitive areas in the program phase. The level of protection for these habitat types is important for several reasons. These habitat types encompass Habitats of Concern, which have been identified as the most scarce and declining habitats in the region. Class I Riparian habitat is critically important to maintain the ecological health of the stream system and connectivity of the riparian corridor. While many environmental issues are important to supporting requirements of the Endangered Species Act and the federal Clean Water Act, efforts to protect and improve the functions provided along the streams are some of the most important. Class I Riparian habitat is also associated with some of the strongest cultural and amenity values from the social perspective. Existing Title 3 Water Quality and Floodplain Protection standards cover about 72 percent of Class I Riparian habitat, which establishes an existing level of protection and limits on development.

Class A Wildlife habitat provides the most valuable environment for many species of concern and also provides important connections to and between riparian corridors. High value upland habitat areas are located in medium, low and other urban development areas. Title 3 Water Quality and Foodplain protection standards cover a little over one percent of Class A wildlife, which leaves it most vulnerable to loss. On the other hand, while protection

of the high value Class I and Class A habitat is critical from the ecological standpoint, this land also encompasses a large percent of the region's vacant and buildable land. About 42 percent (19,922 acres) of this high value habitat is currently in park status, 14 percent (6,578 acres) is considered developed, and 44 percent (21,057 acres) is vacant. High levels of habitat protection could impact the region's ability to meet housing and employment needs within the existing urban growth boundary. In high urban development value areas, 87% of the Class I Riparian is vacant, 41% of the vacant Class I habitat is not constrained for development by Title 3, utility location, or other factors (other than local regulations). A similar proportion of Class A habitat is vacant (75%), but of that vacant habitat most (78%) is considered buildable. A smaller number of vacant acres, about 200, is high urban value in Class A habitat. Any decision on Class I and A will have a significant impact because these areas include the greatest percentage (60 percent) of the habitat inventory.

An important consideration in weighing the choices between lightly, moderately and strictly limit treatments is the extent to which loss of buildable land can be replaced elsewhere within the UGB or outside of the UGB on non-habitat land. Staff recommends that Council provide direction to fully explore tools such as transfer of development rights to mitigate the loss of building capacity as part of developing the protection program. In the program development phase, based on this analysis, Council may want to reconsider the recommendations for Class I and Class A habitat.

Class II Riparian, like Class I Riparian, is also important for riparian corridor health, but provides fewer primary functions than Class I. Council may want to consider increasing the level of protection in Class II riparian areas and to more closely match the level of protection in the Class I habitat areas.

D. Definition of urban development value and appropriate applications of different treatments. The modified Option 2B varies the level of protection by different urban development values. The 2040 design types in high, medium and low urban development values were defined by Council for the ESEE analysis. The staff recommendation recognizes the need to meet capacity needs in the Regional Centers, Central City and regionally significant industrial areas by reducing protection in areas of high urban development value compared to protection in low urban development value areas. Staff do not recommend changes to these definitions or to the range of protection, from lightly limit to strictly limit, from low to high development value. However these definitions and ranges of protection will require further consideration as the program develops. Another consideration may be redefining the boundaries of regional centers to avoid habitat areas.

E. Residential Land. In Option 2B, the residential land that makes up a significant portion of "low urban development value" receives stronger regulatory treatment (strictly or moderately limit) than the commercial and industrial land that comprises "high" and "medium" urban development value areas. Residential land makes up a significant portion of the habitat inventory (34 percent), especially within the UGB (48 percent) making development on vacant residential land and consideration of existing residential areas an important part of the fish and wildlife habitat protection program. While staff does not recommend a change in the treatment of "low" urban development value, staff recognizes this as a continuing issue for consideration in the development of the program.

2. DIRECTION ON DEVELOPING A REGULATORY PROGRAM

The third step of the Goal 5 process calls for the development of a program to protect habitat areas by allowing, limiting, or prohibiting conflicting uses on habitat land based on the results of the ESEE analysis. Based on comments from public open houses and technical committees, the Metro staff has identified several areas of concern when developing a regulatory program. Staff requests Metro Council to give staff direction in these areas.

A. Defining limit in the program phase

The most commonly asked question from the public and technical review committees relates to how limit is defined in the program. The definitions of limit that have been described generally in the ESEE analysis will be further defined in the program phase. The definition of limit describes how well habitat is protected while maintaining development opportunities. The definition of limit will be one of the most important tasks in the program phase. As a guiding principle, the intent is to first avoid, then limit, and finally mitigate adverse impacts of development to protect fish and wildlife habitat. Some of the key issues in the definition relate to impacts on housing and employment capacity, disturbance area, mitigation, and allowable public uses such as roads, trails and other infrastructure as illustrated below:

- Strictly Limit This treatment applies a high level of habitat protection. It would include strict avoidance of the habitat (especially Habitats of Concern) with maximum allowable disturbance areas and mitigation requirements. Based on technical review, Metro staff proposes to allow trails, roads and other public access to meet the public good (e.g., construction and maintenance of public utilities such as water storage facilities) subject to minimize and mitigate. Applying strong habitat protection would result in some overall loss of development capacity; however, there are some tools such as transfer of development rights (TDR) or cluster development that could compensate somewhat for lost development capacity.
- Moderately Limit This treatment balances habitat protection with development needs, and does not preserve as much habitat as strictly limit. It would avoid habitat, limit disturbance areas, require mitigation, and use design standards and other tools to protect habitat (especially Habitats of Concern) while striving to achieve goals for employment and housing densities. Metro staff would work to define moderately limit to minimize the loss of development capacity, which could include development of a TDR program and other tools to compensate for lost capacity.
- Lightly Limit This treatment would avoid habitat as possible to preserve habitat function (especially Habitats of Concern) while allowing development to occur. It would include less restrictive limits on disturbance area and encourage other low impact design considerations and mitigation requirements. Metro staff assumes that application of lightly limit treatments would result in no loss of development capacity.

B. Effect on existing development and redevelopment

Many of the comments received from the public were focused on how a regulatory program to protect habitat would affect existing development. Due to the fact that a substantial portion of the habitat inventory is on developed residential land (15,271 acres) there are

many property owners concerned with the results of the program phase. Since Metro's regulatory program would be triggered by land use activities it would not apply to actions that do not require a land use permit (such as gardening, lawn care, routine property maintenance, and actions necessary to prevent natural hazards). However, many citizens will not be aware that their activities would not be affected; therefore the program clarification would help people understand the potential effect on existing development. Redevelopment (subject to some threshold size or valuation) offers the potential to restore habitat functions in areas in which development patterns have not protected the habitat. Clarification in the program of the intended effects on redevelopment will be important.

C. Regulatory flexibility

Regulations to protect fish and wildlife habitat limit development options on land with habitat value. Some ways in which regulations could limit development include lowered density, minimum disturbance areas, and setbacks from significant resources. Development can occur in a manner that avoids or reduces the impact on the habitat, for example: cluster development, streamside buffers, and habitat-friendly development techniques can all provide some level of regulatory flexibility that allows development to occur while protecting habitat. A transfer of development rights (TDR) program could also compensate for loss of development capacity. Providing flexible regulations and tools to allow for development while protecting as much habitat as possible could allow Metro's goals of habitat protection and maintaining housing and job capacity within the UGB to be met. In addition, variations for local governments to implement the program at the district or other discretionary sites will be considered in the program phase, as described in section E below.

D. Mitigation, mitigation banking and restoration

Development within habitat areas degrades existing ecological function. To better achieve the goals described in Metro's Vision Statement, mitigation for these negative impacts could be required to reduce the effect of allowing conflicting uses on habitat lands. The regulatory program could include mitigation ratios and mitigation banking to facilitate efficient and effective use of mitigation to restore valuable habitat areas. Development on high value habitat land could require more mitigation than on low value habitat land, since the environmental effects would be greater. There will also be the question of where mitigation occurs - on-site, in the same stream reach, within the same watershed, in a neighboring watershed, or anywhere in the region. Mitigation banking could preserve the opportunity to require mitigation when there are no opportunities on-site by requiring funds to be paid into a bank, to be spent at a later date in an area identified through a subwatershed or watershed restoration plan. Monitoring and enforcement of mitigation requirements are an important component of maintaining ecological health. Long-term monitoring can measure the success of mitigation efforts to direct and adjust the magnitude of mitigation requirements. Enforcement of mitigation requirements is essential to ensure that the impacts of development on habitat are minimized. Mitigation can be targeted in accordance with an overall restoration plan.

E. Program specificity and flexibility

Local jurisdiction partners have indicated a need for a regulatory program that could serve both as a general framework for local jurisdictions to implement and as a specific program that could be implemented without further local analysis. Stakeholder groups have continued to express interest in the possibility of planning for the unique habitat and economic concerns within a smaller area, such as in the existing major medical and educational campuses as regional public facilities, other regional public facilities and in riparian or wildlife districts.

In addition, questions about the reasonable timeframe for local implementation of fish and wildlife habitat have also been raised. Title 3 currently exempts some local jurisdictions from complying with a regional habitat protection until their next scheduled periodic review. This could be a challenge for developing regionally consistent protection and standards in the region, especially since the State may not be reviewing local plans with as much frequency as they have in the past. Review of the implementation schedule during the development of the program will be an important consideration.

F. Map corrections and inventory maintenance

The resolution adopting the regionally significant habitat inventory included a process for accepting habitat inventory corrections and requires Metro to complete the map correction process when the final program is adopted and to develop a post-adoption correction process. Metro has been accepting corrections to the habitat inventory map since it was released in 2002. Metro staff will continue reviewing map corrections and will adjust the inventory maps as required until the adoption of the final program. Direction during the program phase for the on-going responsibilities between Metro and local governments regarding maintaining the inventory maps in the post-adoption phase of the program will be important and will have implications for Metro's budget.

G. Long-term monitoring

Monitoring is important to mitigation as described above, but it is also critical to the success of the overall fish and wildlife habitat protection program. Monitoring how well the regulatory and non-regulatory program elements protect fish and wildlife habitat while meeting housing and employment capacity will be important in determining the effectiveness of Metro's efforts and identifying potential adjustments to the program in the future. Monitoring could be included as part of Metro's Performance Measures efforts.

3. DIRECTION ON NON-REGULATORY PROGRAMS

While not a requirement of the Goal 5 rule, Metro has committed to include incentives and nonregulatory tools to protect and restore habitat to complement regulatory program elements. Nonregulatory tools are a key component of a strategy to protect fish and wildlife habitat. Incentives, education, and acquisition strategies are popular among landowners and can be used in situations where regulations do not apply. For example, regulations only come into effect when a land use action is taken. Non-regulatory strategies can apply to other activities such as landscaping, reducing pesticide/herbicide use, and voluntary restoration.

Restoration is a critical component of an effective fish and wildlife habitat protection program. Without active restoration efforts, ecological conditions will likely deteriorate further, even if most habitat lands are protected through regulations. Mitigation for the negative environmental impacts of development may be included as part of a regulatory program. However, actions to restore habitat to a condition better than exists today cannot be required as part of a regulatory program; restoration could be included as a major part of a non-regulatory approach. Regulations can protect land that can then be restored through non-regulatory approaches to provide better functioning habitat.

Metro staff examined the following potential non-regulatory tools:

- Stewardship and recognition programs
- Financial incentives (grants, incentives for green streets, property tax reduction)
- Education (information center, technical assistance, other education activities)
- Volunteer activities
- Agency-led restoration
- Acquisition (outright purchase, conservation easements, revolving acquisition fund)

Based on public comments and staff analysis of the effectiveness of non-regulatory programs, staff recommends that the program phase include further development of technical assistance, restoration grants, acquisition programs and property tax reduction incentives. Key issues for consideration in further development include the level of funding or commitment that would be needed, possible funding sources, an implementation schedule and an assessment of responsibilities between local and regional governments, the private sector and non-governmental organizations. Staff request Metro Council to give direction in how these issues are further developed as non-regulatory approaches to habitat protection.

A. *Technical assistance.* Whether directed at individual owners, developers, or local jurisdiction staff, technical assistance could assist in the implementation of habitat-friendly development techniques, better stewardship of habitat, and restoration on public and private land. Technical assistance would be particularly useful in conjunction with the application of limit treatments to allow for development within habitat areas that protects the most habitat while also meeting capacity needs. Habitat-friendly, low-impact development and green building techniques are innovative methods of minimizing the impacts of the built environment on surrounding habitat. Assistance in these areas for developers, citizens, and local jurisdictions could help to ensure the success of a regulatory program.

Technical assistance programs are noted for being responsive to landowner needs, providing practical information, and having knowledgeable resource staff. Such a program would not provide direct protection to habitat, but would offer a means of improving stewardship and enhancement by private landowners. Technical assistance could help supplement costsharing programs, such as grants, to further protection and restoration efforts. Technical assistance could be focused on landowners, development practices, and/or local partners. Metro has provided technical assistance to local partners throughout the implementation of the Regional Framework Plan and the Regional Urban Growth Management Functional Plan. This has proved especially important in the implementation of Title 3 (stream and floodplain protection) and planning for centers.

Metro could work with local partners to develop technical assistance, incentives, recognition programs, and awards for development that helps protect fish and wildlife habitat. Metro, in conjunction with local partners, could develop regional low impact development standards to

reduce development impacts on fish and wildlife habitat. The Green Streets Handbook serves as a successful model of technical assistance aimed at minimizing environmental impacts of transportation infrastructure. The cost of providing technical assistance could vary depending on the use of existing staff or the need to use new staff and other resources.

As part of a regional, habitat-friendly development program, Metro could develop a *Habitatoriented Development Program* similar to Metro's Transit-oriented Development (TOD) Program to encourage construction of new developments or redevelopment that protects and restores fish and wildlife habitat. As part of the technical assistance program, this would require funds to provide the incentives for developers to practice habitat friendly development.

B. *Grants for restoration and protection.* Achieving restoration on private and public lands typically requires some type of financial incentive to induce property owners to conduct activities such as planting of native vegetation, removal of invasive species, and other habitat improvements. Grants could be aimed at individual property owners, at public agencies that create model examples of habitat restoration, habitat-friendly development, or green streets, wildlife crossings, and culvert replacements. Grants could also be targeted to agency-led efforts to restore habitat on public land, possibly utilizing volunteers. Defining restoration priorities is important to effectively allocate restoration efforts and investments.

Grants for restoration can provide the incentive for supportive landowners and other organizations to restore habitat on private and public lands. A small grant program, targeted to watershed councils, friends organizations, or local governments could be created similar to Metro's recent grants for Regional and Town Center planning efforts. Applicants could submit projects one or two times per year, and they could be reviewed and ranked based on set criteria. Small grants given in strategic places could build on existing work and encourage more efforts in targeted areas.

Funding can leverage additional benefits such as education and volunteerism. Private landowners may be interested in the concept of improving the habitat value on a portion of their land, and the availability of dollars can provide the impetus to conduct restoration activities. Many grants are provided with a required match of either dollars or in-kind materials or labor. These incentives provide landowners who contribute a portion of the proposed cost for conservation or restoration activities with additional funding opportunities. There are several programs in place for rural land in agriculture or forestry use, and some for urban lands. A grant program could target specific activities along stream reaches or within watersheds in coordination with Watershed Action Plans to accomplish the most effective restoration. A monitoring component of a restoration plan would be essential to assess effectiveness over time at restoring habitat function.

C. *Willing-seller Acquisition.* The most certain way to protect habitat is to publicly acquire it for open space preservation. There are various ways to acquire land (outright purchase, easements, development rights, transfers, etc.) and all acquisition programs involve the expenditure of a significant amount of money. Acquisition is the most effective non-regulatory tool to achieve definitive habitat protection. Acquisition can achieve permanent

protection and also preserves land to be restored at a later date. However, the high cost of purchasing land, especially within the urban growth boundary, and the dependence of an acquisition program on willing sellers limits the effectiveness of such a program.

If additional funding to purchase habitat land was secured, an acquisition program could focus on regionally significant fish and wildlife habitat, targeted to achieve specific goals. The goals could include protection of Habitats of Concern, floodplains, regional connector habitat, strategically located high-value habitat, and key restoration opportunities. Acquisition may also target land when the regulatory approach could not protect it to the level desired. Riparian Class I habitat contains over 11,000 acres of undeveloped habitat land. Based on the cost of land purchased through the Metro Greenspaces Acquisition program, land costs inside the UGB average about \$45,000/acre and outside the UGB average about \$8,600/acre. Due to the expense, acquisition clearly is not a tool that could be used alone to protect even this most ecologically valuable habitat.

One way to maximize limited acquisition dollars is to create a revolving acquisition fund. A program could be developed to purchase habitat land, place development restrictions or conservation easements to protect the habitat areas, or subdivide the property to separate the resource land from the developable land and then sell or exchange (via land swaps) the remainder of the land for development or continued use. Funds from the sale could then be used to protect additional land. Such a program could maximize the use of conservation dollars by protecting only the habitat areas on a parcel of land, rather than the entire parcel.

Some jurisdictions currently use surface water management fees or system development charges (SDCs) to purchase land that provides habitat functions for the public good (such as floodplains); these programs could be expanded. However, there may be concerns about raising SDCs or other fees in the current economic environment

D. *Property tax reductions.* There are two state programs that could be applicable within the urban area; the *Riparian Habitat Tax Incentive Program (OAR 308A.350 to 308A.383)* and the *Wildlife Habitat Conservation and Management Program (2003 Oregon Laws Ch. 539)*. Both of these programs would require county or city action to be implemented.

Property tax reduction is a useful tool to provide motivated landowners with an incentive to manage their land for habitat values, and can also serve as a mechanism to achieve some restoration if a habitat management plan includes requirements for enhancement of existing habitat. However, property tax reductions would reduce jurisdictional revenues. Alternatively, these properties could be included by agencies such as Metro, Portland's Bureau of Environmental Services, Water Environmental Services in Clackamas County or Clean Water Services in Washington County that conduct restoration activities. Habitat protection and restoration may be most effective ecologically if this tool is applied strategically, for example in a specific stream reach or headwater area. This tool could serve as an important incentive to encourage landowners to work in a coordinated fashion to leverage ecological improvements in a specific area. A downside to using property tax relief as a tool for habitat protection is that a landowner can leave the program at any time, the only

penalty being payment of back taxes, similar to opting out of a farm or forest tax deferral program.

ANALYSIS/INFORMATION

- 1. Known Opposition. Metro has received public comments from individuals and interest groups representing a broad spectrum of viewpoints as to whether and how Metro should protect fish and wildlife habitat. (See, for example, the "public comment" section of this staff report for a general summary of such comments received at the March 2004 public open houses.) Metro staff expect comments both in favor of, and opposed to, this draft resolution and Metro's approach to fish and wildlife habitat planning between the time this resolution is first introduced and the time a resolution is approved by the Metro Council
- 2. Legal Antecedents. Policies in Metro's Regional Framework Plan and Section 5 of Title 3 in Metro's Urban Growth Management Functional Plan support the development of a Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection Program. In addition, the two phases of Metro's ESEE analysis continues compliance with the State Land Use Planning Goal 5 administrative rule (OAR 660-023). Metro's adoption of the Draft Regionally Significant Fish and Wildlife Habitat Inventory and a Local Plan Analysis by Resolution No. 02-3218A formed the basis for the ESEE analysis and development of a habitat protection program that this resolution endorses.
- 3. Anticipated Effects. Approval of this resolution will allow Metro to complete the ESEE analysis as required by State Land Use Goal 5 and provides a preliminary decision on where to allow, limit or prohibit development on regionally significant fish and wildlife habitat lands. With the completion of the analysis as directed by this Resolution and a Metro Council decision on an Allow/Limit/Prohibit map, the third step of the Goal 5 process, development of a protection and restoration program for adoption into Metro's Functional Plan, can begin.
- 4. Budget Impacts. The adopted budget for FY04 includes resources for staff and consultants to initiate development of a program that includes regulatory and non-regulatory components. The proposed baseline FY05 budget has identified resources to support completion of the program depending upon the breadth and scope of the program direction in this resolution. On-going implementation of non-regulatory and regulatory elements will have long-term budget and staffing implications, depending on how the program is defined and decisions by the Metro Council should be made with the intent that budget resources will be sufficient to implement the direction.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Staff requests that Metro Council endorse the Phase II ESEE analysis as described in Exhibit A to the Resolution and direct staff to develop a program to protect fish and wildlife habitat that includes regulatory and non-regulatory components as described in Exhibits B, C and D.

ATTACHMENTS TO THE STAFF REPORT

Attachment 1. Public comment report

I:\gm\long_range_planning\projects\Goal 5\Council Resolutions\DRAFT staff report 032404.doc

.



MARCH 2004

Public Comment Report

Executive Summary

Metro Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection Program

Economic, Social, Environment and Energy Analysis Phase II



METRO PEOPLE PLACES OPEN SPACES

Metro

People places • open spaces

Clean air and clean water do not stop at city limits or county lines. Neither does the need for jobs, a thriving economy and good transportation choices for people and businesses in our region. Voters have asked Metro to help with the challenges that cross those lines and affect the 24 cities and three counties in the Portland metropolitan area.

A regional approach simply makes sense when it comes to protecting open space, caring for parks, planning for the best use of land, managing garbage disposal and increasing recycling. Metro oversees world-class facilities such as the Oregon Zoo, which contributes to conservation and education, and the Oregon Convention Center, which benefits the region's economy.

Your Metro representatives

Metro Council President – David Bragdon

Metro Councilors – Rod Park, District 1; Brian Newman, deputy council president, District 2; Carl Hosticka, District 3; Susan McLain, District 4; Rex Burkholder, District 5; Rod Monroe, District 6.

Auditor – Alexis Dow, CPA

Web site: www.metro-region.org



Council districts

Metro's Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection Program Economic, Social, Environment and Energy (ESEE) Phase II

Public Comment Report

March 2004

Table of Contents

<u>Page</u>

ntroduction	ii
xecutive Summary	iii
a stien 4. Dublis Commente Cummer (Teble	4
ection 1: Public Comments Summary Table	· I

-

Introduction

In October of 2003, following an active late summer and early fall outreach effort, the Metro Council endorsed a technical report on the general economic, social, environmental and energy (ESEE) consequences and tradeoffs of protecting-or-not-protecting habitat lands within the metropolitan area. This concluded the first phase of the ESEE analysis, Step 2 of Metro's three-step process to develop a fair and equitable fish and wildlife habitat protection program. At that time staff was directed to further analyze six regulatory program options as well as non-regulatory program options. This report summarizes outreach efforts undertaken and public comments received following the October 2003 hearings and activities through approximately March 19, 2004, the close of a comprehensive outreach effort that focused on the second phase of the ESEE analysis and the comparison of regulatory and non-regulatory program options.

Metro staff utilized several different methods for announcing events and engaging the public about on going and current activities relating to the fish and wildlife habitat protection program. Information and event announcements were sent to over 50 newsletters and list serves including Metro sources, neighborhood and watershed groups as well as non-profit organizations representing a variety of environmental, business and other interests. Articles were published in newspapers such as The Oregonian, The Daily Journal of Commerce, the Hillsboro Argus and The Portland Tribune. In addition, in February 2004 numerous advertisements detailing the open houses were placed throughout the region in regional, community and business publications. Several weeks before the first open house 90,000 notices were sent to interested parties and property owners with land in Metro's habitat inventory.

The Metro web page was updated with text and images to reflect past, current and future activities. Several documents are available on line and two interactive web tools have been developed to provide individuals access to property- or area-specific information regarding: (1) the habitat inventory; and (2) 'allow, limit and prohibit' decisions applied under six potential regulatory program options. The searchable habitat maps received more than 800 visitors in its first few weeks of operation, making it one of the top 15 most frequently visited sites for the entire Metro website. Feedback emphasizes the value of this tool for individual property owners, as did the fact that many open house attendees arrived with their printed property maps in-hand.

Comments were gathered with standard forms and open comments have been collected via regular mail, e-mail, phone calls, walk-in visits, one-on-one conversations and "idea tables" at the open houses. Seven open houses were held throughout the region. These public forums were announced through several venues including media releases, advertisements and various newsletters (see the Appendix for examples of outreach materials). Metro staff and councilors also participated in a forum sponsored by the Commercial Real Estate Economic Coalition (CREEC) in March and met with neighborhood and other stakeholders groups, on request. More specific information on the open houses, methods employed for communicating with the public and public feedback are detailed below.

During March 2004 seven open houses, geographically distributed through the region, were held to inform the public and gather feedback about progress on developing a regional fish and wildlife habitat program. More than 700 people attended these events. Two events were coordinated with the Tualatin Basin Partners' parallel fish and wildlife protection efforts. In addition, staff from local jurisdictions participated in each of the events, providing detailed information about how local plans relate to the wider regionally consistent approach Metro is seeking. Metro staff and councilors were available at the open houses to listen to individuals' views and concerns and to answer questions on the habitat program. Maps of regionally significant habitat, urban development values, and the six regulatory program options were available at these events. Information was also posted about the habitat program background and timeline, regulatory and non-regulatory options under consideration and detailed case studies of regulatory program options. In addition, to further facilitate understanding of very complicated scientific and technical findings, a user-friendly summary of each of the steps guiding the development of Metro's fish and wildlife protection program was distributed.

Public comments were documented by three means at the open houses: (1) openended comment cards, (2) "idea tables" at the events, where attendees could write specific comments on post-it notes about how to protect (or not) fish and wildlife habitat in the region; and (3) a keypad "polling" questionnaire that could be completed electronically or on hard copy form (at the events or elsewhere, at the public's convenience). It is important to note that this keypad questionnaire was an unscientific, self-selected survey tool that was incorporated as a means to help people begin to prioritize the many conflicting uses we have for the same land.

Metro has received nearly 700 written comments or other forms of substantive feedback on the fish and wildlife habitat protection program since fall 2003 (see table at right). Approximately 280 people participated in the non-scientific keypad questionnaire either at events, on-line, or via mail. Over 100 written comments were submitted by e-mail or mail and more than 80 comment cards were completed. In addition, Metro staff spoke to more than 50 people on the phone, many of whom requested maps of their property or general information. The majority of callers inquired

Type of contact	Apprx. # received
Phone calls	50
Emails & letters	115
Comment forms	86
Keypad polling	280
Post-it notes at events	60
FAUNA postcards	110
Total	691

about how and why their property (or another particular area) is classified in the inventory or how their property may be impacted by Metro's fish and wildlife habitat protection program. Likewise, many of the conversations at the open houses and with walk-ins were inventory-based inquiries.

Metro's Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection Program Economic, Social, Environment and Energy (ESEE) Phase II Public Comment Report

Executive Summary

Generally, people were supportive of habitat protection. Very few people expressed opposition to protecting habitat in the metropolitan area. Rather, opposition expressed was towards imposed regulations, especially those that reduce the development potential or economic value of private property. Opponents often cited the "takings issue" addressed by the fifth amendment of the US Constitution and some questioned the legality of applying restrictions to private property. Some people who expressed concerns about the impacts of regulations on private property also expressed support for habitat protection, emphasizing the important role of educational and stewardship programs. In addition, several people noted the positive impact that natural resources such as wildlife habitat have on property values.

Most comments received did not express support or opposition to specific regulatory program options. However, the keypad questionnaire provided some information on peoples' preferences for the various program options under consideration. It should be noted, however, that the majority of the keypad responses were from residential property owners and did not, therefore, provide a comprehensive view of business owner/interests. When the first and second most preferred options are considered together, options 1b (33 percent) and 2a (20 percent) rank the highest. The least preferred options were the most and least protective options: options 1a (27 percent) and 2c (61 percent).

Comments with regard to non-regulatory options were far more specific than the comments received regarding the six possible regulatory program options under consideration. The results of the keypad exercise suggest that the most preferred nonregulatory program options are acquisition (32 percent), restoration (20 percent) and low impact development program (17 percent). The least preferred options are an information center (45 percent), a stewardship/recognition program (23 percent) and acquisition (10 percent). Open-ended comments indicated less of a preference for an acquisition program. Those that did recommend acquisition did so in the context of the "takings" issue and legal requirements for just compensation. Though people expressed minimal support for education options in the keypad exercise, several written comments highlight the importance of education in encouraging landowner stewardship, especially with respect to landscaping and the use of chemicals. Beyond information materials on such topics as habitat-friendly landscaping, one-on-one technical assistance with such things as habitat restoration and low impact development were frequently mentioned, as were educational programs for schools. With regard to financial incentives, people expressed substantial support for tax relief (e.g., reductions, credits, etc.) in return for habitat protection or restoration. Concerning restoration, several people mentioned the need for financial and technical assistance.

Overall, there seems to be a desire for a balance between regulatory and nonregulatory program options. Though several people expressed strong opposition to strong standards and restrictions, many people also expressed support. Support is expressed for a variety of protection tools and recognition is generally given to the need for a mixed approach to protection.

Written comments suggested and the keypad exercise further supported that people particularly support protecting areas such as those with water resources, steep slopes, connector habitat areas and unique resources such as Forest Park and Johnson Creek. Moreover, attention is given to specific resource areas within peoples' neighborhoods or residential areas, especially in relation to maintaining the character or sense of place of local communities.

Many written comments expressed concern about recent development projects on steep slopes (especially in the Gresham and east Portland-Metro area and in the West Hills sub-region). These included the removal of trees on steep slopes and resulting erosion and landslide problems. Ironically, results from the keypad exercise indicated that some 45 percent viewed "upland areas" as least important to protect. This indicates that the meaning of "upland habitat" is not well understood.

Although a large number of keypad respondents indicated that "all habitats" were most deserving of protection, additional input suggests that in general people greatly support a tiered approach to protection in which the most valuable habitat (i.e., in the habitat inventory rankings) should be protected with the greatest efforts or strongest standards.

Several emails, phone calls and other comments dealt with two specific issues. First, people want to know how and why a specific area is (or is not) classified as regionally significant fish and wildlife habitat in the inventory. Some of these contacts have noted discrepancies between Metro's maps and the on-the-ground reality of a particular site, while others want to know why, for example, a drainage ditch, intermittent stream or built area is classified as valuable habitat. Some conversations resulting from these comments identified needed map corrections or led to the landowner submitting a map correction form. Though many comments addressed potential map correction issues, less than 15 map correction requests were submitted to Metro this winter/spring. The second major issue raised by the public is how the habitat designations, program options or habitat protection program, in general, affect their property. The searchable inventory and program options maps on Metro's web site helped address these issues to a significant degree.

Other significant issues raised include the following. First, people inquired about how habitat protection and industrial lands designations are reconciled, since many people received both property notices and were confused about how their land could be under consideration for both Metro programs. Second, the fairness of the habitat protection program was emphasized with regard to maintaining private property rights and economic uses of land, especially in terms of the balance between restrictions on residential property owners vs. developers and the distribution of costs for protection. Lastly, several people expressed a desire for flexibility in Metro's habitat program and *not* a "one-size-fits-all" program.

Metro's Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection Program Economic, Social, Environment and Energy (ESEE) Phase II Public Comment Report The Friends and Advocates of Urban Natural Areas (FAUNA) distributed pre-addressed postcards to be sent to Metro Council and the Tualatin Basin partners in support of the fish and wildlife habitat protection program. Prior to the October 2003 hearings, 1,320 postcards were sent to Metro Council and another 168 to the Tualatin Partners. As of March 31, 2004, an additional 111 FAUNA postcards were sent to Metro in support of a regional fish and wildlife habitat protection program. The following are major themes expressed in the postcards: a desire and need for additional regulations to protect watershed and habitat resources; the need to pursue responsible development and stop reckless development; the importance of habitat areas for environmental health and neighborhood livability; the positive influence protected natural areas have on property rights; the long timeframe involved in recovering resource health relative to the short timeframe of degrading resources and, the desire and need to protect habitat resources to maintain the character of our region and for the benefit of future generations.

v

Metro's Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection Program Economic, Social, Environment and Energy (ESEE) Phase II Public Comment Report Section 1: Public Comments Summary Table

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
2	comment card	03/01/04		Tim Shiel	TB-Hillsboro	Goff Place	Supports more cooperative approach to gain more than ha and fast regulations. New lands will unfairly carry a higher resource protection load. Suggests that a shift of protectio could occur on highly valued properties allowing for conflicting use, but requiring purchasing other developmen rights on sensitive property. [Note: resembles mitigation program.]	Not directly expressed.
3	comment card	03/01/04		Dana Wintraub	TB-Hillsboro	SW Spratt Way	Expressed thanks at public comment opportunity. Importar to preserve as much of the natural environment as possible to have least impact on habitat. Urban encroachment shou be taken into consideration on future UGB expansion.	t For habitat protection; supportive of program.
4	comment card	03/01/04		Mary Gibson	TB-Hillsboro	Dogwood Dr.	Resident of Rivergrove, on the Tualatin River, but outside TB plan. Yet the notice received talked mainly about TB plan, not Metro's plan	
5	comment card	03/01/04		Susan Warner	TB-Hillsboro		Family highly values nature. Votes for strong habitat protections.	For strong habitat protection.
6	comment card	03/01/04		Dresen Skees- Gregory	TB-Hillsboro		Option 2A should be lowest level of protection. In looking a options 2A & 2B, it goes from a broad distribution of greens (prohibit & limit treatments) and yellows (allow treatments) almost entirely yellow (under option 2B). Option 2A allows more residents to enjoy open and green spaces.	For habitat protection; supportive of program.
7	comment card	03/01/04		David Hoffman	TB-Hillsboro	NW Rolling Hill Ln	Supports strong protections of streams and habitats. Appreciates open houses, outreach efforts. Balance is important. Economic, individual rights, natural environment need to be considered. Stressed good science and study.	For habitat protection; t supportive of program.
8	comment card	03/01/04		Ann Hoffman	TB-Hillsboro	NW Rolling Hill Ln	Metro has very important goal. Done excellent job in presenting plan to public. Bronson Creek needs work to bring it up to good environmental standards.	For habitat protection
9	comment card	03/01/04		Bill Funk	TB-Hillsboro	SW Gassner Rd	Interested in map correction process and programs designed under ALP conditions to develop. Important to protect these resources.	For habitat protection; supportive of program.

.

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
10	comment card	03/01/04		Kim Vendehey	TB-Hillsboro	SW Sileu	Property not too affected, but neighbors is. Hopes that we can preserve wildlife but not be too rigid in the property rights of those who own/pay taxes on property.	For habitat protection; supportive of program.
11	comment card	03/01/04		Paul Bell	TB-Hillsboro	SE Blossom Ave.	Suggests working with ODOT to build concrete barrier wall alongside I-205 from Strawberry land north for a mile or so. Wall would protect critical wetlands area that forms Kellogo Creek's headwaters from noise pollution. Offers to show people around.	For habitat protection (not directly expressed)
12	comment card	03/01/04		Charles Hoff	TB-Hillsboro	SW 91st	Government continues to take private property under guise of not taking 100% of it, just enough so one can't use it. Asks why one wants wild animals in an "urban" area. Accusation of just trying to take property without paying for it.	Emphasizes property rights. Habitat protection not mentioned.
13	comment card	03/01/04		Sharon L Cornesh	TB-Hillsboro	Hillsboro	Claims that all land in Goal 5 is private property. If program requires or denies land-use, jurisdictions should buy or lease land from private owner. Civil revolt will occur withou compensation.	Emphasizes property rights. It Habitat protection not mentioned.
14	comment card	03/04/04		John & Jean Dickson	TB-Tualatin	SW Norwood Rd	Didn't get notice and wants to know why. [Note: Property o SW Norwood Rd contains no regionally significant habitat.]	
15	comment card	03/04/04		Mike Van	TB-Tualatin	SW Boeckman Rd	Prefers option 2C	Not directly expressed.
16	comment card	03/04/04	Carl Hosticka		TB-Tualatin		Look into including the Living Enrichment Center in Wilsonville as a regionally significant institutional area.	
17	comment card	03/04/04		John Rabnin	TB-Tualatin	SW Montgomery Dr	Supports least restrictive plan, 2C.	Not directly expressed.
18	comment card	03/04/04		Ron Atkins	TB-Tualatin	SW Meier Dr	Believes option 1A is the least we can do to preserve the quality of our city and neighborhoods and provide minimal habitat for wildlife.	For habitat protection

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
19	comment card	03/04/04		Michael G. Holmes	TB-Tualatin	Cardinal Dr	Eliminate or reduce regulatory burdens on private property owners. Promote business activity, growth and opportunities.	Not directly expressed.
20	comment card	03/15/04		Judy Morton	OR City	Geer St, West Linn	Expresses thanks for the outreach and the regional nature of the plan. Protecting wildlife & fish habitat is very important. Clean water & air help everything be more economically productive. Living with environment is more important than controlling it. Population control must be addressed or other programs won't matter.	For habitat protection; supportive of program.
21	comment card	03/15/04		Vinson Turner	OR City	S Beutel Rd, OR City	Commenters property and adjacent property listed as high priority for wildlife. [Note: property contains Class A & B habitat in inventory] Both properties have been logged in la 2 years. Not a lot of wildlife since. Visit property rather thar rely on out-dated photography before decisions are enacte	d.
22	comment card	03/16/04		Doug Bolen	Clackamas		Expressed questions about how program would affect properties under tax deferral through the state small timber lot program.	
23	comment card	03/16/04		Richard B. Shook	Clackamas		Attached letter. Stream side home owner in unincorporated Clackamas county. Property includes class 1 &2 riparian and impact areas in inventory. Need strong protection for highest value habitats. Any allowed development must be mitigated with no net loss of riparian functioning area. Program options should be applied consistently, not just in urban expansion areas or based on development status. Urge programs to comply w/ Clean Water & Endangered Species Acts. Supports strong protection for high value upland wildlife habitats. Supports inventory methodology for riparian/upland resources.	For strong habitat protection.
24	comment card	03/16/04		Roxy Hilton Averill	Clackamas	Jennings Lodge, OR	Asked why do some projects (Trolley Trail) take precedence over habitat protection/restoration? Expressed concerns the despite protections, habitat is still developed cavalierly.	For habitat protection.

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
25	comment card	03/16/04		Larry Jacobs	Clackamas	Boring	Critical of lack of info at open house. Specifically, difficult to provide input with no definition of costs to existing property owner, to future ability to sell, impact of rules on modification of land use.	
26	comment card	03/16/04		Greg De Grazia	Clackamas	Clackamas	Stresses balance in developing the program with more emphasis on regulatory tools. Well defined guidelines that spell out alternatives & restrictions are better than non-reg education only. Economic development should be emphasized more, but habitat protection is critical.	For habitat protection.
27	comment card	03/16/04		Dee Wescott	Clackamas	Boring	Expressed support for option 2B	For habitat protection.
28	comment card	03/16/04		Lynn Sharp	Clackamas	Milwaukie	In addition to strong regulatory-based program, suggests developing a stronger native plant program for homeowner businesses and agencies. Stresses that quick native growing rate means substantial benefits in short time.	For strong habitat protection.
29	comment card	03/16/04		Eileen Stapp	Clackamas	Oregon City	In relation to Damascus development: Imperative that qual of wildlife in all habitats be maintained. Do not allow rezoning of industrial land. Protect quality of wildlife habita by establishing/preserving green buffer zones. Limit tree removal for housing/commercial development.	For strong habitat protection.
30	comment card	03/16/04		Len Mills	Clackamas	Milwaukie	Some regulation is necessary, but sensitive to individual property owners. Lengthy permit/permission processes should be avoided and not tied to simple things. (ex: a new garage should not trigger riparian restoration) Industry must not enjoy relaxed rules, as they can undo the work of everyone else.	For habitat protection, but tbalance of property rights.
31	comment card	03/16/04		Bruce Fontaine	Clackamas	Milwaukie	Request to be added to mailing list	<u> </u>
32	comment card	03/16/04		Nancy Stoll	Clackamas	Milwaukie	Request to be added to mailing list	
33	comment card	03/17/04		Martha Johnston	North Portland	NW Multnomah St, Portland	Suggests that everyone should pay for fees incurred in mitigation. Avoid unfairly burdening residential land owners while exempting industry.	

Metro's Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection Program Economic, Social, Environment and Energy (ESEE) Phase II Public Comment Report

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
34	comment card	03/17/04		Richard Anderson	North Portland	NE Meadow Dr, Portland	Suggests avoiding large fees for residential construction or they will be too prohibitive.	
35	comment card	03/17/04		Carolyn Eckel	North Portland	Portland	Urges adoption of option 1A, 1B "at the very least." Stresses fish & wildlife habitat protection as extremely important.	For strong habitat protection.
36	comment card	03/17/04		Richard Anderson	North Portland	NE Meadow Dr, Portland	"It sounds like residential has no weight in the regulatory option decision."	
37	comment card	03/17/04		Troy Clark	North Portland	NE Klickitat, Portland	Supports Option 1A, 2A as "second choice."	
38	comment card	03/17/04		Brian Williams	North Portland	SE Umatilla, Portland	Questions regarding the limits on fences, decks, landscape and outside lighting; limits on building after fire/earthquake technical assistance for restoration improvements.	
39	comment card	03/17/04		S. Bartel	North Portland	SE 30th	Supports Option 1A	
40	comment card	03/17/04		Barb Grover	North Portland	NE 48th	Compliments presentation of overall program, but critical o option outcome language as sometimes misleading and no necessarily true.	t.
41	comment card	03/17/04		Norm Shaffaroz	North Portland	NW Skyline	Encourage all development to consider opportunities to utilize green building and permaculture design	
42	comment card	03/17/04		Sheilah Toomey	North Portland	NW Sauvie Island	Expresses concern over development in the Tualatin River watershed and loss of habitat.	
43	comment card	03/17/04		Bob Grable	North Portland	Borland Road	Property owner on Borland Road. Suggests no restrictions on land use without compensation of property owner.	
44	comment card	03/17/04		Jeff Kee	North Portland	NW Riverview Dr	Suggests: Systems development charges should be levied for new development. Immigration tax should be develope for new residents. Purchase conservation easements on adjacent land to buffer habitat. Provide tax & permitting breaks for wildlife friendly construction/development.	đ

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
45	comment card	03/17/04		John Nee	North Portland	NW Winston Dr	Expresses thanks for the event and "keeping such a good eye on the livability of our community." Stresses the need t keep the economic value of land in Portland to foster "a good quality of life and prosperity."	D
46	comment card	03/17/04		Jeff Kee	North Portland	NW Riverview Dr	Suggests: inventory noxious & invasive plants on all Metro lands. Develop action plan to control/remove them.	
47	comment card	03/17/04		Scott King	North Portland	NE 133rd Ave, Portland	Commends staff at presenting issues/options. Inventory maps need to be updated well before council decision. Lan use options (2 series) seem more viable/consistent with 2040 than habitat options. Diverse region may mean one option may not be appropriate over the entire region.	
48	comment card	03/18/04		J. Michael McCloskey	SW Portland	SW Sunset Blvd.	Believes Metro should acquire steep slopes owned by cemeteries to prevent development. Slopes should retain habitat, protect from erosion and provide walking trails. Specifically opposed to apartments at Lone Fix Cemetery	For protection on cemetary slopes
49	comment card	03/18/04 .		Bob Del Gizzy	SW Portland	SW 40th Ave.	Riparian zones need to have strong buffers and corridors for the movement of wildlife.	For strong protection along riparian corridors
50	comment card	03/18/04		Scott Rosenlund	SW Portland	NW Cornell	For Option 1A. Writes that Forest Park Neighborhood Assr plan is about protecting wildlife corridor. Both sides of Skyline Blvd important to wildlife corridor, serving two different microclimates, supplying habitat needs to multiple wildlife. Property between Skyline Blvd & WA county line needs max. protection.	For strong protection on both sides of Skyline bivd.
51	comment card	03/18/04		Karen Ashford	SW Portland	NE 28th	Streamside property owner wants full and maximum protection200 feetfor all wetlands & streams. 15' or 50' setback is not enough. Angry at road built into Marylhurst University. Claims MU allows ivy to climb into trees & cove the ground, killing many native plants. Wants no more development.	For maximum protection in wetlands and along streams.

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
52	comment card	03/18/04		Randy Harrimon	SW Portland	SW Ibach Rd	Wants curtailment of a lot of development that eliminates b trees. Cites West Linn development. Wants more natural areas saved from developers.	For habitat protection (not directly expressed)
53	comment card	03/18/04		Doug Pontifex	SW Portland	SW Highland Rd	Cites 5 years of attacks by first Portland, now Metro, on his property rights. Suggests that consistent property rights are 1 of 3 basic things modern economy requires (citing Economist magazine). Probably would leave Oregon, takin company that employs hundreds, if plan moves forward.	Emphasizes property rights. Habitat protection not mentioned.
54	comment card	03/18/04		Alan Locklear	SW Portland	SW 36th Ave	Metro should put very strong emphasis on maximum level or protection & restoration. Time has past for nonregulatory measures. Too much habitat already destroyed/degraded. Strong regulatory measures should be instituted soon.	For strong habitat protection.
55	comment card	03/18/04	, <u> </u>	Kenenth Bauman	SW Portland	SW Upland	Send issue to voters as an up or down votenew regulations or no new regulations.	
56	comment card	03/18/04		Jeny Ward	SW Portland	SW Fulton Park Blvd	Asks why issue is not put to vote. Complaints about the public questionnaire. There is not a "no" options where appropriate. Questionnaire is waited on environmental side	
57	comment card	03/18/04	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Brian Swaren	SW Portland	unknown (PO Box)	The city (of Portland) should be cooperative and not confrontational. Also submitted postit idea.	Not directly expressed.
58_	comment card	03/18/04		Unknown	SW Portland		Get rid of Metro. A real wasted of money, could be replace by local government and/or private sector.	I Not directly expressed.
59	comment card	03/19/04		Debra Fleck	Mailin	SE 105th, Portland	Suggests that enforcing the laws already in place would suffice. Is critical of Metro's program in relation to property rights and moneywasting concerns.	
60	comment card	03/19/04		Ruth Scott	Mailin	SE 89th	Requested to be added to the mailing list.	
61	comment card	03/19/04		D. Fray	Mailin	NE 120th, Portland	Expressed very strong sentiments against Metro concernin landuse restrictions and believes that public input is never listened to.	Against landuse regulations.
62	comment card	03/19/04		F. Fleck	Mailin	SE Main	Expressed concerns about landuse restrictions, suggesting already existing laws are suitable for habitat protection.	Against landuse regulations.

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
63	comment card	03/19/04		Frank Fleck	Mailin	SE 105th, Portland	Accuses the theft of property rights. Asserts standing as good and responsible citizens who do not need communist to tell them how to live.	S
64	comment card	03/19/04	i	D. Fleck	Mailin	SE 105th, Portland	Expressed concerns about landuse restrictions, asserting that already existing laws are suitable for habitat protection they just need enforcement.	i,
65	comment card	03/19/04		Warren Howell	Mailin	SE Lusted	Expressed feelings of discrimination as small/large landowners because of Goal 5. Points to lack of regulations on subdivision residents against use of pesticides, runoff issues.	\$
66	comment card	03/19/04		Dana Bailey	Mailin	Oregon City	Accuses the theft of property rights and Metro's participatio in creating a socialist state.	
67	comment card	03/19/04		John Fleck	Mailin	SE 105th, Portland	Against restrictions on property rights. If rights are to be taken, they should be paid for.	
68	comment card	03/19/04		F. Fleck	Mailin	SE 105th, Portland	Accuses "the few do gooders" of keeping property owners from enjoying their propertyreferred to as a socialist approach.	
69	comment card	03/19/04		Dana Fleck	Mailin	SE 105th, Portland	Stresses the enforcement of pollution lawsjail and fine violators. Expresses concern over restriction of property owner rights.	
70	comment card	03/19/04		Dwight Cash	Mailin	SW Sunrise Lane	Suggested developable habitat land should be purchased. Undevelopable habitat land should be exempt from proper tax.	y
71	comment card	03/19/04		Edo Barbara McDaniel	Mailin	SÉ Webster, Gladstone	Expressed concern that the open house in Clackamas felt too hurried and required more time before giving an option that perhaps the program has already been decided withou public input.	i.
72	comment card	03/19/04		Boring water district #24	Mailin	Boring	Expressed serious concern regarding pollution of North for of Deep Creek, due to Clackamas treatment plant and other upstream issues.	k 21
73	comment card	03/19/04		Nancy Wallwork	Mailin	S. Noblewood Ave, Oregon City	Supports option 1A and passive use (trails, boardwalks, et development.	c

Y

;

comment summary edited

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
74	comment card	03/19/04		Sara Vickerman	Mailin	Hidden Spring Ct, West Linn	Suggests a flood plain development prohibition, a revisit of the balanced cut & fill, more strategic nonregulatory methods, and a flexible incentive fund using mitigation money to fund effective programs.	
75	comment card	03/19/04		RAA LLC	Mailin	NW Metolius Drive, Portland	Refers to specific property listed as no value by the city of Forest Grove/developers. Suggest compensation. Refers to possible incorrect mapping.	2
76	comment card	03/19/04		Elaine Davis	Mailin	NW Evergreen Rd, Hillsboro	Concerned that mandatory implementation of streamside protection would be a hardship for most affected property owners. Suggests incentives. Acknowledges habitat program as important project for future generations, but stresses that existing property owners shouldn't absorb the costs. Believes (new) development should be prohibited within a certain distance from streams, but does not require incentives offered to existing property owners.	For habitat protection; concerned with hardship caused to property owners.
77	comment card	03/19/04		Nancy Cable	Mailin	SW LaSalle Rd, Gaston	Expresses support specifically for the "vision, goal, principles and context" of Goal 5 Streamside CPR and Tualatin Basin Partner's stated goal. Supports Option 1A.	For habitat protection.
78	comment card	03/19/04		Carolyn M. Perrin	Mailin	NW Old Germantown Rd, Portland	Comments about March 1 open house as informative. States it is necessary to educate the public about fish and wildlife protection, and also important to protect property rights and provide adequate compensation to assist in compliance.	For habitat protection; for property rights.
79	comment card	03/19/04			Mailin		Suggests an investigation of a specific property south of Germantown Rd.	
80	comment card	03/19/04		Mike Bode	Mailin	SW Prindle Rd, Tualatin	Concerned that habitat protection will restrict land use and adversely affect property values. Prefers no restriction, but supports 1C if necessary. Expects lower taxation if land use options/value lowered.	Against new regulations without compensation

comment summary edited

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
81	comment card	03/19/04		Lois Read	Mailin	Tualatin Loop, West Linn	Agrees with TB's recommendation to protect habitat along the drainage pathways. Supports options 1A or 2A. Lives o Tualatin Loop replete with wildlife, where contaminants concentrate. Welcomes preservation.	For habitat protection; supportive of program.
82	comment card	03/19/04		Dennis Richey	Mailin	Jolie Pointe Rd, West Linn	Suggests that science can bring back endangered salmon through proper mitigation. Urges compromise option. Achieve environmental progress by considering the economic impact of proposals.	For habtiat protection, but urges compromise
83	comment card	03/19/04		Alan Grosso	Mailin	SE 158th, Portland	Public should bear cost of Goal 5 restrictions, not property owner. Continued regulatory restriction on private property robs landowners of their property rights. Should be volunta or municipality should pay.	Against new regulations withou compensation
84	comment card	03/19/04			Mailin		Half of property is designated in protection area. Landowners who are good wildlife stewards don't want property designated. Property is steep and unbuildable, bu wants to secure landowner rights without wildlife protection Lifelong investment and want to keep it as such.	Against new regulations.
85	comment card	03/19/04		Nancy Cable	Mailin		Quotes Lisa Naito, former Metro Councilor, in June 1998. "a regional water quality strategy that will help protect streams and wetlands from the impacts of development."	For habitat protection.
86	comment card	03/19/04		William Wessinger	Mailin		Resident of Balch Creek Watershed for over 50 years. Strongly supports extremely strong standards, especially o steep slopes.	For strong habitat protection.
87	comment card	03/30/04	Metro	Karen Suran		Clackamas	Migration rates are great, so protect greenways. Facilitate wildlife travel and avoid wildlife losses to due lack of connectivity.	For protection, especially corridors.
88	discussion at event	03/10/04	Lori Hennings, Metro		03/09/04 event	Tualatin Mts.	Gentleman at 03/09/04 event notes that he has seen relatively large elk herd in Tualatin Mts.	

Metro's Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection Program Economic, Social, Environment and Energy (ESEE) Phase II Public Comment Report Section 1

Page 10

•

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
89	email	02/06/04	habitat	Gale Gilliland			Education and incentives are essential tools to protect habitat. However, voluntary measures leave habitat at mer of developers. Benefits of protecting habitat outweigh costs of requiring/enforcing environmental regulations.	for habitat protection including regulatory and voluntary measures
90	email	02/10/04	habitat	Ron Weaver			Comments on ESEE analysis: reads like a justification for economic development. Difficult to read and understand. In economic section, dollars spent on hunting/fishing should be included. How do you plan to weigh the economic, socia and environmental values, especially when positive externalities not included. Have you projected value for 200 years into future? Habitat will continue and the value should be projected into future. No good successes with mitigation over time. On pg 2, what is "rule"?	
91	email	02/20/04	habitat	Leslie Anderson		Oak Lodge area, Milwaukie	Lives in Robins Wood in Oak Lodge area of Milwaukie, has worked to restore and maintain restoration in a wooded are uphill from a class I resource area. Some restoration thru local municipalities with grant. More needs to be done in the area. Dumping of debris/garbage in this area needs to be cleaned up. Has seen following wildlife in this area: Osprey peregrine falcon, pileated woodpecker. Need to make this protected area, clear English ivy. Currently, wooded area labeled medium value, but should be upgraded to high importance. [More comments on online form]	For protection (especially of wooded area near home in Oak Lodge area)
92	email	02/20/04	habitat	Norman Gray		Damascus	Emailed about difficulty in finding his address (SE Hwy. 21 in Boring) with web tool. Expresses dislike of being new incorporated into UGB. Lori responded with info on proper and mailed maps.	a y
93	email	02/20/04	habitat	Susan Blatt		NW Hermosa, Portland	Expresses concern over development on NW Skyline, nea Forest Park. Not opposed to all development in area, but think density of more than 1 house on 310 acres is appropriate. Opposed to loss of any wild lands in this area when Portland has so many other empty lots to offer.	For protection of areas around Forest Park.
	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
-----	--------------------	----------	--	----------------------------	-------	---	--	--
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
94	email	02/20/04	Paul G., Karen W., Metro	Teri, Friends of Trees			Request for information on Goal 5 and outreach events to publish in the Friends of Trees quarterly newsletter.	
95_	email	02/21/04	habitat	Anna Jeter		Johnson Creek watershed	How can you even talk about fish habitat without cleaning u Johnson Creek, specifically homes that are not on sewer system?	
96	email	02/21/04	Metro & Stacy Hopkins, Tualatin	Kathleen Lundeen		SW Kimball St., outside Lake Oswego	Property backs 1.2 acres recently annexed by Lake Osweg and approved for development (five houses). Parcel was clear cut. My parcel outside LO. Neighborhood strongly rejected being annexed by City, feared futher loss of natura spaces, and feel LO always decides in favor of developme and against the environment. Clackamas neglects development, surface water management and preserving riparian areas and habitat. Parcel to be developed is Class and borders Class 1. Part of my land is Class 1. Asks if Metro approves of development of the parcel (Parker Rd. & Baliene St.), and if Metro can intervene, or is it outside jurisdiction? Asks about suface water management suggestions and whether neighgborhood annexation into Lake Oswego would help or hinder Metro efforts to protet natural places. Asks for suggestions on how neighborhood could prevent unwanted changes and environmental damage.	Not specifically, but for natural resource protection.
97	email	02/22/04	habitat	A. Caviglia & S. Emmons		NW Thurman, Portland	Wants to know about final designation for their home on NW Thurman St. Originally it was listed as having an open stream, when in fact the stream is converted and designate a storm drain and there is no running water at all.	
98	email	02/22/04	Lori Hennings, Metro	Chuck Henley		SE Portland	Existing lots of record and developed lots w/ homes should be exempt from new regulations to protect habitat.	

	А	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
99	email	02/22/04	habitat	Rosemarie Evans		SE Portland	How can Street of Dreams for 2004 be built in class A habitat? Has land been reclassified or are maps outdated?	
100	email	02/23/04	habitat	Ellen Worcester		West Linn	Home in West Linn is identified as Class 1 habitat. Asks about proposals on table at this point, and how they can react to them.	
101	email	02/23/04	Karen Withrow, Metro	Michael Ragghianti			Request for general information. Received 4 notices for property (cemeteries) that he maintains. Don't think Gethsemane is in concerned area, but Mt. Calvary Cemeteries is. Wants to know why he received 4 noticesare other properties affected?	
102	email	02/23/04	Stacy Hopkins, Tualatin	Stephen Titus		SW Sedlak Ct, Tualatin	Feels assaulted by gov't sources continuously creating regulations to choke off economic development and never ending quest to increase tax revenue. How will additional property restrictions (under habitat program) continue to economic health, as stated in your materials?	Against (new) regulations/restricti ons on property.
103	email	02/24/04	habitat	Tom Williamson			How does Metro plan to validate habitat model? Have ontheground surveys been conducted? How will efficacy of program be monitored over time?	
104	email	02/25/04	habitat	Leslie Labbe		SW Portland	Follows habitat studies, but couldn't attend open house. Urges strongest protections. States people must be able to plan and count on [Metro's] decisions. Need program that considered varied landscapes and not one size fit all. Talke to Sylvan Nbhd. Assoc., which is fighting overlays. Told them to get involved in Metro's process. Please send even dates.	For protection, not onesizes fits all.

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
105	email	02/26/04	habitat	Chuck Bolsinger		Hemrick Rd., north of Damascus	Lives on Hemrick Rd, N of Damascus, for ~11.5 yrs. Unnamed branch of Rock Creek runs through property. At purchase, closing papers laid out what could/could not be done to property. After that, nearby residents did things papers said couldn't be done - straighten channel, fill in marginal wetlands, build within 10 ft. of creek. Talked to EPA, county who agreed that these were against law but they had no funds to enforce. When Abundant Life Church was built on Hemrick & 172nd, 11 acres of habitat was wiped out and lights increased brightness. I planted trees of open grassland in part to stabilize creek at the sharp bend and to provide habitat. Have seen several avain species. When Metro expanded UGB, we were mad as hell. Helped write Happy Valley's Urban Forestry Plan which was a waste. One concern is apparent lack of connectivity provided east-west across Rock Creek-Pleasant Valley. Also, waterways in this valley (including critical/feeder streams) don't appear to be a part of inventory, which wou be a huge oversight.	d
						-	Broud to own little helf ears percel in unincorporated	
106	email	02/26/04	habitat	Franni Farrell		unincorporate d Clackamas	Clackamas County that is designated Class 1, 2, and A. Expresses great care about issue and for wildlife. Request information on open houses, and asks about further protection opportunities around lot. Supports strictest possible measures to protect habitat.	s For habitat protection
107	email	02/26/04	habitat	Jean Morgan		NW Sewell Rd., outside Metro's boundary	1. Land is included in both the industrial lands study area as well as the habitat inventory. How will two programs be reconciled? 2. Reports neighbors cows in creek, muddy "unsanitary" banks near home by Shute & Jackson Rds. Slough (Wieble Creek). Herd of 7-10 deer have been decreasing, ducks, herons, catchable fish, crawdads, tadpoles, frogs, salamanders are decreasing, creek almos dead last summer.	For wildlife protection

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
108	email	02/26/04	habitat	Joe Turner		SE Jackson, Grehsam	Stream to the south is class I habitat, surrounded by class and C areas. Classifications are understandable but I don't understand why class C areas have significant indents on properties to the east and west of mine. I assume these are due to the location of homes, but the indents on the map don't coincide with the location of the houses. Houses may also be located in class I and II areas; does this matter? Appreciate and encourage natural resource planning effort	For natural resource protection
109	email	02/26/04	habitat	Roy Brower		SW Skiver, Aloha	Property is Class III riparian. What does this mean? Property to east is being developed, trees have been cut, street is about to be paved and a houses built. Any chance of reversing this?	For habitat protection (on nearby, recently developed lot)
110	email	02/27/04	habitat	Don Dubois			As member of Audobon & Nature Conservancy, deeply interested in protecting habitat but more interested in rights of property owners. Gov't should not reduce land values. Landowner should not be made to pay for advantage of mass. Re-zone, take land, protect birds, but pay for it.	for protection, against any resulting losses in property values. must compensate.
111	email	02/27/04	Lori Hennings, Metro	Randy Shaver			Expresses interest in converting farmed property into habitat, and asks if/how Metro can help. Old concrete dam constricts flow. Dirt bikes are damaging habitat, and worry about herbicides in water from nurseries. Hopes Metro will investigate areas in neighborhood that are not ecologically minded.	for habitat protection
112	email	02/28/04	habitat	Jaqueline Wilson			Supports anything to protect our water and air. Decrease use of pesticides/fertilizers, don't allow people to plant and build right up to water, discourage blacktop/cement, fine people who don't recycle.	

-

•

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
113	email	02/29/04	habitat	Andrew Aebi			Think it's great that creek behind house is designated as class I resource, but concerned that entire property is designated class B. Since homes on my street were developed in last 18 months, suggest that zones in area be carefully reevaluated.	
114	email	03/02/04	Paul Ketcham, Metro	Brian & Virgina Horler		West Linn	Expresses thanks for letters of support encouraging West Linn-Wilsonville School Board to establish fair market value for the Dollar Street Property and then to give residents of West Linn opportunity to pass bond measure on Nov. 2004 ballot to acquire property.	
115	email	03/02/04	Justin Houk, Metro	Russell Nance			Inquiry about if/how Longview Fibre property is affected by Tualatin Basin habitat protection area.	
116	email	03/04/04	Justin Houk, Metro	Carla Carver		Germantown Rd.	Thinks stewardship, education are best answers. Appreciates wildlife. Chose home for proximity to park. Tha said, very upset with this process when large condo project is going up less a mile away (Germantown Rd.) on property with intermittent stream. Hillside was clear cut and condo built right over stream. Frustrated that Metro won't allow me to build a gazebo when total habitat destruction is happenin only a few yards away.	t For protection, frustrated with Metro process.
117	email	03/04/04	habitat	Judith Vestch		Milwaukie	In response to Oregonian article published 02/27/04, I am i favor of any and all regulations deemed necessary to prote water and prevent pollution which I believe would increase property values.	for habitat protection
118	email	03/04/04	Lori Hennings, Metro	Michele			Request for mapping criteria used in Metro's model.	
119	email	03/05/04	Justin Houk, Metro	John Frewing			Request for information on habitat classes in order to identify any not on Metro's maps.	

	A	В	С	D	E ,	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
120	email	03/05/04	webmaster @metro	Randy Ellis		Oregon City	Light industrial or any other business has no place in our nice quiet neighborhood. We enjoy peace and quiet surroundings and wildlife. That's the way we like it around Forest Grove Loop.	For protecting natural setting (wildlife), against industrial development
121	email	03/07/04	Hosticka, Mayor Lehan	Phil Lane		Tualatin/ Wilsonville	Lives around Elligsen & SW 65th in Tualatin/Wilsonville area, drawn to area because of natural beauty, wildlife, agricultural land, etc. Consider environmental impacts to ai water & wildlife if you allow industrial development.	For protecting natural areas (wildlife), against industrial development.
122	email	03/08/04	Justin Houk, Metro				Request for 1996 flood map.	
123	email	03/08/04	2040, habitat, Bragdon, Newman	Karen Hall		Oregon City	Explains how recent developing of Holcomb & Winston (OF Cit)y has already endangered wildlife & habitat. Area is hill and forested, a residential country area w/ farms and wildlife, outside of UGB for a reason. Against industrial development here.	For protecting natural setting (wildlife), against industrial development.
124	email	03/08/04	habitat	Nick Corrado	Tualatin	SW Portland	Attended Tualatin open house but was unable to get info o how property is affected. How am I to know how this plan affects me? Oppose further use restrictions on my property Particularly object to Metro making table space available to sympathetic organizations. Process unfair and lopsided since rising from ashes of Healthy Portland Streams. Will continue to oppose project until sincere effort made to address property owners rights. Vague references to possible compensation plans and lack of concrete information at open house not good enough.	n Against any use restrictions on property.
125	email	03/09/04	Metro Council - Monroe & Burkholder	David Ray		SW Portland	Concerned about proposed regulatory map for property on SW Menefee Dr. Haven't received a response, so I'm writir you (Councilors). Why is protection area located on landscaped lot with building? Lines seem arbitrary. Do not object to stricter land use laws (option 2), but in this case, logic is flawed. What recourse do property owners have to redraw map lines?	Not against stricter land use laws, but mapping of my property seems flawed.

Metro's Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection Program Economic, Social, Environment and Energy (ESEE) Phase II Public Comment Report

Page 17

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
126	email	03/09/04	Brian Newman, Metro> Chris Deffebach	Gay Stryker			Emailed twice for more information and haven't received a response. Want more specific information on: meeting agenda for open houses; specific info on six program options; and,what info would aid public dialogue.	
127	email	03/09/04	Lori Hennings, Metro	Keith Black		SW Portland	First, inquired about six program options, which he didn't understand from website, and how decisions were/will be made about high, medium, low levels of protection. Also asked about status of limitations placed on development. Second, inquired about regulations that currently apply to specific address on SW 73rd in Portland.	
128	email	03/09/04	habitat	Mary Regan			Home is in class B habitat. How does that affect me?	
129	email	03/09/04	habitat	Zori & Richard Valasek		West Portland Park	Property owners are in process of negotiating a real estate contract for property on SW Stephenson St. and are talking with Portland's land use dept to discuss aggregation of tax lots to create buildable lots. Property is Class A habitat and maps show that development on entire block may be limite or prohibited. Did Metro notify current owners? how does this affect the development potential of the lot now or in future? Nearby neighbors would be very vocal in keeping this space open and undeveloped.	đ
130	email	03/10/04	Paul Ketcham	Ellen Eaton		East Columbia (NBA)	Request for maps showing how neighborhood is affected a well as other information.	
131	email	03/10/04	Paul Ketcham & Justin Houk, Metro	Janice Lorentz			Map correction request for mother's property on River St. in West Linn. Map indicates that stream flows over much larger section of property than it actually does. Concerned about accuracy. Appreciates effort to protect habitat, but wants to mature sure mother is not unfairly impacted.	For resource protection
132	email	03/10/04	habitat	Jim Karlock		Oregon City	Request for program options maps displayed at Oregon Ciopen house.	

	A	В	C	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
133	email	03/10/04	Paul & Brent, Wa. Co.	Paul Ketcham, Metro		Tualatin Basin	After discussions among property owner and Tualatin Partners, Paul Ketcham responded to Wa. Co. to let them know that Metro amended the regional streams layer to remove the unnamed tributary of Rock Creek, located north of NW Greenwood Dr. & Skycrest Pkwy, which affects the Jenkins property (tax lot 6900) & Kim property (tax lot 101) Section 21, T1N, R1W. Metro will add the wetland resource based on recently amended Clean Water Services data, which adds a wetland to a portion of the properties.	
134	email	03/11/04	Justin Houk, Metro	Mary Gibson			Inquiry about whether or not GIS maps on ftp site include inventory corrections yet. Houk: only those made prior to Aug. 01.	
135	email	03/11/04	habitat	Peggy Day			What do you mean by lightly, moderately and strictly limit and prohibit? Wants to know if any of these would limit building of fences or garden sheds and what extra fees ma be imposed.	Ŷ
136	email	03/11/04	habitat	Santo Graziano		8900 block on SW 157th Ave, Beaverton	Interactive maps suggests a high priority wetland on property. Would like to organize a wetland restoration projectremoval of blackberry and planting natives. Deer a longer run through this area, would be nice to see some trees preserved.	Interested in restoration on personal property.
137	email	03/12/04	habitat	Melissa Maxwell		SW Portland	Drainage stream thru backyard on SW Whitford Dr. flows from culvert, then to another property before going under street. Wants to plant in and around it, do I need permission? Area is classified as class II habitat.	
138	email	03/13/04	habitat	Michael Schuermyer		SE Portland	Property will be affected significantly by new rules accordin to web tool. Loss of use of most of backyard will have detrimental affect on property value. Whole concept needs rethinking and movement of boundary lines to owner's property lines instead of thru private property. Asks who wi take better care of property - landowner with vested interes or regulating uncaring bureaucracy? Additional regs are no needed, they'll just build distrust.	Against (new) regulations or restrictions on property.

	A	В	C	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
139	email	03/15/04	Justin Houk, Metro	Geoff Chew		Lake Oswego	Request for inventory and program options maps. Response: Maps on ftp site show continuous line of forest cover on eastern side of Diamond Head just up from water edge. Attached aerial photo shows forest cover is not continuous and is significantly degraded, with lots of ivy under story. Cannot argue logic of the habitat/inventory model. Area around our house shows that the model is not good fit for our neighborhood. e.g., area with house is classified as class II, and it has roofs, ivy, etc. Respectfully requests that habitat maps be revised. [Houk responded that floodplain is a large factor in the designations, not just tree canopy.]	
140	email	03/15/04	Cameron Vaughan- Tyler, Metro Council	Pat Russell, North Clackamas Citizens Assoc.		North Clackamas, Kellogg Creek & Oatfield Ridge	Neighborhood group circulated ~200 flyers, especially to people who live near Kellogg Creek, Oatfield Ridge to announce Goal 5 meeting. About 35-50 people attended. Residents expressed concern that multiple, responsible agencies aren't working together enough. Neighborhood is low density residential and not likely to increase in near future, so not as concerned about development policy. Neighbors have complained publicly that both Mt. Scott & Kellogg Creek corridors are very sick and in need of a lot of attention. People did not understand (too confusing) six options and ESEE analysis. Seems like option 1a would protect most habitat; this could affect yards and will require a strong pubic relations campaign and feeling among owners that it's in their best interest to protect streams. Appears to be distrust of "lofty" concepts and "promises" presented in hearings and workshops. Current state, feder efforts don't focus enough on local stream corridors. Interagency initiative, cooperation, coordination, long-term planning strategies for improvement/management were no	Interest in protecting habitat, concerns about lack of interagency coordination.
141	email	03/15/04	Justin Houk, Metro	Steve Edelman			Substantial discussions regarding map corrections to property. Old information is not accurate. Check new information provided by 2003 aerial photos.	

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
142	email	03/16/04	habitat	Frank Fleck			Metro's plans will almost totally restrict my property rights. Cannot express strongly enough the unfairness and outrigh theft of my property rights that plan represents. If you want property, buy it. Otherwise, back off and don't steal it. Metro/plan is un-American and against what country founded on.	Against any plan that restricts property rights (wthout just compensation)
143	email	03/16/04	habitat	Joan Holst	Gresham		Email forwarded from Jim Labbe. Criticizes Gresham open house for not focusing on why Metro is holding meetings and what input they want from public; and issues with respect to East County specifically.	
144	email	03/16/04	habitat	Josh Kling		SE Ivon, Portland	Strongly urges Council to adopt regulatory option thats protect most fish and wildlife habitatfor species and for public enjoyment. These areas have much value: aesthetic public pride, neighborhood caring, increase property value: reduces natural disasters (e.g., flooding in Johnson Creek) Compared to efforts at state level, it's time for Oregon's largest urban area to adopt habitat protection in own backyard. Best reason for protection is our regional identity	, For strong habitat protections
145	email	03/16/04	Metro staff	Nancy Chase, Metro			Several people have called to say they would like Metro to buy their (or their neighbor's) Goal 5 property. There seem to be confusion about the availability of money or a program to purchase sensitive lands.	s m
146	email	03/16/04	habitat	Tamara Palmer		SE Portland	Property is classified as Class B. How does this affect wha I can do with my property? Want to build garage/shop. Will there be restrictions?	

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
147	email	03/17/04	habitat	Gay Bauman	SW Portland	Sylvan- Highland area	Live in Sylvan-Highland area. Expects to hear (from expert how specific property was identified as high value habitat a 03/18/04 open house. Maps are incorrect. 5.3 acre parcel that is scheduled for development is not designated as habitat, while it has stream and sits next to wildlife refuge. Process lacks validity as long as naturally wooded land is allowed to be destroyed w/o any regulations. Do not suppo any plan that places severe restrictions on established homeowners who safeguard habitat while allowing developers to clear cut and decimate same property w/o restrictions.	For habitat protection, especially t restrictions for developers.
148	email	03/17/04	Paul Ketcham, Metro	Terry Wilson	Clackamas	Damascus	Following conversation at open house, information sent about Damascus planning process.	
149	email	03/18/04	habitat	Charles B. Ormsby		Birdshill CPO, north of Lake Oswego	Myself and collection of residents throughout Birdshill CPC are concerned about regulations because: 1. they will likely involve fees and taxes. 2. there is lack of consideration to how potential regulations likely affect home insurance rates 3. there are likely conflicts with Lake Oswego tree ordinances and costs associated with second growth tree maintenance in heavy forest canopy areas. And: 1. how does policy interface with Metro's infill policies and decreas in lot sizes from R-30 to R -20, 2. how does policy interface with fire hazard maps of Clackamas Co. and tree codes of LO along with home insurance costs? 3. what is written process to change inventory?	
150	email	03/18/04	Paul Ketcham, Metro	John Nee	NE Portland	NW Winston	Expresses pleasure and gratitude for conversations at the open house.	
151	email	03/19/04	habitat	Andy			Property is classified as Riparian Class 1. How would program, especially a prohibit designation, impact a homeowner?	

Metro's Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection Program Economic, Social, Environment and Energy (ESEE) Phase II Public Comment Report

	А	В	С	D	E	F	G	H
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
152	email	03/19/04	habitat	Jessica Glenn	Clackamas	Johnson Creek watershed	Lives near Johnson Creek and shares space with great blu herons, hawks, beavers and a coyote. Learned at the Sunnybrook Center open house that my land is designated as Class I riparian. As property owner, I am supportive of regulatory actions and urge most protective steps to help areas like Johnson Creek. Encourage collaboration and information sharing across jurisdictions, especially about water quality. Have been in difficult negotiations with 3 jurisdictions about getting on sewer system and no-one but me refers to the environmentally sensitive nature of the area	For habitat protection and regulations a.
153	email	03/19/04	habitat	John Rabkin		SW Montgomery	Owns 5 tax parcels on SW Montgomery Dr. that are zoned for SFR development but are not yet built. Reviewed Metro proposals and spoke with Lori Hennings, who was very helpful. Strongly opposes any limitations placed on developing buildable lots beyond Portland's current e-zone overlay. Supports least restrictive proposals: 2c or possible 1c.	Against (new) regulations or restrictions on property.
154	email	03/19/04	habitat	The Druid			Tax lot maps from counties state: "for assessment purpose only, do not rely on for other use." Concern expressed abo using the tax lot boundaries for inventory. Also contacted Clean Water Services about this and they said locating property using this method is not acceptable.	
155	email	03/20/04	habitat	Courtney Meissen Brooks		Hillsboro	Wants to see more information about use of pesticides and lawn chemicals near riparian areas, clean creeks in region. On other hand, wants to maintain options to use property. Owns 2/3 acre parcel with Reedville Creek, which he may sell and would like maximum value for. Parcel could be divided in a number of ways for development. Doesn't wan new regulations to prohibit new development.	Against (new) regulations or restrictions on property, for educational efforts, clean rivers.

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
156	email	03/20/04	habitat	Linda Robinson		Hazelwood neighborhood , Portland	Support greatest habitat protection but concerned that stringent program will result in huge backlash and legal challenges that will ultimately lessen protection. Concerned that lowest valued resources will not receive enough protection (e.g., Hazelwood has small wooded areas with habitat value, especially for providing link between Johnso. Creek and Columbia Slough). It's a big mistake to remove lower valued resources from protection efforts. Had problems trying to search interactive map for NE 148th & Glisan to see how Glendoveer Gold Course classification.	For habitat protection
157	email	03/22/04	habitat	Phil Hamilton		SW Laview Dr., Portland	Reviewed options and generally favor option 2a, and 2b fo industrial lands.	r
158	email	03/23/04	Paul Ketcham, Lori Hennings, Metro	Sablan's			Inquiry about how property may be affected by inventory a possible program, especially given interest in (potentially) dividing lot.	
159	email	03/23/04	habitat	Warren Aney		Tigard	Expressed difficultly in having to choose which habitat area is least important to protect. On question of compact development vs. trees - this isn't an either/or issue. As professional consultant, notes that survey is biased due to self selection in filling it out. Only can gauge range of opinions, not numbers and strength of opinions.	a
160	email	03/24/04	habitat	David Halseth		S. Wisteria, West Linn	Would like clarification on what exactly the program option mean, where Metro is in decision-making process. Concerned that not contacted about regulations on proper	s ty.
161	email	03/24/04	habitat	Diane Field		NW Portland	Distressed about timber companies trashing headwaters of local streams, especially in West Hills beyond Cornelius pass and around NW Miller & Cornell. How can this be allowed when we are struggling to protect wildlife? Please do everything you can to protect what is left for the future.	For habitat protection

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
162	email	03/24/04	habitat	Jim Harries		SW Portland	Concerned about habitat designations around property on SW 25th, Portland. Map shows a stream on property to the east, which is not correct. There is only a watercourse fed from a culvert that collects runoff from the street on property. Water does not run year-round. Please do not designate my property as critical habitat. If you do, buy the property and designate it as an urban reserve.	Against habitat designations on his property.
163	email	03/25/04	habitat	Heather McNeil		West Linn	Went to Pioneer Ctr. for 3/15 event and couldn't find anyone. On West Linn Parks and Recreation Board and they want more info on habitat planning process. Brought of Metro at a meeting and staff hadn't gotten informational mailers. Would like to help relay this info.	
164	email	03/25/04	habitat	Laurie Sonnefield		Oak Grove	Supports regulatory efforts to protect habitat quality. Lives few hundred feet from Willamette River in Oak Grove. Mar nearby property owners use pesticides and chemicals on lawns, despiteposted signs. Much more education is needed along with regulations. Local suburban stores only have chemicals/pesticides. Gardening workshops are grea but need to reach everyone else.	y For habitat protection t,
165	email	03/29/04	habitat/web master	Sue Dresden		Hillsboro	Questions about why land inventoried and applied potentia regulatory treatments under six program options. Expresse frustration with lack of response through habitat email. [Note: Metro staff cannot find original email in web system or elsewhere].	ed
166	email, phone	02/23/04	Justin Houk, Metro	Amy Patton		SW 76th, Tigard	Appreciates habitat inventory, but sees errors in map details. Map tool is not responding for: SW 76th Ave, Tigard. Requests hard copy of this area. A couple of years ago property was identified as having a tributary of Fanno Creek on it, but this is incorrect Inquired about proposed protection level in Tualatin Basin and what inventory/ALP classifications mean for property owners. Wants to know Metro interest in acquiring the property.	

·

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
167	event hearing	03/29/04		Henry Oberlelmon	TB hearing	NW Evergreen Rd, Hillsboro	Requested program option maps/mailing	
168	event, phone	03/16/04	Paul Ketcham	Lee Bembrose	Clackamas	SE Portland	Checking on map request made June 2002. Postcard sent on 3/18/04.	
169	letter	03/29/03	Metro Council	Bob Williams		SW Portland	Adopt 1a. Protect all remaining habitat since much has been lost. Strictest protection for riparian habitats, which are important to wildlife and flood management. Degraded habitats also should be protected and restored. Habitat los should be mitigated at a 1:2 ratio or more for higher value habitats. Upland areas also deserve protection, especially steep slopes and to maintain connectivity. Keep development away from prime wildlife areas. Portland has been leader in environemtnal issues, hope you protect remaining wildlife areas.	S For protection & restoration of all habitat areas.
170	letter	11/10/03	Carl Hosticka, Metro Council	Margret Jennings		SW Portland	Thanks for coming to my house to see how environmental protection regulations can have devastating impacts on my long-term financial security. I appreciate your willingness to discuss potential solutions. Ordinary property owners are if equipped to bear the financial burden of paying for protection. Any way impacts to property values can be protected will greatly reduce the cost of environmental protection and therefore enhance the chance for success.	- Concerned about (financial) impact to property.
171	letter	12/11/03	Metro Councilors	Sandra Joos		SW Portland	Expresses support for regulatory and non-regulatory protection of stream and wildlife corridors to and from Fore Park. Program must ensure new development doesn't degrade riparian corridors, floodplains and wetlands, seven upland and wildlife corridors, or deforest steep slopes adjacent to Forest Park. No more Forest Heights type developments!	Support for protection

	A	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
172	letter	01/01/04	Metro Councilors	David Mildrexler		Univ. of Montanta	Expresses value of Forest Park for educational, recreational and ecological reasons. Protect Forest Park and adjacent area 94 that is vital to maintaining corridors and sufficient habitat for wildlife. If area 94 is developed, a narrow buffer between the habitat in park and edge effects negative to wildlife. Forest Park and similar natural areas are part of ou cultural roots and foster a healthy, balanced citizenry with exceptional skills and knowledge.	I Supports protection, especially ~Forest r Park
173	letter	01/05/04	Metro Councilors	Julia C. Harris		SW Portland	Urges adoption of a strong, comprehensive fish and wildlife protection program. Need new development standards to protect headwaters, forested ravines and upland habitat. Expresses particular concern for areas by Forest Park. Require developers to retain forest canopy in Balch, Saltzman, and Rock Creek watersheds.	Supports protection, especially ~Forest Park
174	letter	01/08/04	Metro Councilors	Douglas Van Fleet		NE Portland	Concerned about condition of habitat areas in and around Forest Park, including area 94. Supports protecting forest canopy and corridors.	Supports protection, especially ~Forest Park
175	letter	01/09/04	Metro Councilors	Marilyn Clampett		NE Portland	Urges protection of areas around Forest Park from more residential development.	Supports protection, especially ~Forest Park
176	letter	01/15/04	Metro Councilors	Suzanne Thorton			Please protect Forest Park for future generations, fish and wildlife and biodiversity. Your responsibility is great. Homebuilders will try push you the other way. You have the voice of the people. Do the right thing.	Supports protection, especially ~Forest Park
177	letter	01/16/04	Metro Councilors	Anne Favorite and Family		SE Portland	Extremely disappoint with addition of area 94 around Fores Park in UGB. Implores Council to reverse this and protect this critical habitat as buffer around Forest Park or potentia inclusion in it.	t Supports protection, especially ~Forest Park

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
178	letter	01/26/04	Metro Councilors & Tualatin Basin Coordinatin g Committee	Ingrid Louiselle		Beaverton	Cautions against allowing repetition of abused of fragile urbaryforest boundary (area 94) that have resulted from unbridled residential development of other park boundary areas since 1984. Urges strongest protection possible and consideration of ALL ramifications of development. Suppor strict limits on density and steepness of terrain where building allowed, in addition to safeguards for maintain corridors and continuous forest canopy.	Supports protection, especially ~Forest Park
179	letter	01/31/04	Metro Councilors	Phyllis C. & John W. Reynolds		SW Portland	Express support for strong, comprehensive habitat protection for Forest Park and Buttes/Lava Domes of SE Portland, Gresham, and Damascus. Apply options 1a or 2a strictest protection for HOCs and protect upland on steep slopes where reduced trees and increased mud slides in sloped areas have strained habitat. Birds needs continuous ribbon of green. Require 1:1 mitigation. We live near Hoyt Arboretum and have seen a drop in wildlife, especially bird since Forest Heights was developed.	' Supports protection, especially ~Forest Park
180	letter	03/25/04	Metro Council	Barbara Hanawalt		SW Portland	As weekly user of Forest Park and observer of Forest Heights development, I think area is in deep need of protection. Though enough development in area and Fores Heights is ugly, it is at least fairly dense. Support values of clean air, land and water and stable grounds. Developmen should occur where forest has already been changed, leav animals current habitat. Add areas to Forest Park or at leas protect them from development.	t For habitat protection, t especially ~Forest e Park. t
181	letter	03/25/04	Metro Council	Lisa Jaffe		SW Portland	Support for strong, comprehensive regional wildlife program for Forest Park west flank. Between 1984 & 2002, enormous development in Cedar Mill Creek watershed resulted in damage to stream habitat, break up of wildlife corridors to park and unnecessary landslides during floods	For habitat protection, especially ~Forest Park.

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
182_	letter	03/29/04	Tualatin Basin Coordin. Commit.	Laura Hill, Rock Creek Watershed Parnters		Rock Creek Watershed	Extensive 7-page letter emphasizing protection of continuous, viable corridors. Current Tualatin recommendations fall short of this goal. Sites examples. Supports prohibiting conflicting uses. Place greater emphasis on big picture. Addresses confusing "ALP adjustment process."	For habitat protection.
183	letter	03/29/04	Tualatin Basin Coordin. Commit. & Metro Planning	Sue Beilke		Biodiversity Project of Tigard & Friends of Fowler Openspace	Supports option 1a. Protecting just streams and narrow buffer will not protect full range of species of concern. Protection affects livability. In Tigard, many habitat areas lost (e.g. Bull Mt.) Increase protection for floodplains, preserve connectivity, protect & restore degraded habitat & give landowners incentives to do so on private land, continue to fund acquition in Tualatin, especially Tigard, protect all remaining upland forests, and avoid stream crossing with utility lines.	For habitat protection, especially in Tualatin/Tigard
184	letter	03/29/04	Tualatin Basin Coordin. Commit.	Terry & Willy Moore		Garden Home	Fanno & Ash Creek & tributaries deserve strong regulation for protection. Own Class B habitat & support ecologically viable program. Expect Metro to protect and restore remaining riparian areas. Urge strong protection of Garden Home Park, Oleson Rd. & terminus of Taylors Ferry Rd. including stream crossing of Oleson Rd. Support testimony of Audubon Society of Portland that calls for more protection for continuous ecologically viable corridors, no net loss of riparian and habitat areas, protection of upland trees/forest and strong protection for habitats of concern.	s For habitat protection of all areas
185	letter	03/30/04	Metro	Kenneth E. Itel		Tualatin	Believes maps are incorrect for property on SW Tualatin- Sherwood Rd. Frustrated with apparent refusal to address what I believe is obvious area. Questions objectivity of the process, given similar land nearby w/ lower ratings. Strean has never been on this property. Agricultural drainage tiles in place more than 70 years ago. Trees on property serve wind break. See letter for more details	

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
186	letter	12/16/03	Metro Councilors	Geneva A. Maier		NE Portland	Strong support for comprehensive regulatory and non-regulatory fish and wildlife habitat protection. Urges protection of stream and wildlife corridors to and from Forest Park. Program must ensure that new development doesn't degrade riparian corridors, floodplains and wetlands, sever upland and wildlife corridors, or deforest steep slopes by park.	Support for habitat protection, especially Forest Park area.
187	online survey w/ 3 Qs: developed land, incentives, funding mechanisms	02/20/02	habitat	Anderson			Developed land needs new protection standards (e.g. sing home often replaced by several). W/o protection, nearby high quality riparian area will be gone. Sites co-workers that have construction companies joking about loopholes in development. Incentives: assist with maintaining habitat, coordinate activities like SOLV clean up days, enforce illeg dumping laws, support funding depending on how devised organize & mobilize local chapters of environmental groups with restoration programs for homeowners and use volunteers to reduces costs. Maybe a special additional fee for dumping hazardous waste?	e t For protection
188	online survey w/ 3 Qs: developed land, incentives, funding mechanisms	02/03/04	habitat	Marra			Developed land should meet minimum standards for new and additional development. Exceptions should not be allowed. Incentives: public-private partnerships to raise awareness, provide technical advice and support for peopl who want to do the right thing but can't afford it or don't know how, purchase land or use easements for permanen protection, stiffen enforcement fines, impose higher fees or new development and construction (not redevelopment or brownfield construction), support public funding (e.g. greenspaces bond to purchase at reasonable price). Support habitat protection above all economic developmer Mitigation is risky. Use sensitive design!	e For habitat protection

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
189	online survey w/ 3 Qs: developed land, incentives, funding mechanisms	02/15/04	habitat	Murray			Developed land should not be exempt. Restrict further development and lessen impact (e.g. restore native species erosion control). If development unavoidable, require additional actions. Incentives: Education is paramount. Community support, monetary incentives for voluntary restoration and restriction of further development. Support public funding. Revenues and taxes from timber and other industries that threaten habitat. Federal and private grantin sources. Adoptions of Goal 5 is unique opportunity to protect natural areas for future. Value of habitat cannot be translated into economic terms. Rights to clean water, etc. have no price. Foolish not to protect because of decreasing costs and values associated w/ resource protection.	For habitat protection
190	online survey w/ 3 Qs: developed land, incentives, funding mechanisms	02/19/04	habitat	McAlpine			Exempt developed land. No new regs or mitigation requirements. Property tax reduction incentives. Oregon sales tax program. No more funds from property tax. Make state-wide expense. Find another more reliable source tha property taxes.	Against new regualations, mitigatiaon requirements.
191	online survey w/ 3 Qs: developed land, incentives, funding mechanisms	02/19/04	habitat	Moss			Developed land should be exempt. People trump wildlife. Where urban development is designated, it should be the priority. Current protection is adequate. No funding of protection within UGB. Huge areas of E. Portland that contribute pollution of habitat areas are not designated for protection, yet treed areas are singled out as culprits. [Restrict areas contributing to degradation.]	People come before wildlife. Current protection enough.

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
192	online survey w/ 3 Qs: developed land, incentives, funding mechanisms	02/20/04	habitat	Hollands			Developed land should not be exempt. Protect all habitat, with most restrictions on most valuable habitat. Incentives: Easement program. Higher tax rate for "improved" or developed properties and low tax rate for properties with easement contract. Or, differential tax growth rates for lanc w/ vs. w/o an easement. More neighborhood association a watershed council type groups/activities. Support public funding and restrictions on development rights. My propert affected and I support these restrictions. Habitat fee that could be waived if restrictions/improvements agreed to. Acquisition, paid for by people who harm habitat. Urge Council to adopt option that focuses on habitat over economic development. Focus on Portland's niche; presen livability and integration of natural areas and we'll attract quality economic development.	For habitat protection
193	online survey w/ 3 Qs: developed land, incentives, funding mechanisms	02/20/04	habitat	Ritchey			Developed land should be exempt, though new and redevelopment may deserve new standards, especially for most valuable habitat. Notes concerns about new development occurring in valuable habitat area (Springwat Trail). Incentives: cash grant, subsidized landscaping, or ta incentives. No one seems supportive of new taxes. Perhap fees imposed on developers of high value habitat.	er For habitat protection
194	online survey w/ 3 Qs: developed land, incentives, funding mechanisms	02/22/04	habitat	Henley			Developed land should be exempt. Property owners shouldn't be burdened with mitigation requirements. Incentives: public should pay property owners for cost of protecting or improving habitat. Combination of private and public sources. Existing developed land should not be burdened by more regulations.	

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
195	online survey w/ 3 Qs: developed land, incentives, funding mechanisms	02/23/04	habitat	Locklear			Developed land should not be exempt, but regulations should be used on case-by-case basis to avoid injustice. If exemptions, require mitigation at all levels but more for mo valuable habitat. Incentives: Property tax reductions for limited periods, like historical preservation incentives, for voluntary protection. Avoid abuse of incentive programs the inspection, etc. Discounted prices for native plants for mitigation projects. Protection is responsibility of property owners. Public funding for project that do not include property values. Low-interest loans, small grants, and property tax abatement. Support public funding so long as private business pulls its weight. Favor strong and immediate steps for protection and restoration programs. No one has right to destroy habitat. Focus development in already degraded areas. No more building in stream corridors. No removal of urban forests w/o additional plantings. Favor education and non-native plants removal.	u For habitat protection
196	online survey w/ 3 Qs: developed land, incentives, funding mechanisms	02/23/04	habitat	Riches			Education and voluntary efforts are best. Involuntary regulations should not be imposed on already developed land, except with just and fair compensation. Building permits should not be used as leverage for "takings" on other parts of land. Incentives: education - would use organic lawn products if I knew where to find them how to use them. Combination of gov't sources, eventually funded by taxes and (voluntary) foundation type fundraising. Financial burden should not be on private property owners No "takings". Strongly believe in "takings" clause of the fifth amendment and oppose gov't taking control of private property thru imposition of restrictions.	No "takings" thru restrictions.

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
197	online survey w/ 3 Qs: developed land, incentives, funding mechanisms	02/25/04	habitat	Madigan			All land deserves same standards. Incentives: property tax reductions for proof of protection. Support public financing currently thru property taxes. Willing to support science- based policies, not yours. Support concentrating population Habitat in-between highly developed areas may provide hostile environment for wildlife. Notes intermittent streams that are classified as high value habitat -protecting such areas that don't have salmon in them dilutes property tax base. Annoyed with bland replies to emails. Metro does no appear to have open minds or be considering financial impact. Approach doesn't seem science-based.	r. For habitat protection
198	online survey w/ 3 Qs: developed land, incentives, funding mechanisms	02/26/04	habitat	Sutherland- Finch			Developed land should not be exempt. Require reductions negative impact and restoration. Assistance needed, especially for elderly, perhaps by citizen or public group. Incentives: credit for proving protection or property tax reliefto combat issues such as debris removal, appropriate plantings, etc. Wholesale resource for native plants. Define mechanisms. Perhaps a county bond. Restrictions and enforcement of waterway diversions. Subdividing class I areas should be prohibited.	For habitat protection
199	online survey w/ 3 Qs: developed land, incentives, funding mechanisms	02/26/04	habitat	Werder			Developed land should not be exempt. Not in favor of redevelopment plans that alter density. No exemptions for development. Incentives: tax relief, either property or income. Fund with existing resources. Reduce budgets of social programs or education. Also in favor of bonds. Protection is essential.	For habitat protection

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
200	online survey w/ 3 Qs: developed land, incentives, funding mechanisms	03/01/04	habitat	Pistor			Developed land should be exempt from new regulations. Property owners must be compensated for impacts of new regs. Incentives: education to addresses pros/cons of protection, etc. Private funding, except in rare/extreme cases. Notes seasonable drainage ditch that is classified habitat. Don't believe info from source that makes such claims.	Against new regs w/o compensation.
201	open letter	02/02/04	Metro Council	Christian Clere		Kerr Pkwy, Lake Oswego	Strong support for strictest protection. Save riparian corridors and uplands. Concerned about development in Forest Parksteep slopes and near headwater ravines as well as severed corridors, slides, and flooding. Not against development but support smarter development such as cluster development.	For habitat protection
202	open letter	02/03/04	Metro Council	James W. Hatfield, Dunthorpe Press		Portland	Brought company to Oregon for natural beauty and enjoys walks in Forest Park, which are stress-relieving and rejuvenating. Make sure Forest Park remains green and healthy.	For protection (of Forest Park)
203	open letter	02/08/04	Metro Council	Barry Armentoout		SW Preslynn, Portland	Support mandates to protect bird habitat - options 1a or 2a No net loss of riparian habitat and protect habitats of concern and upland habitat on steep slopes.	For habitat protection
204	open letter	02/09/04	Metro Council	Susan Stein		NE Multnomah, Portland	Strongly encourages protection of streamside habitats, birc and bird habitat. Highly recommends most protective options: 1a and 2a.	For habitat protection
205	open letter	02/23/04	Tualatin Basin Coordin. Commit. & Metro Planning	Robert Riches		NE Jackson School, Hillsboro	"Riparian III" designation on property is not accurate reflection of reality. Area is cut off by residential development from swale. Strongly opposed to restriction of use of private property without just compensation. Strongly favors educational and incentive-based voluntary methods Education powerful for conscientious stewardship. Need info on best use of non-toxic pesticides.	For stewardship, against regulations that restrict property rights.

•

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
206	open letter	03/02/04	Metro Council	Peter Finley Fry		SW Main, Portland	Strive to integrate human activities in natural environment and healthy manner. Issue of setbacks must be realigned. Review scientific basis tosupport notion of integration and reject segregation as strategy doomed to failure. Teach people to treat animals with grace and compassion.	For protection, against setbacks
207	open letter	03/03/04	Metro Council	Carolyn Eckel		SE Main, Portland	Homeowner in Johnson Creek watershed. Supports strongest possible standards to protect watershed which w protect habitat. Hike in Forest Park and observe no water running in Balch Creek: Improve habitat for salmon, including prohibiting clear cutting near streams and no tree cutting on steep slopes, since these lead to landslides and destroy streams and habitat. Preserve as much greenspaces as possible for habitat. Better to rely on high density housing and in-filling.	For habitat protection
208	open letter	03/06/04		Larry Read	Mail-in	Tualatin Loop, West Linn	Strongly supports Tualatin River Basin protections found in options 1A, 2nd choice 2A. Talks of shallow 12 foot space between river infiltration and drinking water layer as conce for low pollution and contaminate levels. Stresses importance of non-native vegetation destruction. Suggests incentives.	n For strong habitat protection.
209	open letter	03/08/04	Metro open house team (at Tualatin)	Nancy Lou Tracy	Tualatin	SW Pine St.	Concerned for children and grandchildren and 6th period of mass extinction underway. Supports goals 1 & 2Need political will to reduce growth in energy consumption. Consume less. Good info at the open house but process is still predicated on compromising quality of life.	For habitat protection
210	open letter	03/08/04		Cindy Irvine	Mail-in	NE Cook St, Portland	Wants to keep Portland livable for birds. Supports the mos protection for green areas along streams. Protect steep slops to prevent landslides. Protect habitat with at-risk species. Require no net-loss of riparian habitats. Strictest protections for "primary function riparian habitats."	For strong habitat protection.

ſ		A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
	1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
	211	open letter	03/11/04	Metro	S. Crown	Gresham	Kingswood Way, Clackamas County	Views declarations of resource value for the hills of east Portland/metro area by Oregon, Metro, Multnomah and Clackamas Counties, Portland and Gresham as "public relations gambit." Sites Persimmon phase 7 development a case in point, since proposal will remove stabilizing vegetation from steep hillsides, degrade soil stability and groundwater, destroy wildlife habitat and further pollute the area. Asks how this development can be allowed responsibly	For protection of hills in east Portland metro area. Against irresponsible development.
	212	open letter	03/14/04	habitat	Margot Barnett	SW Portland	SW Portland	Comments follow from event attended on 03/18/04 in SW Portland. Appreciates efforts to inventory habitat. Supports options 1a and 2a. Expresses concerns about keypad polling, specifically questions 11, 12, and 14. Some don't make sense from biological perspective, while others depend knowledge that general public doesn't have. Importance of habitat areas depend on quality and proximi to other habitat areas.	For habitat protection y
	213	open letter	03/16/04		Richard Carfo	Clackamas		Letter presented at Clackamas open house: 28-year resident property owner above Johnson Creek noting an increase in garbage & pollution with nothing done to clean up. Channelization prevents fish to spawn/feed. Offended a financing another habitat study (waste of money). Suggest inmate program to clean/restore habitat along with large fines of polluters. Suggests surveillance cameras at critical spots and a reward program for those who report big polluters. (Provides photographs of Johnson Creek with pollution/debris picture.)	For habitat protection, but critical of process as slow and cumbersome.
	214	open letter	03/16/04		Anne Leiser	Mail-in	SW Pendleton Ct, Portland	Asks what is habitat? Stresses that man alone should not be considered. Describes cutting of trees and proliferation of pets near property that have kept wildlife away. Emphasizes leaving human presence out of habitat. Contro is the answer to encourage habitat.	For habitat protection; concerned with human presence in habitat.

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
215	open letter	03/18/04		Edith Coulter		SE West View, Milwaukie	Metro is 30 years late protecting specific area. Indicates that there are numerous developments in the area. Stream nea property is mostly piped underground. 70 feet of open stream is polluted and without wildlife. Does not want to be penalized as a good caretaker and not allowed to develop. Supports option 1C.	Against regulations that prohibit development
216	phone	02/25/04	Lori Hennings, Metro	Stan Biles		Sherwood	Discussion about property in Sherwood that is being considered for habitat protection and industrial lands.	
217	phone	02/27/04	Lori Hennings, Metro	John Temmy, appraiser			Sent notes for staff review.	
218	phone call	02/19/04		Joanne Galespie		SW Highland, Tigard	Concerned about the definition of protection. Owns propert and is concerned about overlay and loss of property value due to lack of development.	yAgainst regulations that lower property value.
219	phone call	02/19/04		Lina Bauer		SE 158th	Interested in Pleasant Valley concept planning, with no specific question about Goal 5.	For habitat protection; supportive of program.
220	phone call	02/20/04		Eric Schneider		SW Towle Ave, Gresham	Interested in restoration grants. Expressed need for one- stop information center. Supports protective guidelines/regulatory tools in exchange for creek bed enhancement/erosion problems	For habitat protection; supportive of program.
221	phone call	02/20/04		Helen Johnson		SW 42nd, Portland	Concerned about selling property for development if no subdivision allowed. Mailed property map and provided information about the inventory and ESEE analysis.	Critical of program.
222	phone call	02/20/04		Gary Groover		SW 55th, Tualatin	Concerned about his ability to develop his property	For habitat protection, concerned about ability to develop.
223	phone call	02/20/04		Eileen Wong		NW Royal Blvd, Portland	Property owner of 5 acres in Forest Hill. Concern over inconsistently applied Portland regulations and tree cutting restrictions.	Critical of program.

	Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
224	phone call	02/20/04		Dean Myers		East Multnomah County	Concerned that comments aren't amply considered. Suggests gravel loading dock to avoid muddied streets. Suggests silt fencing and erosion control around the edges of farms.	
225	phone call	02/20/04		Stevens			Called to confirm prior map correction to ensure that no stream is listed.	
226	phone call	02/20/04		Nora Lee		Oregon City	Interested in joining the mailing list for various projects	
227	phone call	02/20/04		Peter Hengested		SW Iron Mountain Blvd.	Interested in property's inclusion in Goal 5 program. Explained process and referred to open houses.	
228	phone call	02/23/04		Irene James		NE 137th Ave, Portland	Requested general information.	
229	phone call	02/23/04		Sherri Nee			Requested information on regulatory options; referred to website. Concerned about total value loss of property. Referred to ALP guidelines that prevent total loss of value.	For habitat protection, concerned about ability to develop.
230	phone call	02/23/04		Tamara Smith			Called for more info regarding program. Referred to websit and map tool for further info.	e
231	phone call	02/23/04		Dick Wyss		E Historic Columbia Hwy.	Expressed questions about willing seller acquisition and concerns that this is a duplication of US Fish & Wildlife.	
232	phone call	02/24/04	·	Felix Frayman		SW 57th Ave, Portland	Property owner requesting information about program.	
233	phone call	02/24/04				Sylvan Area	Wanted to know the possible scenarios for property under various program options.	
234	phone call	02/25/04		Harriet Levi		Jackson M.S.	Interested in protection possibilities on a neighboring property in predevelopment stages. Referred to city of Portland.	For habitat protection; supportive of program.
235	phone call	02/26/04		Pat		Clackamas	Expressed questions about inventory, ESEE analysis and open houses.	

	Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	H
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
236	phone call	02/26/04		Mary Hopkins			Has property with Class 3 Riparian value. Concerned that property owners are already preserving trees and are only being further penalized.	For habitat protection, but critical of program elements.
237	phone call	02/27/04		Judy Hoglund	· · ·	SE Tong Rd, Clackamas	Questions about open houses and which would be most important to attend. Referred to Sunnybrook and Oregon City open houses.	
238	phone call	03/01/04		would not provide		West Linn	Expressed concerns that Metro is implementing a program without giving notice. Did not receive public notice.	Critical of program
239	phone call	03/01/04		Debbie Dresner		Terwilliger & Taylors Ferry	Owns steep slope property with erosion problems, searching for suggestions. Referred to program tools draft document, City of Portland's BES & EMSWCD.	
240	phone call	03/01/04		Steve Edelman		NW Portland	Email response: referred to ORS 527.722 in regards to loc governments regulation power on forestland property insid & outside urban growth boundary.	e e
241	phone call	03/01/04		Erin Vandeheu		Tualatin Basin, Clackamas	Attorney representing client trying to develop. Requested info on Goal 5 process, including Tualatin Basin partner process	
242	phone call	03/01/04		Heather Arendt, Pacific Habitat Services		SW Roy Rogers Rd	Expressed inventory questions about a particular property! Class III Riparian value. Performs wetland/habitat surveys for local jurisdictions.	c,
243	phone call	03/03/04		Anne		Boundary & Shaddock, Portland	Generally supportive of habitat program.	For habitat protection; supportive of program.
244	phone call	03/03/04		Heather Arnt			Expressed questions about ESEE analysis and open houses. Walked through online map tool on the phone. Expressed helpfulness of map tool.	

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
245	phone call	03/03/04		Brian Willis		SE Hogan Rd, Gresham	Expressed concern that maps default to one option and tha a decision has already been made. Expressed positive and helpful interaction with Metro staff.	t Critical of program.
246	phone call	03/03/04		Brian Bjornson			Expressed concerns that wetland mapping is too broad. Referred to website, interactive tools and explained invento critena.	
247	phone call	03/03/04		Richard Kell			Doesn't want to lose right to develop on his property, thoug supportive of habitat protection.	For habitat h protecton, but concerned about property rights.
248	phone call	03/03/04		Steve Overson		Holcum Blvd	3rd generation property owner outside UGB & industrial lands study area. For habitat protection, but concerned about lot (59 acres) and its validity in inventory.	For habitat protection, concerned with program elements.
249	phone call	03/04/04		Jim Hinzdel		Weller St, Lake Oswego	Expressed questions about inventory & open houses. Sent property maps and public notice.	
250	phone call	03/04/04		Peter Adams		SW Nottingham Dr	Expressed concerns over county assessed values. Requested Portland C-zone and Metro regional habitat inventory maps. Referred successfully to website.	For habitat protection; supportive of program.
251	phone call	03/04/04		Janet Rood		SE Hwy 212, Clackamas	Requested info about urban growth boundary expansion plans	
252	phone call	03/04/04		Michelle, Pac Habitat Srvcs		NE Cornell Rd	Expressed inventory questions about a particular property's value. Performs wetland/habitat surveys for local jurisdictions.	
253	phone call	03/09/04		Pat McGuinn		SW Willowmere Dr, Portland	Wants Metro to do more to protect the environment. 30 years resident of Fanno Creek property. Concerned about neighbors falling trees and building in the area.	For strong habitat protection.
254	phone call	03/09/04		Dana McCullough		Washington County	Expressed rumor that 3,000 of new industrial land would require 1,000 acres of habitat with UGB expansion. Informed of inaccuracy and mailed info on program.	
255	phone call	03/11/04		John Frewing		SW 74th	Specific questions about Tigard property in unincorporated WA county.	

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
256	phone call	03/16/04		Edith Coulter		SE West View, Milwaukie	Expressed questions about inventory. Property maps were requested and sent.	Not directly expressed.
257	phone call	03/17/04		Rick Miller		Cooper Mt.	Generally critical of program. Has property on Cooper Mt ir class 1 area and would like to build a house.	Critical of program.
258	phone call	03/19/04		Nancy Waller		SW Newland Rd, Wilsonville	Generally supportive of habitat program. Requested property maps	For habitat protection; supportive of program.
259	phone call	2/23/04 & 2/25/04		Virginia Horler		West Linn	Owns property up for sale (22 acres). City of West Linn is interested in acquisition for park use, school district supports development sale. Wants letter from Metro in support of open space purchase.	For habitat protection; supportive of program.
260	phone call	2/27/04, 3/2/04, 3/12/04		Tim O'Callahan		NW 185/Hillsboro	2/27 Did not receive notice. Faxed & mailed notice. 3/2 Requested inventory technical report. 3/12 Meeting held to look at GIS layers. Submitted map data using Clean Water Servoces floodplain data; primarily concerned w/ maximizin development when rural property brought into UGB	
261	phone call	2/27/2004 & 3/1/04		Ollie Olsen		West Linn	Property owner with creek on land. West Linn told him his land is undevelopable. Concerned that he was not adequately notified. Supports compensation for setbacks. Concerned about legality of the program under eminent domain laws.	Critical of program.
262	phone call	3/4/04 3/9/04		Terry Wilson		SE Heuke Rd, Boring	Generally supportive of habitat program. Questions about inventory. Property maps requested and sent. 3/9 Concerned that program would prevent development/limbe sale from property	For habitat protection; supportive of program.
263_	phone, email	02/02/04	Maggie Voss, Metro	Ralph London		SW Portland	Ralph called to inform Metro of address correction: 6809 Raleighwood Way, Portland 97225-9137	
264	phone, email	02/27/04	Lori Hennings, Metro	Sheer Nee			Spoke on phone last week. Lori sent info on web tool and s options.	
265	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		"Property owners right!"	Property owner rights

	A	В	C	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
266	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		Special permit to transfer debris to a landfill or transfer station at no cost. By request on a one time/day or event basis.	
267	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		"Protect property owner rights."	Property owner rights
268	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		If value is lost, it should be compensated. Stressed protection of property owners rights.	Property owner rights
269	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		Question #11 of keypad questionnaire is poorly written. Choosing between compact development/preserving trees does not correlate. You can do both.	
270	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		Unsure why the open house is taking place.	
271	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		Limit development. Start with the Persimmons developmen bad for existing neighborhoods.	t, .
272	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		Tree covered buttes are unique factor. Don't allow destruction, they should remain a legacy.	For habitat protection.
273	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		Property owner already protects local environment by planting trees, etc near stream	
274	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		Supports option 1A	For habitat protection
275	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		Protect our water supply.	
276	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		"Saving our trees/forests is a start."	
277	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		Suggests pesticide regulation. Owners may be more open to regulation if coupled with education programs offering easy alternatives.	
278	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		Imposing regulations cause anger. Protecting habitat can be a positive and rewarding experience. Education and reward are good approaches.	Against regulations, but not protection
279	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		Give awards to land owners who make efforts to preserve/enhance their properties adjacent to streams, lakes, etc.	
280	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		City of Gresham should rescind its new steep slope rules.	
281	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		Don't limit development based on maps. Evaluate each site separately. Do not substitute fixed regulations for reasoned decisions.	
282	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		Supports option 1A	

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
283	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		Fairview Creek Coordinating Committee has worked for years. Cities just keep on developing impervious areas draining into Fairview Lake.	
284	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		Conservation banking tied to a regulatory program; protect restore high priority sites.	Supports protectior
285	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		Limit development. Stop the Persimmons development. Ensure community concerns are addressed to protect habitat.	Supports protection
286	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		Suggests positive responses to habitat protection stem fror education. Regulation makes land owners angry. Work with them, not against them.	
287	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		Leave protection of habitat to local jurisdictions. Any program adopted by Metro should be non-regulatory.	
288	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		"Stop development. Save our habitat. Enough is enough. Support option 1A."	
289	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		"Why are you (Metro) here? Faircreek creek not been enough (home) (habitat) protection nothing left/all developed."	
290	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		Develop a waste program for sewage/waste that develops "methane gas" for energy to offset oil demand.	
291	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		Persimmons development will destroy butte, trees, wildlife. Land development will not preserve our natural habitat.	
292	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		Property owners can protect their own land and are responsible. Don't need more rules.	Against regulations
293	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		A list of native plants/places to purchase or pick-up upon private restoration grant.	
294	post-it idea	03/11/04			Gresham		People should be left alone by Metro, but educated on proper fish and game management on properties.	Against new regulations
295	post-it idea	03/15/04		Clair Klock	OR City		The title of education classes (a non-regulatory tool) should reflect how the class will improve the property.	

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
296	post-it idea	03/15/04		Clair Klock	OR City		Grants for city lot owners should be in conjunction with a Naturescapaing class & technical consultation	
297	post-it idea	03/15/04		Clair Klock	OR City		Grants should be given in conjunction with a conservation plan of the entire property.	
298	post-it idea	03/15/04		Karen Davis	OR City		Question: are there any agencies that would help with wildlife restoration?	
299	post-it idea	03/15/04		Sarah Brown	OR City		No paved trails along rivers.	
300	post-it idea	03/15/04			OR City		In large developments along UGB edge, make developers leave a naturalized boundary.	
301	post-it idea	03/15/04		Larry	OR City		Enforce current laws regarding polluting streams, etc. Don add more laws.	Not directly expressed.
302	post-it idea	03/15/04		Larry	OR City		Leave restoration to people who will do it voluntarily or donate their land	Not directly expressed.
303	post-it idea	03/15/04			OR City		Make developers leave old growth large trees—work development around to save maximum extent possible.	Not directly expressed.
304	post-it idea	03/15/04			OR City		Use non-regulatory incentives for property owners of small tracts. Regulate urban areas less aggressively where large tract owners are impacting wildlife.	Not directly expressed.
305	post-it idea	03/16/04			Clackamas		Same essential rules for business as everyone else.	
306	post-it idea	03/16/04			Clackamas		Strive for sustainabilitya balance between economy, ecology and community. Going with what brings the most money makes the environment and community suffer.	
307	post-it idea	03/16/04			Clackamas		"The more the better!" (Reference unknown.)	
308	post-it idea	03/16/04			Clackamas		Enforce the regulations, once adopted.	
309	post-it idea	03/16/04			Clackamas		Metro must enforce its laws, audit performance, quality and administrative track record of local jurisdiction's programs.	

	A	В	С	D	E.	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
310	post-it idea	03/16/04			Clackamas		Visit homeowners in habitat areas and give suggestions on what to plant, how to improve, etc.	
311	post-it idea	03/16/04			Clackamas		More home- and commercial owner (esp. near streams/new development) education about pesticide/runoff issues	v
312	post-it idea	03/16/04			Clackamas		"If taxpayers' want to regulate someone else's land, let ther buy it!"	n
313	post-it idea	03/16/04			Clackamas		Don't allow developers to cut all the trees.	
314	post-it idea	03/16/04			Clackamas		Restrict companies along waterways to prevent growth of pollution problem.	
315	post-it idea	03/16/04			Clackamas		"Use common sense. The area will never be as it was before the Indians came here. People are more important than fish."	
316	post-it idea	03/16/04			Clackamas		Tax reduction for maintaining wetlands and streamside habitat.	
317	post-it idea	03/16/04			Clackamas		Combine regional trail system with wildlife corridors that connect streams, buttes & riparian areas.	
318	post-it idea	03/17/04			North Portland		Higher density development.	
319	post-it idea	03/17/04			North Portland		Better stewards on Metro-owned property. (e.g., remove iv	<i>y</i>)
320	post-it idea	03/17/04			North Portland		Charge immigrants to Metro counties a habitat tax and/or develop system development charges for proposed development.	
321	post-it idea	03/17/04			North Portland		Buy conservation easements on lands adjacent to Metro lands to buffer high quality habitats	
322	post-it idea	03/17/04			North Portland		Include more street tree protection, even outside habitat areas.	
323	post-it idea	03/17/04			North Portland		Support/encourage limits on sale of chemical fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides, fungicides.	
324	post-it idea	03/17/04			North Portland		Only allow native plans for new landscape development.	

Metro's Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection Program Economic, Social, Environment and Energy (ESEE) Phase II Public Comment Report Section 1

	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
325	post-it idea	03/17/04			North Portland		Tax or water bill credit for amount of tree canopy for homeowners/businesses.	
326	post-it idea	03/17/04			North Portland		Encourage the use of native plants on all metro area development projects, commercial or residential. Discourage the increase of "car" habitat through tax incentives. Tax on pesticides.	
327	post-it idea	03/17/04			North Portiand		Do not expand urban or industrial lands	
328	post-it idea	03/18/04		Brian Swaren	SW Portland		City of Portland usually overbearing/bossy. Most people want to do right thing. Work w/ homeowners to help them protect streams in cooperative, non-dictatorial manner. Contact person/advisor that homeowners hire to look at property, listen to and consider ideas. Then, through simplified process, homeowners could begin immediately of plans. Critical of city process with tons of paperwork, lot of money, just for a meeting.	Not directly expressed.
329	post-it idea	03/18/04		J. Michael McCloskey	SW Portland	SW Sunset Blvd.	Metro should put pressure on City of Portland to change Local Improvement District approach that requires nearly every resident to agree to putting in more curbs to help collect storm water.	For habitat protection (not directly expressed)
330	walk-in	02/24/04		Terrell Garrett		NW St. Helens	Interested in map correction form. Faxed form.	
331	walk-in	02/25/04		Linda Bauer		SE 158th	Very supportive of Metro program thus far. Knowledgeable about current ESEE analysis and program development process.	For habitat protection; supportive of program.
332	walk-in	03/11/04		Alex Reverman		NW 185/Cornell	Concerned about wetland & stream protection requirement Provided arc view maps and explained timing of program versus development permitting process	:
333	walk-in	03/19/04		Gordon Boorse		NE 122nd Ave, Portland	Requested and given property maps. Discussed questions about the inventory and ESEE analysis.	
334	walk-in	2/20/04 & 2/23/04		AI Jones		SE Robert Ave, Clackamas	Owns several properties, one zoned industrial. Concerned with takings/condemnation issues.	Critical of program.
	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н
-----	--------------------	---------------------	----	--------------------------------	-------	------------------------------------	--	--
1	Type of comment	Date	То	From	Event	Location of sender (general)	Brief Summary	Sentiments about habitat protection program
335	walk-in	2/20/04 & 3/3/04		Skip Ormsby		SW Birdhill Rd, Portland	Picked up inventory, science report and industrial lands study. Chair of Birdshill CPO.	For habitat protection, concerned with program elements
336	walk-in	2/26/04 & 3/2/04		Sparkel & Bruce Anderson		SW Stafford Rd, Wilsonville	Questions about stream on her property and possible discrepancies between habitat inventory and industrial lanc study area maps.	

.

.

ia A

.

041504c-01

April 2004

D



Executive summary: Expanding the urban growth boundary to serve the region's industrial growth

The challenge

The primary purpose of managing land use and boundary growth is to keep this region a great place to live, work, and do business. The choices we make today must not only balance a mix of current needs and values, but also position the region well for the future. In this light, adjustments to the urban growth boundary test our perspective and foresight. That is the task at hand as we prepare to finish the boundary and policy adjustments largely completed in December 2002, when the Metro Council added 18,638 acres to the UGB. Now we must designate the remaining share of land needed to accommodate industry and the regional economy through 2022.

Staff analysis shows that the region has, in fact, had a deficit of industrial land needed to serve a prosperous, growing economy. The recommendations summarized here address that need.

The 2002 adjustment, the largest since the UGB was established in 1979, added about 7 percent to the lands inside the boundary. That addition meets the region's projected need for residential and commercial development through 2022. Although the 2002 boundary expansion included 2,317 acres for industrial development, the Council recognized at the time that the industrial portion of the expansion fell short of projected needs by some 2,000 acres. There was a consensus that more study was required to consider a number of issues.

The most basic question, of course, is how much overall land should be considered – and where – in addressing the 2,000-acre industrial shortfall? But addressing that question brings others to the fore. To mitigate boundary expansion as much as possible, how can we better use land inside the boundary to serve industry? Where is the regional economy going? What kinds of businesses and jobs are likely to

flourish, and what building and land demands will that engender? How much flexibility should be built into our planning? For instance, as more businesses create intellectual or technology products in an office environment, how do we distinguish between office and industrial land? How do we accommodate the state's interest in nurturing traded-sector clusters – those industries that concentrate around talent and other resources, that sell their products and services outside Oregon, and that provide living wage jobs?

Recommendation overview

The Metro staff, with intergovernmental collaboration and extensive public input, has been working on these and related issues the past 15 months. The result, which we commend to the Council, is this package of recommendations. The specific area-by-area expansion recommendations are identified in adjacent maps and tables, and they are discussed more fully in the detailed staff report that accompanies this summary. It is important, however, to set the context for these details by noting broadly what they do and what policy choices are involved.

Key choices

The staff recommends that the Metro Council adopt measures to:

- Use industrial land more efficiently and flexibly
- Expand the supply of industrial land
- Choose farm land, if farm land must come into the boundary, that is less important to the viability of commercial agriculture in the tri-county area.

Efficient, flexible use. Under state land-use guidelines, we have the responsibility to use the land we have as efficiently as possible before we look to expand. In that vein, we should finish work on policies that the Council adopted in 2002, when it amended Title 4 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan to protect industrial lands from other uses. This will achieve industrial land-use efficiencies that mitigate a portion of the need to expand the boundary. By creating Regionally Significant Industrial Areas (RSIAs) in 2002, and by limiting the scale of retail stores and services in RSIAs and industrial areas, the region will save some 1,400 acres inside the UGB from conversion to non-industrial uses. Such uses can, instead, be accommodated in other locations such as employment areas, station communities, main streets, and transportation corridors. Without this 1,400-acre policy saving, the net expansion need would be closer to 3,400 acres.

In addition, add needed flexibility to the RSIA designation. In the past year, Metro has learned that industries involved in the creation of technology products need latitude to make greater use of office space as an integral part of what they research, develop, produce, and service. These can be viewed as "back office" functions integral to an industry, as opposed to "front office" functions that cater to walk-in retail customers and other visitors. The Title 4 ordinance should be amended to accommodate that need for flexibility. The more detailed RSIA map also needs to be adopted. RSIAs, it should be noted, are distinguished by their proximity to major freight transportation infrastructure and to concentrations of nearby industries, often of like character. RSIAs mapped within

the boundary are located primarily around Port of Portland lands, the Hillsboro and Troutdale airports, the Columbia Corridor, and the Highway 212 Corridor.

Boundary expansion. From a framework of roughly 4,000 gross acres, select 1,968 net acres of expansion land for industrial use. The 4,000 acres for consideration here have been winnowed from a study scope of 29,000 acres adjacent to the current boundary in 31 areas as far west as Forest Grove, as far south as Wilsonville South, and as far east as the Boring area. Unlike the 2002 expansion decision, the lands recommended here for possible inclusion represent only a fraction of the total acreage under study.

Resource land protection. In boundary expansion deliberations, affirm Metro's commitment in the Regional Framework Plan to (1) protect agricultural and forest land, (2) recognize agriculture as an important regional industry in its own right, and (3) avoid, to the greatest extent possible, expansion of the urban boundary into farm land that is critical to the viability of commercial agriculture in the region.

As it happens, expert advice provided through the Oregon Department of Agriculture recommends against expansion of the UGB into farm land that is critical to commercial agriculture. The land-use efficiencies and the boundary expansions recommended here meet the region's industrial land requirements for the next two decades. Wilsonville South is a case in point. There is no compelling need to push the boundary farther south of the Willamette River when better options, with less adverse impacts, are available.

However, affirming this position on resource lands affords Metro an ideal opportunity to start a discussion – not only with our rural neighbors, but with the state – about firming up the urban-rural interface and deciding whether the boundary should be an ever-expanding line. There may be logical stopping points – east and west, as well as south – beyond which the boundary should not go. Oregon and the region should come to grips with this issue in a comprehensive process.

Related choices

The Metro Council should also consider two related choices:

Additional land efficiency. There is an opportunity to create an additional policy saving of industrial land beyond the 1,400 acres saved for industry by the RSIA designations. The 2002-2022 Urban Growth Report: An Employment Land Need Analysis (UGR employment analysis) identified a surplus of 393 commercial acres within the present boundary. If the Council chooses to apply the surplus commercial land to the 1,968 net acres needed for industrial land, it could reduce the boundary expansion for industrial land to roughly 1,600 net acres. Surplus commercial land would satisfy a portion of the industrial land demand, because – as we have learned from the business community – office space now satisfies many industrial uses, especially among technology companies.

Medical facilities. This is a good opportunity to settle the question whether hospital and medical clinics over 20,000 square feet should be allowed in RSIAs and other industrial areas. The staff does not recommend this exemption from current policy. If medical facilities are allowed to locate in industrial areas, the land they use will have to be replaced by adding land to the UGB.

Apart from that, traffic to and from medical facilities will interfere with movement of freight. Such facilities should be located in areas where transit is available or planned.

Specific recommended areas

At a minimum, the staff believes that areas in the industrial land expansion should include: Damascus West, Tualatin, Quarry, Borland Road North of I-205, Oregon City, East Coffee Creek, Wilsonville East, Cornelius, and Helvetia (see table below). These total 1,608 net acreas.

Table 7. Recommended urban growth boundary expansion areas

	Acres				Suitability factors		
Recommended expansion areas	Total	Net	Tier and land type	2040 design type	Access	Proximity Slope less than 10%	
Damascus West	102	69	Tier 4 - Resource	Industrial			
Tuəlatin	646	339	Tier 1 – Exception	Industrial			
Quarry (partial area)	354	236	Tier 4 – Resource	Industrial	-		
Borland Rd N (partial area)	575	164	Tier 1 – Exception	Industrial	-		
Beavercreek	63	30	Tier 4 – Resource	Industrial	-		
East Coffee Creek (partial area)	264	97	Tier 1 - Exception	Industrial			
Wilsonville East (partial area)	641	460	Tier 5 – Resource	RSIA	-		
Cornelius (partial area)	206	91	Tiers 1 and 5 – Mixed	RSIA	-		
Helvetia (partial area)	249	149	Tiers 1 and 5 – Mixed	rsia	-		
Total	3,100	1,635					

Table 8. Additional areas for consideration

	Acres			Suitability facto	ers.
Expansion areas under consideration	Total Net	Tier and land type	2040 design type	Access Prox	inity Slope less than 10%
West Union (partial area) Evergreen (partial area)	368 133 985 730	Tiers 1 and 5 – Mixed Tiers 1 and 5 – Mixed	RSIA RSIA		
Total	1,353 863				

RSIA – Regionally Significant Industrial Areas

The overall need

The UGR employment analysis projects that the urban growth boundary will need to encompass 9,366 acres of industrial land to accommodate 90,000 more industrial jobs by 2022, roughly a two-fold increase over the number of industrial jobs within the boundary in 2000.¹ Leading up to the 2002 decision, the boundary, as shown in the adjacent table, contained a supply of 3,681 industrial acres, leaving a deficit of 5,685 acres. The Title 4 policy saving

Supply and demand	Net vacant
comparison	acres
Demand	9,366
Supply	3,681
Deficit	(5,685)
RSIA and title 4 Policy Savings	1,400
Adjusted (deficit)	(4.285)
2002 UGB decision	2,317
Remaining industrial land need	l (1,968)

mentioned earlier reduces that deficit by 1,400, and the industrial land added in the 2002 UGB decision reduces it another 2,317 acres. This leaves a need of 1,968 net acres. As noted above, this could be reduced further by reassignment of 393 surplus commercial acres.

Industrial land needs

In general, to accommodate industry, acreage brought into the boundary must be flat, near existing industry, and accessible to freeways and other transportation infrastructure. Seventy percent of industrial land is needed by warehouse and distribution – businesses that receive, hold, and ship goods. They especially need close access to major highways, and in some cases, to rail and port facilities as well. Thirteen percent of industrial land is needed by general industry, which produces a range of things, including food products, clothing, building materials, metals, and transportation equipment. Seventeen percent is needed by tech-flex businesses, such as those that provide industrial and commercial machinery, electronic goods, data processing services, and software.

Most industrial businesses in the region need 25 acres or less, and many of these with smaller space needs can locate in industrial/office parks. Economic development officials believe some larger parcels, such as 50 to 100-plus acres, should be available to accommodate expansion of existing large companies or recruitment of outside enterprises with larger land needs. There is also support for policies that permit larger parcels to be subdivided in cases where industries need such flexibility.

¹ Starting with the estimate of total industrial jobs, the acreage is determined by calculating the square footage typically needed per employee in different kinds of enterprises along with the parcel sizes these businesses typically require. In December 2002 the Metro Council concurred with the forecast of job growth and land needs.

The difficulty of making the choices

As the Council is well aware, the difficulty in making boundary expansion choices lies in balancing various objectives:

- Accommodating population growth while maintaining compact urban form
- Balancing the needs of housing, industry, commerce, the environment, and efficient transportation
- Assuring that land is allocated for uses that best fit its characteristics
- Making certain that public services and infrastructure are feasible to provide
- Protecting other important land categories such as natural areas and productive agricultural lands
- Assuring regional parity and equity in the responsibilities, burdens, and benefits of land expansion and use
- Making planning decisions that reflect real-world trends and realities as much as traditional goals and guidelines.

Metro is experienced in addressing most of these requirements, but the last one is elusive because no one has an infallible crystal ball. No one knows with certainty where the economy is going and how changes in various industries may affect their land needs.

Three decades ago, when the urban boundary was established, who could predict that high technology, especially semiconductor fabrication, would become Oregon's most significant employer while the forest products payroll would shrink? Who could predict then that Oregon would become home to a cluster of businesses with a major international market share in athletic and outdoor apparel? Today we see trends that may portend similar structural changes. Manufacturing companies continue to move or outsource production off shore, and even some service and professional jobs are heading in that direction. We might infer that the region will not see the kind of manufacturing investment and land needs of the past, but new land demands are likely to emerge.

From a land-use point of view, we are seeing the traditional definitions of industry evolve as businesses integrate research, development, and production functions and as the distinction between office and production work blurs. The most competitive industries have a strong investment in innovation connected with the presence of universities, research labs, and concentrations of expertise. Likewise, the most competitive businesses often grow in clusters where talented workers, competitors, suppliers, professional services, and distribution facilities are located in close proximity. The state and the business community, in fact, are encouraging localities to have a ready supply of buildable land for traded-sector clusters. They are also promoting the integration of land-use policies with broader regional economic strategies.

Metro can't necessarily address all of these issues in this boundary decision, but it can begin to weave them into this discussion and its longer range thinking.

Land analysis

For this phase of the boundary expansion, the Metro staff originally started with 68,000 acres of potential industrial land. Because of the scale of the undertaking, the Council reduced that to 29,000 acres in December 2003. That land volume meets the major site factors of interest to industry: major transportation access, proximity to other industrial users, and slopes of less than 10 percent.

Suitability determination. Thirty-one areas within the 29,000 acres were then subjected to analysis for a variety of suitability factors. The Alternatives Analysis Study looked at environmental, social, energy and economic characteristics of each area, assessed agricultural compatibility and productivity, determined acres of buildable land, and evaluated the feasibility of providing urban infrastructure and services.² Each area was examined in detail to determine if it meets key location criteria: at least two miles proximity to an interchange and one mile to existing industries. Even though they met key location factors, some study areas were deemed unsuitable for industrial use and were excluded from further consideration due to parcelization, the constraints imposed by existing development patterns, location and extent of natural resources, difficulty of providing services, negative impacts on agricultural uses, or a combination of these factors.

Areas that meet industry and suitability criteria are those mentioned earlier for UGB inclusion: Damascus West, Tualatin, Quarry, Borland Road North of I-205, part of Beavercreek, East Coffee Creek, Wilsonville East, Cornelius, and Helvetia. Although Evergreen and West Union meet industry and suitability criteria, they are not recommended for inclusion except as alternatives in the event that the Council decides not to implement pending Title 4 changes or does not bring in some lands on the recommended list.

Areas determined to be unsuitable for industrial designation at this time, primarily because they don't meet key location criteria, are Pleasant Home, Bluff Road, Oregon City East, the remainder of Beavercreek, Wilsonville West, Sherwood East, Farmington, and Jackson School Road.

Areas meeting at least one location factor but still not recommended for UGB industrial inclusion are Gresham, Boring, Noyer Creek, Oregon City South, Borland Road South, Norwood/Stafford, Wilsonville South, Brookman Road, Sherwood West, Hillsboro South, and Forest Grove West.

Oregon City North and Forest Grove East meet both location factors but are not recommended for UGB inclusion because they have some of the development constraints, servicing difficulties, and adverse impacts listed more fully four paragraphs above.

²Industrial Land Alternatives Analysis Study, February 2004.

Warehouse and distribution land. As noted earlier, 70 percent of the industrial land demand is generated by warehouse and distribution businesses, which need to be located within two miles of an interchange along I-5, I-84, or I-205. Among the expansion areas recommended, Tualatin, Quarry, Borland Road North, Coffee Creek, and Wilsonville East fulfill 1,270 acres of the 1,377-acre demand for warehouse and distribution land.

Aggregation potential. Most industrial lands added to the UGB will be developed from the aggregation of smaller parcels, typically in ranges of 10 to 25 acres, 25 to 50 acres, and 50 to 100-plus acres, depending on the use. Industry representatives indicate that warehouse and distribution uses typically require a minimum of 20 acres; general industrial, 25 acres or less; and tech flex, 50 to 100 or so acres. Although there are some parcel deficits in each of the recommended inclusion areas, all have a degree of aggregation potential and the majority have potential to assemble 10 to 25 and 50 to 100 acres. Quarry, Borland Road north of I-205, Wilsonville East, and Helvetia, have the potential to achieve larger aggregations, particularly the latter two at 100 acres and above.

Stakeholder involvement

Industrial land and boundary decisions affect a great many stakeholders, from local governments to businesses to individual property owners. Accordingly, Metro has involved all of these interests in its deliberations.

Intergovernmental dialogue. Metro staff has met regularly with representatives of local governments as policy is being formulated and recommendations are being developed. This includes consultation with Marion County officials about land south of the Willamette River, which the county opposes as a site for boundary expansion.

Open houses. In March 2004, Metro held five open houses throughout the region to acquaint the public with the industrial land issues discussed here. More than 1,500 people attended those forums. The open houses provided a project overview and offered visitors an opportunity to talk to staff about specific areas under consideration. Staff received over 800 responses from the public in the form of phone calls, comment cards, and emails.

Agriculture symposium. In October 2003 Metro sponsored a symposium called "Agriculture on the Edge" to hear the perspective of farmers and others on the issues surrounding farmland and boundary expansion. The symposium provided farmers a forum to represent agriculture as an industry and to express concerns about urbanization and its impacts on agriculture.

Public hearings. Two sets of public hearings are scheduled to provide opportunities for citizens and effected parties to address the Council. A series of three public hearings are scheduled in April and early May to begin to take testimony on ordinances that will enact the recommendations proposed here. A second set of public hearing will be held in May and June to consider possible ordinance revisions and to finalize the Council's decisions by the June 30, 2004, deadline.

0411501c-02

April 15, 2004

To the Metro Council:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Metro Council's proposed 2004-2005 budget.

I support the specificity of the targeted proposal to support regional parks via an excise tax imposed on solid waste hauled in the region. This proposal is a positive development for my part of the region. Parks and open spaces are very popular among residents of the region, and this proposal is a direct result of recommendations provided by the Green Ribbon Committee. Due to its involvement at the local level, that committee did some excellent work.

Without the leadership of the Metro Council, and many others, we would not have the 8,000 plus acres of open spaces set aside that we do today. This proposal promises to realize the potential of those open spaces in a fiscally responsible manner.

Sincerely yours,

Dick Schouten Washington County Commissioner

P. 02/02 141504c-03



West Linn-Wilsonville School District 3JT

ADMINISTRATION BUILDING P.O. Box 35 · West Linn, Oregon 97068 · 503-673-7000 or Fax 503-673-7001

April 15, 2004

David Bragdon, President Metro Council 600 NE Grand Avenue Portland, Oregon 97232

Dear Mr. Bragdon,

I am writing to support your proposed budget for FY 04-05 that provides funding for the completion of public access and related improvements for the Wilsonville Tract. This funding will support the Wilsonville Tract Master Plan developed by the City of Wilsonville and the West Linn - Wilsonville School District.

The Master Plan provides for the development of a public gateway entrance to the Wilsonville Tract on school district property. The gateway includes a South Metro Area Rapid Transit stop, a parking lot, an information kiosk, public drinking fountains and toilet facilities. The gateway is adjacent to the district's environmental research facility where student and adult environmental education programs will help restore the Tract's trial system.

The Wilsonville Tract is an integral part of the School District's science program, and students will use the gateway as an access point to develop wetlands habitat and wetlands restoration and clean-up projects. Our students will also work on creating icons for the trail system that identify plant and wildlife for the public.

The School District and the City of Wilsonville have worked together to develop a Master Plan that will allow the Wilsonville Tract to serve as a regional center for environmental studies and provide high quality public access to the Tract's trail system and its natural treasures.

Thank you for supporting the funding for our gateway project.

Sincerely,

annenbaum

Michael Tannenbaum, D.Ed. Deputy Superintendent

Phil Prewett -

Page 1

COL/1504-04

From:Blair NeumanTo:prewettpDate:4/15/04 3:15AM

Dear Councilor:

I am the other nightkeeper at the zoo and decided to give you my thoughts on the elimination of this position. I'm sure you're sick of the topic, so I'll be brief. The added work that will fall to the security staff aside, I think the biggest issues are public perception and safety, and effects on the animal collection. I have held this position for over 10 years, so I have seen a lot.

As to the first point, the visiting public is extremely concerned with the care our animals receive. No doubt the work that PETA and other animal rights groups have done has heightened this awareness. Although many zoos do not have nightkeepers, you'd be hard pressed to find one that utilizes the grounds after hours like ours. With no night animal keepers, there will be a great deal of time when the public is on grounds and animal keepers are not, period.

From a month of Zoolights to summer concerts and on-grounds catered events, as well as year round overnights (up to 4 nights a week during peak season), the zoo is a very busy place after the posted closing hours. I am often called (usually by reception, security or other zoo staff) to respond to a real or imagined animal health/safety concern. In the majority of these cases, the initial caller (and gathered crowd) is waiting to see what the zoo's response will be and their relief is evident upon my arrival. A keeper responding knows of current or long-standing health issues, is able to discern normal versus abnormal species behavior -- and most importantly is able to immediately respond if necessary. All this absolutely effects the public's sometimes volatile perception about how we care for "their" animals and how their taxes are spent. Telling them the problem will be checked in 12 hours or more is not gonna fly.

Just a couple of weeks ago, on March 17th, a security officer noticed one of the monkeys had escaped its enclosure. This occurred at 5:55 pm, and on a night when a group of children were sleeping at the zoo. The security officer was of course unfamiliar with the species and its capabilities, and called it as a dangerous animal out — as it well could have been. I was able to quickly and safely resolve the situation. Had the nightkeeping shift been eliminated at this time, there would not have been a keeper (or any animal management staff) on grounds. The delay in summoning staff in this instance may not have been critical, but that is not always the case. Animal escapes and complications are not something that can be predicted. Having a qualified animal keeper immediately available certainly lessons liability issues for humans as well as animals.

As to how our presence directly effects the animals, let me just offer a couple of examples of problems nightkeepers have caught because we were there. There are 2 fires in animal areas that I personally prevented because I caught the problem in time. In one case, a malfunctioning heating pad was the culprit and the other case concerned a heat light that had slipped and was in direct contact with a plastic tub. Neither area has sprinkler systems or automatic monitoring for smoke/fires.

There are also several specific times where a nightkeeper was invaluable in saving an animal's life simply because we were there to find and resolve the problem or get help. The most notable example was when Rama the elephant managed to get an enrichment toy (a tire on a long chain) wrapped around his neck. He was unable to free himself or move very far. Nightkeepers discovered this problem around 11pm and were able to free him. If Rama had to stand outside like this all night until day staff arrived he may well have been seriously injured by struggling in frustration to free himself or if he had been startled and jolted into movement or panicked.

I have also found animals who have managed to get caught in their enclosures and certainly would have succumbed to shock and been dead by morning. One nightkeeper recently found the female tree kangaroo slowly bleeding to death and was able to call in veterinary staff for after hours lifesaving treatment.

I won't say nightkeepers catch everything, but because our sole focus and training is on animal care, and we have access where other night staff does not, our presence has inarguably benefitted the collection. I know the veterinary staff and day keepers would attest to this fact. I just want you to be aware of this information as management (who have never worked nights), makes their case.

Thank you VERY much for your time,

Blair Neuman

0H150HC-05

Metro Council 600 NE Grand Ave. Portland, OR 97232-2736

Dear Metro Council,

Please take advantage of this unique opportunity to protect urban watersheds and wildlife habitat by choosing the Goal 5 option that provides the greatest community benefit in all areas—economic, social, energy, and environment. This is *option 1A*, as you clearly demonstrated in the ESEE phase II: analysis of program options.

In the draft report you state that option 2B is the leading candidate because it "ranked third or fourth (out of six) on all the ESEE consequences described by the evaluation criteria—falling in the middle of the range of regulatory options and balancing the conflicting goals of habitat protection and allowing conflicting uses." But there is an error in logic in this assessment because the goals of habitat protection versus economic, social, and energy needs are in fact *not conflicting*, as I explain below.

In the ESEE phase II: analysis of program options, Table 4-34 is the overall "summary of program option analysis." In this table you ranked each option 1st through 6th based on its positive effect on 18 criteria grouped into the following categories: economic, social, environmental, energy, and other. If you take the average ranking for each option across all criteria, you find that option 1A ranks highest overall (meaning the score closest to 1) with a score of 2.4 versus option 2B which has a score of 3.7. More importantly, option 1A ranks as high or higher than option 2B in *every single* category, including economic factors. In other words, even not taking environmental factors into consideration at all, option 1A provides the greatest benefit to our community. So why choose a plan that ranks third or fourth in each category when we can have a plan that ranks first in each category?

This is one of those rare and wonderful cases in which we actually can have the best of both worlds. It simply requires recognizing that we don't have to compromise between environmental protection and development—the two are inextricably linked. So I urge you to choose the option that is best for the economy, energy, society, *and* the environment. Choose option 1A.

In addition to my letter, I have provided you with a copy of Table 4-34 along with my calculations showing the rankings of each option.

Thank you very much for all the time and hard work you have put into this project and for considering community input in making this important decision.

Sincerely,

Ausablinay

Susan Murray 11555 SW Denfield St. Beaverton, OR 97005

4/15/04

	Option 1A: Most habitat protection	Option 1B: Moderate habitat protection	Option 1C: Least habitat protection	Option 2A: Most habitat protection	Option 2B: Moderate habitat protection	Option 2C: Least habitat protection
Criteria	Highest level of protection for all habitats	High level of protection for highest value habitat, moderate protection for other habitats	Moderate level of protection for higher value habitats, no protection for lowest value habitat	Moderate level of protection in high urban development value areas, high level of protection in other areas	Low level of protection in high urban development value areas, moderate level of protection in other areas	No protection in high urban development value areas, moderate level of habitat protection in other areas
Economic factors						
 Supports the regional economy by providing development opportunities (such as residential, commercial, industrial) 	Ranks 6 th : Provides least development opportunities due to highest levels of habitat protection on residential, commercial and industrial lands.	Ranks 4th: Provides some development opportunities for residential, commercial and industrial.	Ranks 2 nd : Provides substantial development opportunities for all types of development.	Ranks 5 ^m : Provides minimal development opportunities because residential development in some high value habitat is prohibited.	Ranks 3 rd : Provides moderate development opportunities due to less habitat protection in all commercial and industrial areas and some residential land.	Ranks 1 st : Provides most development opportunities due to relaxed habitat protection; provides more development opportunities in commercial and industrial areas than in residential areas.
 Supports economic values associated with ecosystem services (such as flood control, clean water, recreation, amenity values) 	Ranks 1 st . Retains most existing ecosystem services across all habitat classes. Highest protection for habitat.	Ranks 3 ^{rn} : Retains moderate ecosystem services with moderate protection to high value habitat.	Ranks 6 ^m : Retains least ecosystem services overall for all habitat classes.	Ranks 2 nd : Retains substantial ecosystem services with strict protection to high and medium value stream corridors.	Ranks 4 ^m ; Retains some ecosystem services. Applies moderate protection to stream corridors but higher protection to upland wildlife habitat.	Ranks 5 ^m : Retains minimal ecosystem services due to relaxed protection in areas with high and medium development value.
3. Promotes recreational use and amenities	Ranks 1 th . Promotes the most recreational benefits by prohibiting development in highest quality habitat lands.	Ranks 3 rd : Provides moderate recreational benefits by applying relatively strong protection to the highest value habitats.	Ranks 6 ^m . Provides least recreational benefits because it applies only moderate protection to highest value habitat.	Ranks 2 nd . Promotes substantial recreational benefits of stream corridors, does not apply same protection to wildlife habitat.	Ranks 4 ^m : Promotes some recreational benefits, mostly on park land.	Ranks 5 th : Promotes minimal recreational benefits mostly on park land.
 Distribution of economic tradeoffs 	No rank: Privately-owned habitat land bears greater proportion of highest protection than publicly-owned habitat.	No rank: Privately-owned and publicly-owned land bears equal proportion of highest protection.	No rank: Privately-owned and publicly-owned land bears equal proportion of highest protection.	No rank: Publicly-owned habitat land bears greater proportion of highest protection than privately- owned habitat land.	No rank: Publicly-owned habitat land bears greater proportion of highest protection than privately- owned habitat land.	No rank: Publicly-owned habitat land bears greatest proportion of highest protection.
 Minimizes need to expand the urban growth boundary (UGB) and increase development costs. 	Ranks 6 th . Affects the need to expand the UGB the most; highest level of protection restricts development.	Ranks 4 th : Moderately affects the need to expand the UGB because of restrictive protection levels.	Ranks 1 st . Least need to expand UGB; lowest protection levels provide most development opportunity.	Ranks 5 th : Substantially affects need to expand the UGB because of restrictive protection levels.	Ranks 3 rd : Some need to expand UGB but less restrictive protection.	Ranks 2 nd . Minimal need to expand the UGB because low level of protection provides development opportunity.
Social factors						
 Minimizes impact on property owners 	Ranks 6 ^m : Affects the most property owners with the highest level of habitat protection regardless of zoning.	Ranks 4 th : Moderately affects all property owners, but does not apply highest habitat protection anywhere.	Ranks 1 st : Affects the least number of property owners and applies lower levels of habitat protection.	Ranks 5 th : Substantially affects large number of property owners with strong protection, especially in residential and rural areas.	Ranks 3 ^{ra} : Affects some business landowners with moderate protection, but high protection is applied to residential and rural owners.	Ranks 2 ^{no} : Minimally affects business landowners, but many residential and rural property owners are affected with lower levels of protection.
7. Minimizes impact on location and choices for housing and jobs	Ranks 6 th : Most effect on the location and choices available for jobs and housing by	Ranks 4 ^m : Moderate effect on the location and choices available for jobs and housing,	Ranks 2 nd : Minimal effect on housing location and choices, some effect on job location	Ranks 5 th : Substantial effect on housing location and choices, moderate effect on	Ranks 3 rd : Some effect on job location and choices, moderate effect on housing	Ranks 1 st : Least effect on job location and choices, minimal effect on housing location and

Table 4-34. Summary of program option analysis.

DRAFT: ESEE Phase II Analysis

:

.

.

April 2004

.

•

	Option 1A: Most habitat protection	Option 1B: Moderate habitat protection	Option 1C: Least habitat protection	Option 2A: Most habitat protection	Option 2B: Moderate habitat protection	Option 2C: Least habitat protection
Criteria	Highest level of protection for all habitats	High level of protection for highest value habitat, moderate protection for other habitats	Moderate level of protection for higher value habitats, no protection for lowest value habitat	Moderate level of protection in high urban development value areas, high level of protection in other areas	Low level of protection in high urban development value areas, moderate level of protection in other areas	No protection in high urban development value areas, moderate level of habitat protection in other areas
	applying high protection levels to all habitats.	applies a medium protection level to residential and employment land.	and choices. Applies lower protection levels to all land regardless of zoning.	job location and choices. Applies high protection levels to residential land, medium protection levels to most employment land.	location and choices. Applies lower protection levels to employment land, moderate protection levels to residential land.	choices. Applies lowest protection levels to employment land, moderate protection levels to residential land.
8. Preserves habitat for future generations	Ranks 1 st : Preserves the most habitat for future generations by applying high levels of protection to all habitats.	Ranks 3 rd : Preserves a moderate amount of habitat for future generations, focuses protection on higher value habitats.	Ranks 6 ^m : Preserves the least amount of habitat for future generations, applies lower level of protection to higher value habitats.	Ranks 2 nd : Preserves a substantial amount of habitat for future generations. Higher protection levels applied to highest value stream corridors, moderate and high protection applied to other habitats.	Ranks 4 ^m : Preserves some habitat for future generations. Applies some protection to highest value habitats and moderate protection to other habitats.	Ranks 5 th : Preserves a minimal amount of habitat for future generations. Habitat in areas of high urban development value is not preserved, habitat in other areas receives low and moderate protection.
 Maintains cultural heritage and sense of place 	Ranks 1 st : Provides the most protection for the highest value habitat, highest level of protection may result in need for expanding the UGB.	Ranks 3 rd : Provides moderate protection for highest value habitat, less potential for expanding the UGB.	Ranks 6 ^m : Provides the least protection to highest value habitat, habitat outside UGB at less risk.	Ranks 2 nd : Provides substantial protection to highest value habitat, a small portion in high urban development value areas receive moderate protection.	Ranks 4 ^m : Provides some protection to highest value habitat; applies low protection to habitat in high urban development value areas.	Ranks 5 th : Provides minimal protection to highest value habitat, habitat in high urban development values receives no protection.
10. Preserves amenity value of resources (quality of life, property values, views)	Ranks 1 st : Retains the most amenity value in the highest value habitats.	Ranks 3 rd : Retains moderate level of amenity value in the highest value habitats.	Ranks 6 ^m : Retains least level of amenity value in wildlife habitat, slightly more in stream corridors.	Ranks 2 nd : Retains substantial amenity value in highest value habitats, more protection for streams than upland habitat.	Ranks 4 ^m : Retains some level of amenity value in highest value habitat, more protection for streams than upland habitat.	Ranks 5 th : Retains a minimal level of amenity value, highest value wildlife habitat receives more protection.
Environmental factors						
11. Conserves existing watershed health and restoration opportunities	Ranks 1 st . Preserves most high value habitat; provides substantial protection to other habitats.	Ranks 3 rd : Preserves moderate amount of all habitats; higher protection for highest value habitat.	Ranks 6 th : Preserves least amount of habitat; moderate protection for higher value habitat; no protection for lowest value habitat.	Ranks 2 nd : Preserves substantial amount of habitat. Highest protection levels for most high value habitat, moderate protection for other habitats.	Ranks 4 th . Preserves some amount of habitat. Higher value habitats receive moderate protection levels; other habitats receive lower protection.	Ranks 5 ^m : Preserves minimal amount of habitat. Provides low protection levels for all habitat classes, no protection for highest value habitat in some circumstances.
12. Retains multiple habitat functions provided by forest areas	Ranks 1 st . Retains the most forest cover in both vacant and developed habitat lands.	Ranks 2 nd : Retains substantial amount of forest cover in both vacant and developed habitat lands.	Ranks 6 ^m : Retains least amount of forest cover, likely to result in significant forest habitat loss over time.	Ranks 3 rd : Retains moderate amount of forest cover, some protection for all forested habitat areas and highest protection for forested habitat in stream corridors.	Ranks 4 th : Retains some amount of forest cover, some protection for almost all forested habitat areas.	Ranks 5 th : Retains minimal amount of forest cover, low protection levels for most forested habitat areas.
13. Promotes riparian corridor connectivity and overall habitat	Ranks 1 st : Promotes most stream corridor continuity and overall habitat connectivity.	Ranks 3 rd : Promotes moderate retention of connectivity. Provides small	Ranks 6 ^m : Promotes least retention of connectivity and likely to result in most	Ranks 2 nd : Promotes substantial retention of stream corridor continuity; moderate	Ranks 4 ^m : Promotes some retention of connectivity in stream corridors and between	Ranks 5 ^m : Promotes minimal retention of connectivity, likely to result in significantly

DRAFT: ESEE Phase II Analysis

April 2004

	Option 1A: Most habitat protection	Option 1B: Moderate habitat protection	Option 1C: Least habitat protection	Option 2A: Most habitat protection	Option 2B: Moderate habitat protection	Option 2C: Least habitat protection
Criteria	Highest level of protection for all habitats	High level of protection for highest value habitat, moderate protection for other habitats	Moderate level of protection for higher value habitats, no protection for lowest value habitat	Moderate level of protection in high urban development value areas, high level of protection in other areas	Low level of protection in high urban development value areas, moderate level of protection in other areas	No protection in high urban development value areas, moderate level of habitat protection in other areas
connectivity -		connector habitats with higher protection, does not preserve as much stream corridor continuity.	reduction of regional connectivity. No protection for small connector habitats.	protection for small connector habitats.	upland habitats.	reduced regional connectivity.
14. Conserves habitat quality and biodiversity provided by large habitat areas	Ranks 1 st : Conserves the most large habitat areas.	Ranks 2 nd : Conserves a substantial amount of large habitat areas, moderate risk for urban development fragmenting large habitats.	Ranks 6 ^m : Conserves least amount of large habitat areas, likely to result in significant fragmentation.	Ranks 3 rd : Conserves moderate amount of large habitat areas, small amount of low protection applied to portions of some large habitats.	Ranks 4 ^m : Conserves some amount of large habitat areas, lower protection levels applied to all large habitats.	Ranks 5 ^m : Conserves minimal amount of large habitat areas, likely to result in significant fragmentation of large habitats.
15. Supports biodiversity through conservation of sensitive habitats and species	Ranks 1 st . Supports the most biodiversity by applying highest levels of protection to sensitive habitats and stream corridors.	Ranks 2 nd /3 rd : Supports a substantial amount of biodiversity, applies more protection to sensitive habitats than stream corridors.	Ranks 5 ^m : Supports a minimal amount of biodiversity, applies moderate protection level to sensitive habitats and stream corridors.	Ranks 2 ⁿ⁰ /3 ^{re} : Supports a substantial amount of biodiversity, applies more protection to stream corridors than sensitive habitats.	Ranks 4 ^m : Supports some biodiversity, applies higher protection to stream corridors than sensitive habitats.	Ranks 6 ^m : Supports the least amount of biodiversity, likely to result in substantial loss of sensitive habitats and sensitive species.
Energy Factors						
16. Promotes compact urban form	Ranks 6 ^m : Promotes compact urban form the least. Highest protection levels applied to vacant land intended for urban uses (housing & jobs).	Ranks 4 th : Moderately promotes compact urban form. Some reduction in development potential on all habitat land.	Ranks 1 st . Promotes compact urban form the most. Development allowed in lowest habitats, moderate protection to other habitat lands.	Ranks 5 th : Minimally promotes compact urban form. Development opportunities reduced in all habitat areas.	Ranks 3 rd : Promotes some amount of compact urban form. Development opportunities reduced in most habitat areas.	Ranks 2 nd : Substantially promotes compact urban form. Development opportunities on business land less impacted than residential land.
17. Promotes green infrastructure	Ranks 1 st : Conserves the most vegetation and forested areas.	Ranks 3 rd : Conserves a moderate amount of vegetation and forested areas.	Ranks 6 th : Conserves the least amount of vegetation and forested areas.	Ranks 2 nd : Conserves a substantial amount of vegetation and forested areas.	Ranks 4 ^m : Conserves some vegetation and forested areas.	Ranks 5 ^m : Conserves a minimal amount of vegetation and forested areas.
Other criteria						
18. Assists in protecting fish and wildlife protected by the federal Endangered Species Act	Ranks 1 ^{sc} Provides most protection to sensitive habitats; most protection for hydrology and riparian functions; most likely to protect sensitive species.	Ranks 3 rd : Provides substantial protection to sensitive habitats and species. Similar to 2A, but provides less protection for hydrologic conditions.	Ranks 6 ^m : Provides least protection to sensitive habitats and species, hydrology. Minimal protection for riparian functions.	Ranks 2 nd : Provides substantial protection to sensitive habitats and species. Similar to 1B, but provides more protection for hydrologic conditions.	Ranks 4 th : Provides some protection to sensitive habitats; less likely to maintain hydrologic conditions or riparian functions.	Ranks 5 th : Provides minimal protection to sensitive habitats and species and hydrology. Provides least protection for riparian functions.
19. Assists in meeting water quality standards required by the federal Clean Water Act	Ranks 1 ^{sc} Provides most protection for clean water. Most protective of forest canopy, habitat near streams and on steep slopes; most protection for hydrology.	Ranks 3 rd : Provides moderate protection for clean water. Moderate protection for for slopes, wetlands, and resources near streams. Substantial protection for forested areas.	Ranks 5 ^m : Provides minimal protection for the natural resources important to protecting water quality. Least protection for forested areas.	Ranks 2 nd : Provides substantial protection for clean water, with strict protection for slopes, wetlands, and resources near streams. Moderate protection for forested areas.	Ranks 4 th : Some protection for slopes and wetlands, hydrologic conditions, habitat near streams, hydrologic conditions and forest. Potential for decreased water quality.	Ranks 6 th : Provides least protection for slopes and wetlands, habitat near streams, and hydrology; minimal protection for forested areas. Most potential for poor water quality.

·

DRAFT: ESEE Phase II Analysis

April 2004

Page 140

Category	Option 1A	Option 1B	Option 1C	Option 2A	Option 2B	Option 2C
economic factors*	3.5**	3.5	· 3.8	3.5	3.5	3.3
social factors	3	3.4	4.2	3.2	3.6	3.6
environmental factors	1	2.4	5.8	2.4	4	5.2
energy factors	. 3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
other factors	1	3	5.5	2	4	5.5
overall ranking	2.4	3.1	4.6	2.9	3.7	4.2

* Under economic factors, #4 "distribution of edonomic tradeoffs," was not considered since no ranks were given.

** Scores are the average ranking across all criteria under the designated category. For instance, option 2B for economic factors ranked 3rd, 4th, 4th, and 3rd for criteria 1,2,3, and 5, respectively, so its score is (3+4+4+3)/4=3.5

03-16-04

041504C-06

LADIES & GENTLEMEN OF METRO:

MY NAME IS RICHARD CAYO & I OWN PROPERTY AT S.E. 42 ND & JOHNSON CR. BV. IN MILWAUKIE, ORE.

THE N. SIDE OF MY PROPERTY 15 APPROX. 60' ABOVE JOHNSON CREEK. HAVING LIVED HERE FOR OVER 28 YEARS & HAVING, LOOKED AT JOHNSON CREEK NEARLY EVERY DAY FOR 28 YEARS THE ONLY CHANGE I'VE NOTICED OVER THIS SPAN OF TIME IS THAT THE CREEK HAS GOTTEN MORE & MORE GARBAGE THROWN INTO IT & HAS BECOME MORE POLLUTED FROM STORM WATER EACH YEAR & NOTH-ING HAS EVER BEEN DONE TO CLEAN IT UP.

ABOUT A YEAR & A HALF AGO YOU METRO PEOPLE CAME BUT WITH YOUR GRANDIOSE PLAN TO "MAKE ALL THE PWERS CREEKS BEAUTIFUL & NATURAL AGAIN" AT EVERY ILAND OWNERS EXPENSE -OF COURSE, ADJOINING

2056 IT TOOK A LOT OF OUR EFFORT TO GET THAT IDEA "ITABLED" - BUT NOW-HERE YOU COME AGAIN WITH A NEW STUDY !- WOW !

EVEN THOUGH JOHNGON CREEK WAS CHANNALIZED DURING THE 1930'S AS A W.P.A. PROJECT (CHANNA-LIZED MEANS THE ENTIRE LENGTH OF THE CREEK HAS LARGE ROCKS ALONG ITS BOTTOM & UP BOTH BANKS)

THIS CHANNALIZING HAS MADE IT VIETUALLY IMPOSSIBLE FOR ANY FISH TO SPAWN OR GETANY KIND OF FOOD TO EAT.

YOU METRO PEOPLE KNOW THIS VET YOU PROPOSE ANOTHER STUDY TO IMPROVE THE CREEK FOR FISH. I TAKE GREAT OFFENSE AT SEE ING MY TAX DOLLARS GOING TO YOU PEOPLE (WAGES) SO YOU CAN WARRANT (HAVE AN EXCUSE FOR) YOUR JOB BY STUDYING THE GREEK TO DEATH.

YOU PRESENT US (FOR SUPPOSED APPROVAL) WITH YOUR WORTHLESS STUDIES & THE CREEKS JUST

30F6 GET DIPTIER & DIRTIER. WHAT A WASTE OF OUR MODEY IT WOULD SEEM TO ME TO BE A LOT MORE WORTHWHILE TO GET FORCE) THE CONVICTS IN VALL TO COME OUT & CLEAN UP THE DEBRIS & JUNK G THEN PUT HUGE FINES ON ANYONE THAT POLLUTES. TO HELP SOLVE THE PROBLEM -PUT UP SURVEILLANCE CAMERAS AT CRITICAL SPOTS & GIVE LARGE REWARDS FOR ANYONE TURNING 10 POLLUTERS. THIS WOULD PERHAPS JONVE THE PROBLEM NOD & WE WOULDN'T NEED ANOTHER WORTHLESS STUDY TO PROVE MY POINT ABOUT HOW DIETY & LOATHSOME THE CREEK HAS BECOME _ I TOOK PICTURES AT 4 LOCATIONS ON MARCH 15-2004 (see attached Pictures)

4 OF 6 #1 - Johnson Cr. Bv. at the levidge accross Johnson Creeks at 45th 5T. #2 — 5. side of Bell Station grocery at bridge accross Johnson Creek at 5.E. Bell St. 1 Blud, #3-5. Bank accross 76th from A.C.F. West (8951 5.5. 76th DR) #4-End of 5-E. 76th DR occass from W. C. mol. Co. THE PICTURES AT 45th & J.C.B. AT BRIDGES SHOW A MEDIUM AMOUNT OF GARBAGE. THE PICTURES AT BELL STATION SHOW HUGE AMOUNTS OF CRAP & GARBAGE. while taking these pictuses A noticed the screeb was awfully "FOAMY" I WONDERED WHY?

5 OF 6

PICTURE # 3 WAS TAKEN ACCROSS THE STREET FROM A.C.F. WEST SHOWING BATTERIES - TIRES -JUNK-GARDAGE etc.

2 BLOCKS FURTHER N. TO THE END OF 76th I. FOUND A ± 2'0" HIGH DAM ON JOHNSON CREEK & THERE WERE <u>MOUNTAINS</u> OF WHITE FOAM FLOATING, DOWN THE CREEK BELOW THE SMALL DAM.

BESIDES THE PICTURES I TOOK I WANTED TO FIND OUT WHY ALL THIS WAS ON THE WATER SO-I WENT TO NOHNSON CREEK RENTALS & DRUG MY FRIEND ED (THE OWNER BACK TO 76 th & WE BOTH LOOKED IN DISSBELIEF AT ALL THE GARBAGE & ED SAID FROM ALL THE EMPTY CONTAINERS -SOMEONE WAS MIXING UP "METH". & DUMPING DETERGENT, D. INTO THE CREEK AS A BY PRODUCT.

I THOUGHT TO MYSELF "OUR CIVILIZATION HAS REACHED A NEW LOW IN ITS EVOLUTION.

6 OF 6 # 1- BECAUSE OUR POPULACE ALLOWS METRO TO EXIST IN ITS PRESENT DAY FORM : EXTREMLY WASTEFUL OF OUR RESOURCES & TAX DOLLARS. #2- OUR CITIZENS HAVE BECOME 50 THOUGHTLESS & INCONSIDERATE OF OTHER FORMS OF LIFE (IN 10HNSONSOR ANY OTHER WATERWAY, OUR EDUCATION SYSTEM HAS FAILED. 11 (1)1 OUR ENFORCEMENT thank you god the time Fichand Carfo 503-059-1951

0415040-06
































I'm here today to put a face on the E-mail I sent to everyone, and I've brought extra copies for everyone's review today.

I'm here to defend those of us who are targeted for having their hours cut in the current Budget Proposal.

Our livelihoods are at risk.

Our Health and Safety is at risk.

For as long as I have worked for Metro in the Scalehouse we have perpetually worked under the threat of having staff levels cut. Vacated Positions have gone unfilled. The net result of this on my group has been one of increasingly low morale, diminished motivation, and a depleted sense of encouragement. All of these are IN the face, and ON the faces of the individuals that make \rightarrow those figures happen day in, and day out.

Over time these threats & cuts have taken a toll on all of us. We experience Health problems directly related to this stress. We've reached a point where enough is enough. We are expected to maintain the same level of customer service with continually fewer workers, continually more customers. Nothing more can be cut without directly affecting the level of service.

I suggest to you that we have proven ourselves to flexible through various changes in working conditions:

- learning new programs on the fly
- decreased staffing levels

- increased business demands

In all of this, it just doesn't make sense to balance a budget on the backs of those individuals on the frontlines of your profit center.

I encourage you to consider the "Sustainability of **their** Environment"

Janice Strand 4/15/04 17014 SERhone Portland, OR 97236

Exhibit 1 Number Of Outgoing Non-Automated Loads Handled Per Scalehouse FTE

<u>.</u>	FTE Rate Of Pay ¹	Loads ²	Loads/FTE	Notes:	
1999	13.54	243,086	17,957	1	Source = Official payroll records of hours paid to "permanent"
2000	13.14	246,141	18,731		employees divided by 2,080.
2001	13.78	255,071	18,508		
2002	13.67	267,870	19,599	2	Source = Scalehouse transaction data.
2003	13.91	275,825	19,830		•
2004 estimated ³	14.68	313,243	21,332	3	Estimate = Extrapolation of actual Jan+Feb 2004 data.

The loads/FTE and dollars colleced/FTE for scalehouse employees far exceeds the rates for househould hazardous waste (HHW) FTE.

The budget proposes cutting 1.0 FTE during FY 2004-05. An alternative is to not fill the vacated Landfill Senior Supervisor position.

```
Average fees collected per FTE (excluding automation) during CY 2003 =
```

\$819,289 this is about \$38/load



The Case Against Cutting Scalehouse FTE

- 1. Workload, as measured by transactions per scalehouse FTE, now stands at more than 19,000 transactions per year. The average FTE takes in more than \$800,000 a year in scalehouse receipts.
- 2. Workload rates have increased every year since 1999 to the point where, last year, scalehouse personnel were feeling over stressed during peak periods of the day and were fearing consequential safety issues would ensue.
- 3. Workload thus far this year has increased so much that 1.0 FTE should be ADDED, not cut, just to keep the workload at last year's levels.
- 4. The rationale given in the proposed budget for cutting a scalehouse FTE makes no sense. The rationale states that opening Metro Central one hour later will result in a savings of one FTE. Well, there is no such thing as a one-hour-per-day shift. Even if there was this only pencils out to 363 hours saved per year; less than 1/5th an FTE. More importantly, shifts run through the peak load hours of 10 AM to 2 PM. Given the way shifts are spread across both sites, if you cut an FTE you are requiring the remaining people at BOTH sites to handle about 19,000 more loads; thereby increasing stress and the probability of safety accidents and long term disabilities.

April 15, 2004

Metro Council Metro 600 NE Grand Avenue Portland, OR 97232

Dear Metro Council,

City of WILSONVILLE in OREGON **30000 SW Town Center Loop E Wilsonville, Oregon 97070** (**503**) **682-1011** (503) 682-1015 Fax (503) 682-0843 TDD

We are writing to express our strong support for Council President Bragdon's budget proposal for Fiscal-Year 2004-05 related to creating a stable, long-term funding source for improvements and management of regionally significant open spaces purchased with the 1995 Greenspaces Bond Measure. Securing over 8,000 acres of natural resource areas is a truly remarkable achievement, but the next steps need to be taken to begin to provide access, restore these sites, and improve key properties for the public to enjoy.

The City of Wilsonville has been working on the *Wilsonville Tract Master Plan and Natural Resources Management Plan* for over two years, and before that spent many years working with Metro Staff to purchase the property from the State. From our previous achievements, it is clear that we have a solid partnership. The City and the citizens of the Wilsonville area have a strong commitment to implementing the vision that was created in the Master Plan, and we are enthusiastic about the potential that the property has for environmental education, resource recovery and enhancement, passive recreation and experiencing nature close to home.

As City Staff managing the *Wilsonville Tract Master Plan and Natural Resources Management Plan*, we recognize the important role that the Wilsonville Tract plays in the significant planning efforts occurring on the west side of Wilsonville. With the adoption of the Villebois Village Master Plan on land adjacent to the Tract, the Tonquin Trail feasibility study, Coffee Lake Creek basin restoration and the support of the West Linn/Wilsonville School District and the excellent environmental science based curriculum offered by the Center for Research on Environmental Science and Technology (CREST), the benefits to the community of opening this site cannot be overstated. Children from all over the region will be able to use the site as an outdoor classroom, which in turn will create the next generation of stewards.

You are to be commended for your vision in wanting to provide the citizens of the region with an opportunity to experience these regional open spaces. I want to urge the Metro Council to support Council President Bragdon and adopt the proposed Fiscal-Year 2004-05 budget.

Respectfully submitted,

Neamto

Chris Neamtzu, AIC⊉ Manager of Long-Range Planning

Keny Za

Kerry Rappold Natural Resources Program Manager



April 15, 2004

City of WILSONVILLE in OREGON **30000 SW Town Center Loop E Wilsonville, Oregon 97070** (503) 682-1011 (503) 682-1015 Fax (503) 682-0843 TDD

Metro Council Metro 600 NE Grand Avenue Portland, OR 97232

Dear Metro Council,

We, the Wilsonville Planning Commission, want to express our support for Council President David Bragdon's FY 2004-05 budget proposal to create a long-term funding source to improve four significant open spaces into regional parks, one being the Wilsonville Tract. The Planning Commission shares the Council President's view that we need to take care of the land that we have, and that it is important to provide park facilities that are distributed equitably across the region.

The Planning Commission unanimously adopted the Wilsonville Tract Master Plan and Natural Resources Management Plan, and is a strong supporter of the concepts and goals identified in the plan. The citizens of the Wilsonville area place a high priority on the value this land provides to the community, and will continue to be supporters and partners in the development and restoration of the Wilsonville Tract.

We appreciate the Metro Council's consideration of this important issue, and want to encourage adoption of the proposed FY 04-05 budget so that these properties can become available to the public.

Sincerely,

Debra Iguchi, Chair Mary Hinds, Co-Chair

Craig Faiman Sue Guyton

Richard Goddard



0415040-10



April 15, 2004

Metro Council 600 NE Grand Ave. Portland, OR 97232

RE: Metro Regional Fish and Wildlife Protection Program

Dear Metro Councilors:

Thank you for the opportunity to present testimony at this midpoint in the Metro Regional Fish and Wildlife Protection Program planning process. My testimony is presented on behalf of the Tualatin Riverkeepers and our 700 members.

Having participated in this planning process myself for about four years now, I must admit that I am surprised and disappointed that the recommendation, at this stage, does not identify a single piece of property throughout the entire region worthy of a prohibit designation. Although the program elements are yet to be determined, it appears that we may be on a course that would fall short of meeting the regional goal that was so thoughtfully developed at the outset of this process.

We know, for example, that existing urban development in the Metro region, how we manage the urban landscape today, has degraded water quality and diminished aquatic and upland habitat. All of the urban streams in the Tualatin Basin fail to meet state water quality standards on multiple parameters and we are losing sensitive habitat. To be successful, this program must achieve an improvement in water quality and habitat conditions at the same time that we are developing more compact urban communities. It is not an easy task.

The following recommendations are offered to refocus attention on protection of the highest value resources that we believe can be protected with flexibility achieved through development and integration of two key program elements to achieve infiltration of stormwater and preservation/restoration of tree canopy.

Goal 5 Program Recommendations

• Apply Prohibit designation to Class I and Class II Riparian and Class A Upland Habitat. These areas are extremely difficult to replace through mitigation and are the <u>highest</u> priority to protect for ecological value and ecosystem services, e.g. undeveloped floodplain is not adequately protected under Title 3.

- Mitigation should be approached cautiously given the low rate of success. True costs
 need to be reflected in the mitigation ratio to achieve replacement of the loss. Mitigation
 requirments <u>must</u> include monitoring and enforcement. Mitigation will require land. As
 we move into Phase III. there will need to be a calculation of the number of acres needed
 to fulfill potential mitigation requirements <u>within the sub-basin where the loss occurs</u>.
- Conflict in High Urban areas can be avoided by adjusting site specific High Urban boundaries and adjusting desities by a variety of strategies. These conflicts can also be eased by integrating design criteria that infiltrates stormwater and preserves free or enhances tree canopy. These strategies should be developed in Phase III Goal 5 program planning. Metro has already developed a significant tool in the the Greenstreets Manual.
- Retain flexibility to reassess ALP in Phase III to assure the adopted vision and goals are achieved... to conserve, protect and restore a continuous ecologically viable stream corridor that maintains connections with adjacent upland habitat. The ESEE section that assesses the options to meet ESA and CWA refger to option 1A as the best option... but only when restoration and infiltration strategies are coupled with this highest option.
- At this stage, prior to development of the program, Impact Areas should retain LL category. There may be opportunities to negotiate low impact design criteria (infiltration of stormwater and tree preservation) by retaining a LL classification.
- There is a need to address unmapped headwater streams and steep slopes currently outside of Title 3 for most of the region. The program phase should consider the application of Clean Water Services' Design and Construction standards for intermittent streams draining 10-100 acres throughout the region.
- In considering adjustments to limit definitions in the program phase, the suggested Strictly Limit definition raised in the staff report, "allows trails, roads and other public access to meet the public good" still would need to meet the avoid, minimize and mitigate criteria when a water resource is present. Also, a "Lightly Limit" that assumes no lost in development capacity.... is a big change from protecting 50% of habitat as assumed in the ESEE analysis. I suggest not moving too dramatically from the existing limit definitions.
- Consider utilizing Metro Parks and Greenspaces expertise in the development of nonregulatory programs such as restoration and acquisition <u>and</u> developing strategic partnerships with local government and non-governmental organizations to achieve long tern and larger scale restoration that can leverage dollars.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Marshall

Executive Director Tualatin Riverkeepers

Design Division Annual Report 2002/03

0415040 - 11

Division Goals - A New Focus

The Design Division shifted focus in the 2002/03 fiscal year. The emphasis has been on long term planning and design goals. The division has made a concerted effort to address longstanding wayfinding issues at the zoo, develop a better understanding of institutional branding philosophies, and focus on permanent exhibit planning and design.



Katagiri/03

Goals included:

■ Focusing on the visitor experience to implement improvements to the zoo's branding efforts.

■ Improving awareness of the zoo's enrichment and conservation efforts through interactive interpretives.

■ Serving as interdepartmental artistic advisors to maintain consistent and superior design standards.



Wayfinding

An internally driven team effort in the Spring of 2002 produced a report on longstanding wayfinding issues on the zoo campus. The report was shared with senior management in the Fall, and several components were adopted into the division workplan for the year.

Surveys conducted with visitors indicated that 12% of zoo visitors had some difficulty in finding their way around the zoo campus. A new map design was formulated and tested with visitors in the Spring. Additional changes were implemented with input from the visitor



Kato/03

surveys and from staff comments. The map included color coordinated exhibit areas and a grid system for locating services and exhibits.

in the Summer of 2003. Additional components will be PACIFIC SHORES PRIMATES added next fiscal year. AFRICA GREAT NORTHWEST EXIT PLAN ELEVATION 30000

New directional arrows and a system for identifying visitor services were designed. The system is to be implemented

FACILITY DIRECTIONAL TRAIL SIDE POST MOUNT

Design Division Annual Report

The wayfinding system was enhanced by the design of new Zoo Street banners. The banners use imagery and titles to provide visitors with additional information about exhibits in the Pacific Shores area.

Graphics were generated to promote the new Deep Sea simulator ride. Banners lined the boardwalk, leading visitors to the ride location.

Additional on-grounds banners in Pacific Shores Plaza assisted visitors in locating the Winged Wonders butterfly exhibit.

Katagiri/03

T



Kaczmarek/Contract/03



Signage and Interiors

AFRICAPE

The Design Division worked with restaurant staff and contractors to upgrade restaurant interiors. Improvements were made to signage and graphics in the Africafe service area and dining room. A lighter, brighter color scheme was implemented to create a cleaner, warmer environment for visitors. Images of African animals from the zoo's photo files were installed to carry the African theme into the dining areas and party rooms.

Color was also added to the Cascade Grill restaurant, providing a more pleasant and family-friendly feel to the lobby and dining rooms.

Sonderman/03

Kaczmarek/Contract/03



Design Division Annual Report

Exhibits

The division has been developing long range design plans for the Eagle Canyon Exhibit due to open in fiscal year 2003/04. In the interim, the division focused on upgrades to the Winged Wonders and Orangutan exhibits.

Two new interactives were added to the Winged Wonders exhibit. Several other graphic panels were designed to focus on the Oregon Zoo's conservation programs and opportunities for visitors to create butterfly habitat in their own gardens.

The viewing area for the Orangutan exhibit was completely

renovated, and a climbing structure was installed nearby to allow children to experiment with typical primate behaviors.



Stoianoff/03



Butterflie

are free

Event & Program Graphics

The division continues to provide graphic design services to support events and programs at the zoo. This year new graphics were developed for ZooLights, spring events and the Summer Concert Series. The division also created graphics for studbooks, curriculum publications and special events, such as an appearance by Spider-Man at the Insect Zoo.



Kato/03

STRAW-COLORED

BATS





Development Support

The Design Division contributes support to the Oregon Zoo Foundation's efforts to raise community awareness about zoo projects, raise funds, and recognize donors. During fiscal year 02/03, the division created on-grounds donor recognition boards and developed informational materials about the California Condor recovery project and exhibit.



Sonderman/03



Contract/03

Design Division Annual Report

General Performance

During the past fiscal year, the Design Division handled a total of 252 design requests. There were 209 maintenance alerts. The images in this report are only a small sampling of the work performed by the division. Less visible services include

general maintenance of all zoo interpretive graphics and audio visual systems, and support for zoo programs through temporary signs and graphics that help vistors find event activities at the zoo.

The Design Division provides support services to other divisions within the zoo. A survey program that was initiated in fiscal year 2000/2001 provides baseline information on efficiency, timeliness and customer satisfaction. This year's survey results are as follows:

Design Survey 02/03

- Was the work completed on time?
- 42 Yes
 - 3 No
 - 1 Blank
- If there was a delay, were you notified?
 6 Yes
 0 No
 40 Blank
- Were you satisfied with the product? 44 Yes
 - 1 No



Kaczmarek/Contract/03

1 Blank

- Were staff cooperative and helpful?
- 45 Yes
- 0 No
- 1 Blank

• Were staff available to meet with you on your project? 39 Yes

- 0 No
- 7 Blank
 - Dialik

•Were phone calls and e-mail requests responded to quickly? 44 Yes

- 0 No
- 2 Blank

Note: results based on 46 surveys received

DesignDivision Annual Report 2001/2002

Division Goals — Planning and implementation

The Design Division started the year with the successful completion of the Zoo's temporary exhibit, "Cold Blooded Kingdom," an exhibit of reptiles and amphibians. The Design Division has actively pursued greater responsibility for on-grounds project design in wayfinding and exhibit interpretation. At the same time, the division continues to produce high quality print graphics in support of Zoo programs and events. Primary goals for the year included:

- continued development of a design "philosophy" for the division as it relates to the Zoo environment and publications.
- documentation of the design standards for publications, signage and interpretive design.



Kato/02

- improve the visibility of the Africa exhibit and plan for future wayfinding upgrades.
- provide high quality interpretive design for new permanent or temporary exhibits.
- provide support to the Zoo retail operation to increase revenues.
- continue to build positive client relationships.
- increase our team's effectiveness through time managment training and practices.

DesignDivision Annual Report 2001/2002

Implementation of goals

A division retreat held in November focused on clarifying, with the Zoo Director and Deputy Director, the vision of the zoo that will provide the basis and support for new exhibits that are

developed. Discussion points included the quality of the work currently being produced, areas of special concern and the concept of a biopark.

Design Standards were developed to document the key design elements in use in Zoo print graphics, signage, banners and interpretive displays. The standards are contained in three volumes, the Graphic Standards Manual, the Uniform & Vehicle Standards Manual, and the Signage and Interpretive Standards Manual. The manuals are maintained and updated within the division.



Contract/02

AFRICAFE

A design process was implemented to develop new exhibit signage and wayfinding improvements to the Africa Exhibit. Suggested improvements included changing pathway materials to clearly indicate the route to the exhibit, developing a series of African sculptures to line the pathway along the concert lawn, and the addition of a directional graphic treatment on the wall surfaces of AfriCafe. Due to time and budget constraints, the project was limited to the installation of new main exhibit signs and some pathway improvements at the Bats exhibit. These improvements were completed in June.

RERICA DIRECTIONAL

Sonderman/02

DesignDivision Annual Report 2001/2002



Sonderman/Contract 02

■ In January, division staff began a series of meetings to focus on wayfinding issues. The group worked independently to develop a proposal for upgrades to the existing wayfinding system and map. Staff members took on assignments to review existing wayfinding components, mock up examples of improvements, and outline both short-term and long-term upgrades. The proposal is currently under review in the division and will be presented to the Zoo administration later this summer.

■ The Division began the year with a fast-track schedule to design and implement the interpretive components for the new Amazon Flooded Forest exhibit. The addition of an experienced exhibit designer to the team has improved understanding of the process of exhibit development and preparation of fabrication documentation among the Design staff.

Several members of the staff have now successfully completed projects that required design development, placement of outside contracts with fabrication vendors, and supervision of fabrication and installation on the Zoo campus.

Damage to the mural in the Bats exhibit was evaluated, and plans were developed to resurface and repaint the mural. The repair work was postponed due to animal husbandry issues.

The Division coordinated the development of the temporary exhibit "Winged Wonders" that opened in May of this year. The collaborative project included team members from every division at the Zoo.



Sonderman/Stoianoff/Contract 02

DesignDivision

Annual Report 2001/2002

The division worked with Retail on several concepts for upgrades to the Cascade Outfitters store. A new banner was created for the front entry, and animal graphics were applied to the display windows.

Periodic meetings were scheduled with our "clients" in other Zoo divisions. The meetings allow the division

to plan for new projects, and minimize "rush" jobs. A new

"project survey" was developed to analyze the effectiveness of new exhibits and wayfinding programs. The division hosted a wrap-up meeting to review the exhibit design and development process for the Winged Wonders exhbit.





Kato/02

A new annual calendar of design projects has been developed as a planning tool. The calendar shows when projects overlap during the

year, and provides an opportunity to get appropriate staff or contractors in place to handle the projected workload. The Design Guidelines booklet has been added to the ZooNet to provide easier access by staff needing design services.

Design and production staff attended a one-day seminar on time management techniques. The Design Coordinator attended a seminar on managing multiple projects. Both seminars provided or reinforced techniques for more effective use of time and better prioritization of the division workload.



FY 1999-2004 Zoo Budget (Personal Services + Materials & Services + Cap)



Total (PS + MS+ Cap)

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Admin	975,374	1,049,688	451,422	499,862	544,144	386,805
Animal Mgmt	3,080,621	3,428,655	4,236,091	4,395,791	4,630,247	4,915,673
Design	650,332	509,854	596,768	642,272	611,786	586,161
Education	915,729	1,103,542	1,224,379	1,376,912	1,436,332	1,435,234
Facilities	4,304,964	5,353,968	2,789,370	3,035,216		
Marketing	1,234,273	1,551,756	1,605,564	1,686,825	1,752,650	1,669,475
Visitor Services	4,094,826	5,242,976	6,208,140	6,618,734	7,854,517	7,844,297
Construction M.			2,097,208	2,303,840	4,191,821	3,815,372

•

Katherine Otten Administrative Secretary, Design Services, Oregon Zoo 0.8 FTE

1. What I bring to the zoo

In addition to efficiently performing my general admin duties, I add value by providing the following professional services:

- project management major wayfinding effort
- research photography; interpretive content
- writing interpretive panels
- editing dozens of materials from all divisions
 "I love your idea of having one person (and you'd be the best) serving as the official proof reader." 3/5/04 email from Jane Hartline

2. While I was gone: Parental Leave, Summer 2003

- No approval for temp, even though only 20% of my leave was paid, saving the zoo \$5,000.
- Manager and other higher-paid staff spent a great deal of time on routine administrative tasks.
- Nearly \$7,000 was overspent, miscoded or otherwise erroneously handled.

3. If my position is eliminated: Support Pool?

"The idea of creating a support services pool, where all of the support staff could work for all of the divisions is an idea that I've been considering for a couple of years. I was looking at a pretty desperate picture of not enough revenue and too many expenses. So, I decided that we needed to try to see if we can get the support work done with fewer people." -3/4/04 email from Tony Vecchio

- No further information about how my duties will be handled has been given.
- A support pool may be helpful in situations where:
 - managers and support staff work in close proximity;
 - ongoing working relationships between managers and staff are not necessary; and
 - administrative tasks are routine, such as data entry, answering phones, and filing. None of these cases apply to the zoo.
- Any division with a budget deserves a dedicated support person familiar with that division's needs, suppliers and procedures to track that budget.
- Budget proposes a .25 FTE increase to a Guest Services Secretary.

4. Where can the money come from?

- It will cost about \$45,000 to keep me at the zoo (salary + fringe)
- Summer Cultural Festival \$51,000 add
- Secretarial increase in GS \$8,000 add

5. Design Division asked to pay disproportionately to its size

- We are a small division: 5.8 FTE with approximately \$600,000 total FY04 budget.
- Our division has maintained a budget at or below 1999 levels for the past 5 years.
- Our FTE has remained flat over at least the past 10 years (0.05 increase during this period). Requests to add FTE over the past several years have not made it to Council.
- Proposed cuts would reduce our FTE by 22% and our personnel by 29% (2 out of 7 would leave).
- Of the 4 "warm bodies" that would have to leave the zoo, half are from Design.
- The work we do directly impacts visitor experience. It is irresponsible to create new exhibits while eliminating staff who help build and maintain them.

SUMMARY: Maintaining the 0.8 FTE Design Services Administrative Secretary position will provide the zoo with valuable writing and editing skills, prevent costly mishandling of funds, and help preserve a proven successful division structure.

Ľ.

Date: April 15, 2004

To: Metro Councilors

Re: Metro Budget, including Proposed Excise Tax in Metro FY 04-05 Budget

I am Deanna Mueller-Crispin, a member of the Board of Directors of the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District (THPRD). I am here today speaking on my own behalf and on behalf of the President of our Board, John Griffiths, as the whole Board has not yet had an opportunity to discuss and take a position on this issue.

I would like to make a few points in support of Metro President Bragdon's proposal to establish an excise tax on solid waste disposal to support public access and site improvements to four regional parks and greenspaces purchased with funds from the 1995 bond measure, and one comment on another aspect of the Budget.

Mr. Griffiths and I support the proposed excise tax as an equitable way to provide much-needed funding to help regional parks, trails and greenspaces. More specifically:

- 1. The excise tax would provide a **stable funding source** for existing Metro parks and for management of new open space sites. This is particularly important as a source that could be used to provide matching funds to leverage grant funds from other sources for much-needed restoration.
- One of the areas slated to benefit from the new funding, Cooper Mountain, is of special interest. THPRD staff have been cooperating in its master planning process through the Cooper Mountain Project Advisory Committee. Site improvements on Cooper Mountain could be a very positive thing because:
 - a. Cooper Mountain is close to population centers in Beaverton and Washington County.
 - b. It is a large park that will provide resource-based, non-programmed recreation opportunities, complementing yet offering differing activities from those in THPRD's Nature Park.
 - c. Without a stable source of funding, development of public access and other related improvements to be identified in the Cooper Mountain master plan is problematic for the foreseeable future.
- 3. The proposed "**Technical Services Program**" could aid local jurisdictions in acquiring rights-of-way, planning and grant funding. All these activities are critical factors in helping to meet the service level needs desired by residents.
- 4. The new fund would also support stewardship, restoration of the land, educational and recreational opportunities in existing Metro sites. This

1

follows the public's desire to provide good ecological stewardship for properties already in public ownership. These activities maintain and improve the quality of life for everyone in the rapidly growing Portland metro area.

One additional thought. Although the new excise tax is necessary, it is not sufficient to maintain Metro's ability to support its on-going commitment to habitat and natural areas. Mr. Griffiths and I are also concerned that there be adequate funding in the Metro 04-05 budget to implement a successful Goal 5 fish and wildlife habitat program (now under development). Metro needs to continue its commitment to complete development of and to implement this program. It is particularly important that Metro be able to maintain their strong technical capability in mapping as the Goal 5 program continues to be developed, and to monitor its results over time once the program is adopted.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Ham Muellu-Ci Deanna Mueller-Crispin

Deanna Mueller-Crispin 8570 SW White Pine Lane Portland, OR 97225 Date: April 15, 2004

To:	Council President, David Bragdon Councilor Rex Burkholder Councilor Carl Hostica Councilor Susan McLain	Councilor Rod Monroe Councilor Brian Newman Councilor Rod Park
	Councilor Susan MicLain	Michael Jordan

From: David Kato, Graphics/Exhibits Designer, Oregon Zoo

RE: Oregon Zoo Proposed Budget FY 2004-05:

- Elimination of Administrative Secretary, 0.8 FTE, Design Services
- Elimination of Graphics/Exhibits Designer, 0.5 FTE, Design Services

FTE positions:

• I am a graphic designer, 1.0 FTE, at the Oregon Zoo. Two of my coworker's positions have been eliminated in the FY 2004-05 budget. For our department, this represents 22% of our FTE and 29% of our personnel.

• Katherine Otten and Stewart Sonderman are not merely 0.8 and .5 FTE. I work side-by-side with them and I see them as full, 1.0 people.

The visitor experience will be diminished.

• It will be devastating enough to loose two outstanding coworkers, but, there will be a greater loss to the visitor experience. Virtually all that Design Services does is focused on creating a positive and fun zoo experience, or helping other departments accomplish the same. See our your copies of our recent Annual Reports.

• As a designer I depend heavily on Katherine. Although she is classified as an Administrative Secretary, she does far more than data entry, telephone answering and filing. She is an integral part of the design team. Her publishing background makes her ideally suited to our department.

• Katherine not only understands, but anticipates our needs. She understands the design jargon. For instance, Katherine, fully understands, "Katherine, please research and find me photos of black rhinos, in tiff format, 300 dpi., 5" x 8" x 25 megabytes". I doubt anyone in a secretarial pool would even begin to understand this.

• Katherine's excellent writing, editing and researching skills would be difficult to replace as there is no one else at the zoo to replace what she does if her position is eliminated.

• Stewart Sonderman brings much design experience and maturity to the department. And, since, Stewart's work is now primarily involved in zoo exhibits, the elimination of his position will impact our ability to continue making the zoo experience positive and fun. Who will do the work and where will the funds come from? Stewart's salary does not come close to what it would cost to contract out what he currently does.

•Stewart was hired by Design Services to meet Tony Vecchio's recommendation to do more work in-house, whether designing new exhibits or renovating older exhibits. How will the zoo maintain the benefits that Stewart currently brings to the zoo?

Summary:

In summary, both positions directly impact our ability to continue delivering products and messages that enhance the visitor experience. Our value-added benefits are not measured in dollars, but in the laughter and smiles of our visitors.

Please restore the Administrative Secretary and Graphics/Exhibits Designer positions.

Thank you!

2420 SW Boundary Street Portland, OR 97239 April 9, 2004

Metro Council Metro 900 SE Grand Portland, OR 97232

Subject: Budget

Dear Metro Councilor:

I am writing about two programs that I think Metro should fund that are not in the President's recommended budget.

Compost specialist

Composting of yard debris and food is essential to reach the regional recovery goals. RSWMP counts on composting to account for 21% of total tons of waste diverted from the landfill to reach our 2000 goal and 33% of total waste diverted to reach our 2005 goal. Collection of food from large commercial generators was to have begun in 1997, from small commercial generators in 2000, and from households between 2000 and 2005. Here's what the region has achieved compared to the 2000 goal:

Home	composting	Commercial organics collection
2000 goal	11,100 tons	41,700 tons
2002 actual	8,555 tons	12,000 tons

The current compost specialist has done a good job of assuring the health of yard debris compost facilities and expanding backyard composting. But there is still a huge potential: About 20% of landfilled waste is yard debris and food, and with good systems and incentives, most of that could be recovered.

Composting is also important to conserve resources. Soil cannot continue to grow food and fiber year after year without being replenished with organic matter. Compost allows soil to retain nutrients and water, thereby reducing demand for water, fossil fuel fertilizers, and toxic pesticides.

For these reasons I propose that a compost specialist be incorporated into the budget but that the position be upgraded so that the staff person would have expertise in food composting. I think it would be a serious mistake for Metro not to have a compost specialist at this crucial time when an infrastructure needs to be established for commercial organics. You need new initiatives. In addition to collection of commercial organics, on-site composting at businesses and institutions is a logical extension of home composting for households.

You also need to keep the momentum you've started and the public trust you've built. For example, each year tens of thousands of households move into the Metro region. These households need access to good information and inexpensive composting bins if we are to maintain a high participation rate. The Earthwise certification program makes it possible for consumers to purchase compost they feel confident about. If people get compost that doesn't perform well, that will hurt the long-term market.

Sustainable procurement position

I also recommend that Metro add to the budget a half-time person to focus on sustainable purchasing. If Metro is to be a model of sustainable business practices, the two most important things it can do at this time are 1) implement a sustainability management system and 2) hire a half-time person to focus on sustainable procurement. One of the largest impacts that Metro has on the environments is its expenditure of \$90 million in annual purchases. A staff person devoted to procurement could do the research to determine the availability, performance, and price of more sustainable products and services. She could then coordinate with other local governments to stimulate demand, standardize specifications, and minimize any price premiums.

State and local government purchasing in the US is \$1 trillion annually (compared to federal procurement of \$200 billion). That gives a lot of power to local governments. By establishing sustainable procurement policies and then forming a coalition with other local governments, Metro could achieve perhaps more than it does by lobbying and public education. For example, in addition to lobbying for elimination of toxics in electronic products, Metro could write procurement specifications that obtain the same objective. Instead trying to persuade manufacturers to take back their computers for reuse and recycling, Metro could put that requirement in its specs.

Other possible cuts

My first choice would be to have no other cuts. My second choice would be to give waste reduction priority over development of green spaces. My third choice would be to cut other solid waste programs.

If other solid waste programs must be cut, one possibility is in Public Outreach & Education. I note that it has 12.33 FTE whereas Waste Reduction has 7.67 FTE, a proportion that seems out of balance considering the effectiveness of each in reaching the waste reduction goals. The Public Outreach & Education programs don't seem to get evaluated to determine their value. What is the benefit of the calendar the RIC publishes? The billboard art? The "Reduce Junk Mail" kit is very popular, but no one has checked to see whether it works.

Another possibility is the Regional System Fee Credit of \$450,000, which subsidizes recovery at dirty MRFs. This subsidy has outgrown its usefulness. It was first employed to protect the recovery investment of MRFs when Metro's tip fee fell \$12 a ton in the mid-1990s to \$63 per ton. However, the tip fee has increased in the last few years and could approach \$70 per ton this year. The MRFs have made no additional investment in recovery equipment, and post-collection recovery levels have been flat for several years. This credit is simply subsidizing annual operations.

In addition, here are some specific programs that I think could be cut:

Reduce SOLV	\$12,500
Reduce/eliminate HW intern program	64,000
Eliminate special project grants	13,000
Reduce competitive grants to local governments	100,000
Eliminate product stewardship program	82,200
Eliminate school billboard art project	78,00

Respectfully yours,

Jeanne Roy

Good afternoon councilors.

My name is Avory Gray, I am a graphics/exhibits technician in the Design Division at the Zoo.

You'll be hearing from all of us in the division today briefly summing up our opposition to the proposed layoffs of our .5 fte designer and our administrative secretary. My intent is to introduce the discussion with a bit of context to help you understand what our division does and who we are. I know Zoo jobs can sound esoteric, and the job titles don't really explain much.

I began working in the division in my current position in 1984, and I was hired permanently in 1985. I have always held this same position although I did serve as interim manager during 98-99 during the recruitment process for a manager. When I started the division was the "graphics department" and was part of the Education Division. At some time around 1988 I think, I did not take the time to look up the exact date, it was decided that the division really served all the zoo divisions and the zoo public directly and should be a separate entity.

Soon after that it was realized that as a distinct division we needed our own administrative assistant and we have had one ever since.

Our work deals with all facets of what the public sees and experiences when they visit the zoo. We produce new material and maintain exhibits. As some example, in the last week or so I have written an RFP for pa systems for educational programs in the new Trillium creek family farm; created giant birthday cards for visitors to sign for packy and rama this weekend, refilled the fluid in the fog machine in the entry plaza (which is a huge hit with the kids!), designed produced certificates for the top corporate donors for an OZF luncheon, setting up a new DVD player in the penguinarium, and making a number of signs to direct visitors to activities at Rabbit Romp. Each of us does just as many varied tasks and our annual reports for the last two years will illustrate that as well. We have never had enough staff to do everything we would like to do. We are responsible for maintenance of all exhibits on grounds but sometimes that takes a back seat to an urgent request for event materials. There is always a backlog. We currently provide six day coverage which helps insure that true emergencies can be handled. Anything that adds extra tasks will result in something having to get pushed back.

If I can draw your attention to the budget chart that I handed out, I want to be clear that we don't want to be misleading with regards to other divisions' budgets. Some divisions have drastically grown or shrunk and that is largely due to the shifting of departments from one to the other. But we feel it is worth noting that our division has decreased its budget over the last five years without any such administrative changes. Education and marketing are two divisions that increased their budgets steadily although they had no such changes.

The bottom line is that over the last twenty years the zoo had grown tremendously. We've added exhibits, improved the technology of our interpretives, increased our attendance, added staff overall, increased the number and scope of educational programs and marketing driven events. We have added an exhibits department and shifted to producing new major exhibits almost entirely in-house. The Design division has continued to support all these endeavors and other divisions as well as initiate our own improvements to the visitor experience, and we have done it all with negligible budget changes.

We just don't feel it makes sense to gouge a small division that has run responsibly and effectively for so long for so well.

Thank you very much for your time. I'll be happy to at least try to answer any questions?
4.15.04

Statement by Stewart Sonderman Concerning Budget Cuts

I've been with the zoo for 3 years as a part time employee in the Design Services Division. During that time my supervisor has requested each year for an increase in my FTE to full time. Each request has been denied. These appeals have not been made in order to alleviate my own needs but because of the added demands on my division. Now I face the possibility of losing my position altogether.

I am listed as a Graphics/ Exhibit Designer as are two of my colleagues but our skills are quite different. Where as they specialize more in the Graphic fields, most of my work relates to physical designs of interpretives, signage, and interactives.

Part of what I do is to work closely with Education, Animal Management, the Oregon Zoo Foundation, and our Exhibits department creating large scale new exhibits for the Zoo.

More specifically when new projects come along, I work with education to develop themes and possible interpretive opportunities based on the exhibits physical layout. I then generate concepts and present them to all involved in the project. Once concepts are finalized, I create working drawings, refine design details, and coordinate fabrication and installation.

This is not to mention the graphic layouts, illustration coordination, photo allocation, proofing, material selection, contracting, and text development that must happen during this process.

I am an industrial, exhibit, and graphic designer, project manager, and production artist which combined allow me to work on a variety of projects.

I do not think this is a beneficial move for the Zoo with the upcoming projects and renovations that need to happen in areas such as penguins and the primates building.

The work I am able to do for the Zoo could easily cost 50,000 to 100,000 in design fees alone at the going rate of 75.00 to 100.00 for professional design services. Exhibit work will continue at the Zoo and I only hope I have the opportunity to do the same.



30000 SW Town Center Loop E Wilsonville, Oregon 97070 (503) 682-1011 (503) 682-1015 Fax (503) 682-0843 TDD

April 15, 2004

The Honorable David Bragdon and Metro Council Metro 600 NE Grand Avenue Portland, OR 97232

Dear Council President Bragdon and Metro Council:

I am writing to support your budget proposal for Fiscal-Year 2004-05 related to funding improvements at four key properties around the region to develop the next generation of regional parks, one being the Wilsonville Tract. As you are aware, the City of Wilsonville has been working on a Master Plan for this 230-acre property for the last two years, and before that worked for many years toward protecting the property. With Metro's support, we have been able to make great strides in these efforts.

I am a strong supporter of creating a long-term, stable funding source for making these improvements, promoting environmental education and conducting habitat restoration on properties purchased with funds provided by the 1995 Greenspaces Bond Measure. You are to be commended for your vision in wanting to provide citizens with an opportunity to have quality experiences with nature close to where we live. I appreciate the approach for supporting our regional park improvements, especially since the impact on the average household will be quite small—under a \$1.50 each year.

The Wilsonville City Council recently adopted the *Wilsonville Tract Master Plan and Natural Resources Management Plan* and has forwarded a recommendation of approval to the Metro Council. I understand that this item will be before you in the near future. At this time, there is substantial local momentum behind this master plan, and strong support for this site to be opened to the public. The City of Wilsonville has and will continue to be a strong partner in implementing the concepts envisioned in the master plan. Metro has done an outstanding job of acquiring and protecting significant natural areas and open spaces throughout the region with the funding provided by the 1995 Greenspaces Bond Measure. The time has come for the vision to be taken to the next level.



April 15, 2004 Page 2 of 2

The west side of Wilsonville is beginning to see the results of years of good planning and projects are beginning to coalesce. With construction planned at Villebois this summer and the completion of improvements to Boones Ferry Primary School, and the developing curriculum at the Center for Research on Environmental Science and Technology, the timing for this proposal could not be better. Wilsonville is poised and ready to begin to implement the concepts contained in the Master Plan.

Since Charlotte Lehan

Mayor

Resolution #04-3440

0415040-19

. From: JoAutumn Brock 14260 S. Beemer Way Oregon City, OR 97045 723 7467 1 Strongly support option IA in the Wildlife Habitat Protection plans proposed by Metro, Firstly would like to express my gratitude that public opinion is included in making these decisions, especially in the current political and economic climate where those who deeply care about our environment are being increasingly excluded from voicing thier opinions. One of the main reasons that people choose to live in Oregon is for it's natural abandance and beauty. It is also why people visit as tourists. Unfortunately our natural recourses are diminishing every day. I bought my home foar years ago because of the woods and stream & (Tour Creek in Oregon City) on my property. There is good wildlife but in just 4 years I have seen It diminish. There used to be cystes living in this woods intermittently and I would attended Frequently hear them howling at night. Thave not heard them now in a few years. Tour Creek, being a year round stream should have lots of frogs living and breeding there but 1 now hear one or two occasionally. I know that

Oregon's Salmon are in Serious trouble and I have heard that my stream used to have fish. It is ho longer large enough or clean enough to Support wildlipe. It is well past time to work to regenerate and improve natural spaces, not diminish them further. If not now, when ? I understand that in general homeowners do not like to have restrictions put on them. Developers and those who stand to make money from destroying our natural recouses especially do not like these kinds of regulations. I believe that they are absolutely necessary to protect the environment. I have personnally seen regulations for building in steep slope and thetter untlands areas work to prevent a travesty on the property right next door to me, thereby saving Tour Creek from certain destruction. I also believe that Voluntary and non regulatory ways to accomplish a healthy envivonment are not at all sufficient. I do, houever believe that educating the public is very important. I know that the public at large cares about having open spaces, healthy wildlife and clean water and air. " don't think that they are sufficently informed about what they can and should do to protect our natural recourses. Children especially need to be educated about how the heath of the environment affects them. Thank you for your hard work.

John FoselD

• Thank you council President Bragdon and distinguished Council members for listening to my testimony today.

My name is John Foseid and I have been the compost projects coordinator for metro for the last nine years. I'm here to strongly recommend the composting program be reinstated into the budget so that program can continue to serve the citizens of the metro region. The program cost is a very reasonable considering the positive effects it has on the entire region (the business community and residents) and it

- Program is more than "home composting" as stated in the budget report.
- Program elements and benefits are:

should not be abandoned.

• **Compost bin sale** This program is the most successful bin distribution program in the United States. Governments representatives from all over the country call me for my

- advice on how they can model our program.
 - Over 80,000 bins have been sold to date
- **O Diversion and savings**
- \circ 80K bins X 500 lbs ea. per year = 20,000 ton per year. Diverted.
- 20,000 X ten years (bin life) = 200,000 tons diverted from landfills at no cost to Metro.
 Home composting costs Metro \$ 6 \$8
 - Home composting costs Metro \$ 6 \$8 per ton (over the life of the bin) to promote and implement.
 - Savings to public
 - Retail value \$80.00
 - Public charged \$25.00
 - Savings to public \$ 55.00
 - 80,000 bins sold X \$55.00 (public savings) = \$4,million 400 thousand dollars savings to the public. NOW THAT'S SERVICE
- Earth-Wise testing (has national recognition as a model program for quality assurance of compost) hold up article. Other Government agencies use this program as a benchmark for

their compost permit renewal requirements (Clark County) State of California.

• Compost • Technical assistance to processors (no region in the nation has more facilities 14) and metro has a partnership with these businesses to provide a needed service. They count on Metro's technical assistance to keep them from becoming a nuisance to the public

- Market development of compost through the erosion prevention (Soils for Salmon) water quality and fish habitat issues.
- **o Greenstreets program**
- **•** Wet lands development with the Parks division Coffee LARE

Partnerships with other agencies local governments, DEQ, Dept of AG, and compost industry partners on compost issues need to be mountained.

• Clopyralid study

 \bigcirc

 \cap

• DOA restricted the use and sale of this her beside from the marketplace to protect the compost industry

Conclusion

This agency represents 1.2million people three counties and 24 cities and metro should continue to represent them in the compost industry.

1



AUDUBON SOCIETY OF PORTLAND

1902-2002 Celebrating 100 years of inspiring people to love and protect nature

April 15, 2004

Metro Council 600 NE Grand Ave. Portland, OR 97232

RE: Metro Regional Fish and Wildlife Protection Program

Dear Metro Councilors,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Phase II ESEE decision and draft program recommendation. I am testifying on behalf of the Audubon Society of Portland and our 10,000 members residing throughout the Portland Metropolitan region. The written comments below are based on our preliminary review of the draft staff report and preliminary ALP decision for the regional fish and wildlife plan. We expect to have addition comments as deliberations proceed over the next month.

By way of general remarks the draft recommendation contains some positive features. Making no outright allow decisions is clearly an important provisional decision critical to establishing a program that can realistically achieve the goal of improving the overall health of environmental conditions in the region. We appreciate the value and significance of this aspect of the draft recommendation for a regulatory program.

The staff report also identifies key issues to be considered in revising the draft recommendation. The most important issue for us is the need for protection of high value habitats in order to achieve the overall goal and meet key environmental criteria a scientifically defensible fashion.

To do this, Metro must incorporate components of the habitat-based approach in the Option 1 series into the regulatory program. We must increase for protections many high value habitats regardless of ownership or development status, particularly those that support the ecological integrity and connectivity across the region or provide critical habitat to sensitive or at risk species.

Specifically, we request the following revisions to draft recommendation for a regulatory program:

5151 NW Cornell Road • Portland, Oregon 97210 • (503) 292-6855 • FAX (503) 292-1021 www.audubonportland.org Printed on 100% post-consumer recycled paper with soy ink

- 1.) Re-evaluate protections for high value riparian habitats (Class I and II). Increase protection of Class I and class II riparian habitats (primary function) in high and medium development value areas to ensure avoidance of impacts that could jeopardize ecological connectivity and viability of riparian corridors. Avoidance could include rezoning, density transfers, and redrawing center and industrial land boundaries. Many of these high value riparian areas include undeveloped floodplains. The region needs to cease allowing development (clearing, grading, paving, or building) within the 100-year floodplain and 1996 flood inundation areas to maintain the social, ecological, and economic value of these lands for the habitat and ecosystem services values they provide. These areas also represent high restoration potential and will likely serve as important mitigation sites to maintain ecological functions lost elsewhere to development.
- 2.) Identify highest value habitats where development should be prohibited. The draft recommendation does not include or acknowledge the need for prohibiting development on some of the region's highest value, irreplaceable habitats. There will be sites where the program can and should protect a resource, regardless of ownership or lot configuration, by prohibiting development. Given the degraded condition of many of our urban streams and watersheds we would find it difficult to develop a scientifically defensible approach that can credibly achieve program goals for habitat connectivity and conservation of sensitive habitats and species without prohibiting development on some sites. The highest value riparian habitats including key connective areas within existing water quality management areas, floodplains, and habitats of concern represent locations on the landscape where prohibitions on development should be considered.
- 3.) Increase protections for upland wildlife habitat along unmapped headwater and intermittent streams and steep slopes outside Title 3 water quality management areas and Habitats of Concern. The low and moderate levels of protection applied to upland wildlife habitat should be revaluated across all wildlife habitat categories. The draft program recommendation should increase protections necessary to maintain and improve water quality by protecting unmapped streams (including intermittent streams) outside water quality management areas. The program phase should consider applying Clean Water Services Design and Construction standards for intermittent streams draining less than 10-100 acres throughout the region. Stronger protections for upland habitat on steep slopes (greater than 25%) and debris flow hazards mapped by the Department of Geology and Mineral Industries would optimize economic and environmental outcomes by reducing habitat loss, forest canopy removal, soil compaction and associated cumulative watershed

2

impacts while also reducing threats to life and property from increased landslide and debris flow hazard.

4.) Analyze cumulative impacts of decisions and revise Phase II decision. We must maintain flexibility to revisit the ESEE decision based on the substance of the program decisions and an analysis of the environmental consequences of those program decisions.

We request the following in moving forward with the developing a Regulatory Program.

- 1.) Prohibit and Limit Definitions: The definitions for prohibit and limit designations used in the ESEE analysis should be the starting point defining a regional program since they were the basis evaluating the degree to analyzing environmental, social, and economic and energy consequences. These definitions are:
 - a. Allow subject to existing regulations and where none exist, habitat assumed to be lost to development over time.
 - b. Lightly Limit 50% of habitat protected.
 - c. Moderately Limit 65% of habitat protected.
 - d. Strictly Limit 80% of habitat protected
 - e. Prohibit 95% of habitat protected

The new definition of lightly limit in the staff report would appear to depart from these definitions in assuming lightly limit treatments would result in "no loss of development capacity." This was not assumed in the Phase II ESEE analysis and would significantly increase the negative environmental consequences of the program options.

2.) Avoidance of roads and utilities impacts: The staff report also

proposes to allow "trails, roads, and other public access to meet the public good" under the definition of strictly limit. Strictly limit must apply different avoidance criteria for roads and utilities than applied to trails in riparian habitats. For example the direct and local impacts of an individual road or utility stream crossings may be minimized and mitigated but the cumulative basin-wide impact of multiple crossings, even if minimized and mitigated locally, could still degrade the resource. Minimizing stream crossings at a landscape gould require avoiding them at particular sites. One standard developed for the Damascus Community Design established 1,200 feet (or two blocks or a five minute walk) maximum distance between crossings to reduce losses to riparian corridor continuity.¹

3

¹ Damascus Community Design Workshop, Final Report. Online at: http://www.designdamascus.org/damascus%20final%20report/Final%20Report.pdf

- **3.) Mitigation:** The staff report identifies mitigation as an important program tool and lists key issues to be resolved in developing a program. They include mitigation ratios, where mitigation will occur, monitoring and enforcement. We feel that mitigation must ensure functional equivalency of lost habitat (no net loss), monitoring and enforcement, and occur within the resource/sub-watershed sites that formed the basis of Metro's inventory of regionally significant fish and wildlife habitat.
- 4.) Need for vegetation clearing standards: The staff report failed to address the need for clearing controls or ordinances to sufficiently dissuade habitat destruction in advance of development or permit applications. Several local jurisdictions have provisions that create a strong disincentive for habitat destruction in advance of development applications. These should become a part of an effective regional program.

Thank you for the opportunity to input. I look forward to working with you in crafting a final recommendation.

Sincerely,

Jim Labbe



041504C-22





Plot time: Mar 16, 2004 J:\price\04008\landuse_11x17 with proposed.mxd

04/150x/c-23

1



Expanding the Urban Growth Boundary to meet the region's industrial needs

Chief Operating Officer's Recommendation April 2004



Chief Operating Officer's Recommendation April 2004

.

2



Purpose

•Primary purpose of managing land use and urban growth boundary is to keep region a great place to live, work and do business

•Choices made must balance current needs and values with future

2002 UGB Decision -- Industrial work is a continuation

•Met the housing and commercial needs in 2002, largest UGB expansion in OR history

•Still a shortfall in industrial lands, approximately 2,000 acres

Balancing Objectives

•Accommodating population growth while maintaining compact urban form •Have to manage the line but we have to balance the built environment with preserving natural resource areas

•Assuring land is allocated for uses that best fit its characteristics

•Making certain that public services and infrastructure are feasible

•Protecting natural areas and productive agricultural lands



(Intel Ronler Acres on left, Synopsys on left)

Changing nature of industry of our economy

•Emergence of high tech and reduction of forest products jobs

•Out-sourcing production jobs which includes service and professional jobs

•Integration of research, development and production functions into single buildings or a cluster of buildings, blurring lines between office and manufacturing

•Increased emphasis on integration of land-use policies and regional economic strategies

•Metro can't address all of these issues in this boundary decision, but it can begin to weave them into the discussion and its long range thinking for future land use decisions

•We heard a lot from industry that we need large parcels of land but over the last 6 months the discussion has evolved to one that is centered around flexibility

4

•The definition of industry has continued to evolve, it raises questions about where the economy is headed in the future. We don't think it includes manufacturing but we can't forecast the type or land needs of industry in the future.



Key Questions

•How much overall land should be considered and where should it be located to meet the shortfall?

•How can we better use the land inside the boundary?

•Where is the regional economy going?

•What kinds of businesses and jobs are likely to flourish and what building and land needs will they have?

•How do we build flexibility into our planning? How do we distinguish between office and industrial land and do we need to?

•How do we accommodate the state's interest in nurturing traded-sector industry – those industries that concentrate around talent and other resources, sell their products and services outside Oregon, and provide living wage jobs?



Public involvement

•Public involvement started in 2000 in support of the Council's 2002 UGB decision. The 18-month "Let's Talk" outreach included public opinion polls, stakeholder surveys, small-group discussions called, "Coffee Talks," a regional conference, community workshops, a televised town hall discussion, open houses and public hearings.

•In all, more than 9,500 people participated and thousands more saw a related television and newspaper series, "Your neighborhood. Your future."

Industrial lands specifics

•To better understand these issues, Metro staff met with the building and commercial real estate and development community, freight and business interests representing manufacturing and industrial-based jobs as well as local jurisdictions and individual property owners throughout the region.

•In October 2003 Metro sponsored an agriculture symposium to learn more about the direct impact of urbanization on farmers and the farming industry.

•In February, 57,000 brochures were mailed to potentially affected property owners and interested persons to update them on the industrial land study.

•Open houses and other opportunities for involvement were publicized via Metro's email list, Metro council newsletters, community organization and business association newsletters. 16 ads were placed in The Oregonian and community newspapers. A telephone hotline message contained open house information and allowed people to record comments.

•Six (6) open houses were held between March 2 and March 30, drawing more than 1,300 people.

•Industrial lands interactive map on Metro's web site received nearly 800 visits in the month of March alone.

•Metro received a total of 616 comments. Most comments (506) came in as comment cards from open houses. The remainder came via e-mail, letters and phone calls

6

Policy recommendations

- Use industrial land efficiently & flexibly
- Apply commercial surplus 393 acres
- Expand UGB to meet needs of industry

Decision addresses more than just adding industrial acres

Moving parts of this decision are as follows:

•Regulations in Title 4, last year we did not map the RSIA areas- the intent is to use land most efficiently – we propose to do that by restricting commercial uses that do not serve industrial users and direct them to centers. By creating RSIA's and by limiting the scale of retail stores and services in industrial areas, the region will save about 1,400 acres inside the urban growth boundary from conversion to non-industrial uses

•Applying the 393 acre commercial land surplus- responds to the changing nature of industry is testimony that office/industrial is a trend

•Lastly, amend the UGB to meet the industrial land shortfall of approximately 1,600 acres



If farm land must come into the boundary, choose land that is less important to the viability of commercial agriculture in the region

- 1. Affirm Metro's commitment in the Regional Framework Plan to protect agriculture and forest land;
- 2. Recognize agriculture as an important regional industry in its own right;
- 3. Avoid to the greatest extent possible, expansion of the boundary on to farm land that is critical to the viability of commercial agriculture
- To accomplish these things recommending incorporating the policy direction in Ordinance #1041 but not the site specific nature
- Future discussion By affirming this commitment to protect farm and forest land affords Metro the opportunity to start a discussion with our rural neighbors and the state about deciding whether the boundary should be an ever-expanding line or if there may be logical stopping points.

Summary of recommendation

- Provide land for jobs
- Position the region for the next discussion
- Respect the agricultural industry's needs

Exceeds the 1,575 net acre land need after applying the saving from adopting Title 4 regulations and applying commercial land surplus.

Total recommended= 1,635 net acres



•Transition to Lydia Neil

Title 4 - Preserving industrial land



•During the last year MTAC, MPAC and the Metro Council have struggled to determine the right amount of restrictions to support industrial business and balance the flexibility needed to accommodate supporting commercial services and the changing nature of industry. **Purpose**- preserve industrial land and freight capacity.

Additional Land Efficiency

•Recognize that smaller, closely sited retail and service businesses for the convenience of industrial employees –

•Title 4 commercial restrictions: RSIA's 3,000 sq ft/20,000 sq ft, Industrial areas 5,000 sq ft/20,000

•Airport- accessory uses supporting airport functions are allowed, same- training facilities

•RSIA + industrial areas: Non-retail offices uses are allowed with a transportation test- "do not reduce off-peak performance on main roadway and corridors on freight map"

•No back sliding for jurisdictions that prohibit office in industrial or have more restrictive retail regs

Issue of Medical Facilities

•Land intensive – do they have the same needs as industry?

•Should medical and hospital facilities over 20,000 square feet be allowed in Regionally Significant Industrial Areas and other industrial areas?

•Traffic to and from medical facilities will interfere with the movement of freight. Such facilities should be located in areas where transit is available or

Urban Growth Report calculations

Supply and demand comparison	Net vacant acres
Demand	9,366
Supply	3,681
Deficit	(5,685)
RSIA and Title 4 policy savings	1,400
Adjusted (deficit)	(4,285)
2002 UGB decision	2,317
Remaining industrial land need	(1,968)

20-year industrial land need

•UGR- includes a projection of the region's land needs for the next 20 years

•Required to assess the supply of land inside UGB and compare with demand

•Growing sectors: W/D, GF, TF – roughly 70% of land need is for W/D use (1,337 NET ac)

•Addressed the deficit by adding land in 2002 and projected making a policy change in Title 4

•Result- still have a shortfall of 1,968 net acres of land

Adjusting the land supply

Supply and demand comparison	Net vacant acres
Industrial land need	1,968
Less commercial land surplus	(393)
Remaining industrial land need	1,575

Apply commercial surplus - 393 acres

Adjusting the land supply

•Apply the commercial land surplus to reduce the industrial shortfall

•Reduction is appropriate because more industrial users will locate in commercial office type buildings.

•Office space is now incorporated in many industrial uses especially technology related businesses.

•A Employment UGR identified a surplus of commercial land within the present boundary. It seems reasonable to apply the surplus of commercial land to the industrial land shortfall to respond to the changing needs of industry.



Concentrated around I-5, I-205 and Hwy 26
Goal 14 drives some of these location decisions
Suitability factors are a key

14



•Contains Tier 4 resource lands, includes no exception land, 102 GROSS ac, 69 NET ac

•Important component of following Goal 14 Hierarchy of lands – can not skip over (lower value farmland must come in 1st)

•Located within 1 mile of a planned industrial area

•Provide additional employment and compliment the Damascus town center •Has limited large lot potential



•Includes Tier 4 resource land and no exception land, 63 GROSS ac, 30 NET ac

•Contains 1: 63 ac parcel- 30 net buildable ac.

•Contains remaining portion of the golf course that was added to the UGB in 2002

•2002 expansion area is in concept planning now

•Compliments the existing Oregon City industrial area and Clackamas Community College by adding additional industrial land



•Contains all Tier 1 exception land, contains 575 GROSS ac, 164 NET acres •First priority in Hierarchy of lands

•Bounded by Tualatin River to the north and I205 to the south

•Over half acres are not developable

•Although area has good access to I-205, the area has a lot of constraints – it is not very productive

•Constraints: several schools, large churches, rural residential and natural resources

•Likely that City of Tualatin will provide services to the area from the west

•Presents an opportunity to comprehensively plan the entire basin

•I-205 is a good buffer from agricultural activities to the south



4 areas: Wilsonville east, Tualatin, Coffee Creek and the Quarry

Quarry: Tier1: 354 GROSS ac, 236 NET acres, adjacent to 2002 expansion, part is needed for transportation connect

•Within 2 miles of an interchange, 1 mile of existing industrial areas

•Limited agricultural value due to active mining use

•Concept planning will happen in conjunction with adjacent 2002 UGB expansion

•Contains a small amount of environmental resources

Wilsonville east: 641 ac, 460 net ac, Tier 5 contains the best soils

•agricultural viability is poor due to lack of water, conflicts w/urban residential uses- contains class I/ II soils

•Isolated from larger agri- community by Newland creek canyon

•Located within 1 mile of existing industrial, 2 miles of an interchange

•Of all study areas it has the best aggregation potential (50-100 ac lots)

-Area is unlikely to be suitable for residential use due to BPA easements and facilities located through out the site

-Conditions: establish a buffer from existing residential uses to the west and south

Tualatin-Tier 1 exception land, 646 gross ac, 339 net ac

•Meets 1 mile from industry and 2 miles from an interchange factors

•Area is surrounded by non-agricultural uses, contains conflicting uses and constrained areas

•Condition: I-5/99w connector alignment may be located in this area- identify and include in concept plan, may define city boundaries

Coffee Creek- Tier 1- exception land, 264 gross ac- 97 net ac., located west of prison

•Within 2 miles of an interchange, 1 mile of existing industrial areas

•Extensive natural resources: floodplain and T3, Metro Greenspaces land

•Southern portion is adjacent to the 2002 UGB expansion area and can be planned together

18



•Contains Tier 3 and Tier I exception lands, 249 GROSS acres, 149 NET acres •Bounded by West Union Rd to north and Helvetia Rd to west, surrounded on 2 sides by the UGB

•Adjacent to existing industry and has services available, immediately adjacent to Shute Rd interchange at Hwy 26



•Contains Tier 1 (exception) and Tier 5 resource lands - 206 GROSS ac, 91 NET ac

•Located within 2 miles of TV Hwy- a portion of the area may provide land for a localized W/D use or other types of industry

•Located within 1 mile of existing industrial area

•Contains two exception areas (bookends east and west between 43 ac of EFU land)

•EFU portion is necessary to provide services to the two exception areas

•Addresses a community need for additional industry and an expansion of the City of Cornelius tax base


Two areas are proposed for consideration if the Council chooses to consider different land or makes different policy choices regarding Title 4

Evergreen-large area 985 gross ac, 730 net acres, 1/3 is exception land

- Located within 2 miles of Hwy 26, within 1 mile of existing industrial land

- Considerable util. (redundant power, specialty gas, sewer, water) - Shute and Evergreen Rds, adjacent to a large industrial base

- Shute Rd expansion area is in the final stages of concept planning

-Area could be reconfigured based on natural boundaries (Wiable Creek to the north)

-Challenge – defining edges and respecting farm industry concerns

West Union- 368 gross ac, 133 net acres, Tier 5 with a small amount of exception land

- Within 2 miles of Hwy 26, majority is located within 1 mile of existing industrial area

- The portion of the larger study area proposed for consideration is class I and II soils not class III and IV

-Area has significant natural resource constraints, Metro greenspaces pc in center of the area makes the area very challenging

-West Union Rd to the south has transportation challenges



•Some areas meet 1 or 2 of the suitability factors but were not included because of other issues:

•committed uses: concentration of housing on fairly small lots (less than 5 acres), churches, schools

•Natural resource areas, slopes greater than 10%

•Disconnected from the UGB or intervening rural residential uses

•Small potential areas that would not meet the 300ac "neighborhood" threshold

•Constraints separated viable pockets of areas



•Area is part of the Springwater area and includes 90 GROSS ac, is proposed to be removed because of natural resource constraints

•Area was originally included to address the need for a connection to Hwy 26

•Concept planning has determined this connection is not necessary

•Removal reinforces the green corridor agreement with the City of Sandy



•Includes 18 GROSS ac (Tax Lots – 1,300, 1,400 and 1,500)

•Removal satisfies the removal requirements and it is not need to maintain either the 20 yr land supply for residential, commercial or industrial land





Metro logo/tagline

26

Metro Fish and Wildlife Habitat Protection

Phase II ESEE Analysis Recommendation



Recommendation

- Accept Phase II ESEE report
- Recommend Option2B, modified
- Recommend four non-regulatory options
- Provide direction on development of regulatory and non-regulatory options
- Recognize that this is an interim action



Habitat Quality

Based on ecological function

- Class I Riparian: highest value
- Class II Riparian: medium value
- Class III Riparian: lowest value
- Class A Upland: highest value
- Class B Upland: medium value
- Class C Upland: lowest value



Urban Development Value

Based on assessed value, employment density, 2040 design types

• High: includes city center, regional centers and regionally significant industrial areas

 Medium: includes town centers, main streets, station communities, other industrial areas and employment centers

• Low: includes corridors and inner and outer neighborhoods

• Other: includes parks and openspaces, rural areas outside UB with no design type



Allowing, limiting and prohibiting development

Allow: allow development subject to existing local, state and federal regulations

Limit: restricts development as defined in Step 3, program phase

- lightly limit
- moderately limit
- strictly limit

Prohibit: restricts development unless all economic use of property is lost

Regulatory option (2B, modified)

Habitat quality	High urban development value	Medium urban development value	Low urban development value	Other urban development value
Class I	ML	SL	SL	SL
Class II	LL	LL	ML	ML
Class III	LL	LL	LL	ML
Class A	LL	ML	ML	SL
Class B	LL	LL	ML	ML
Class C	LL	LL	LL	ML
Impact areas	A	А	A	Α



Regulatory option

- Limits development in habitat areas
- Recommends no additional regulation in impact areas
- Class I riparian receives the highest level of protection (ML, SL) with consideration for highest urban development value
- Other habitat classes receive protection with consideration for urban development values
- Parks and rural areas get the highest level of protection reflecting habitat values



Non-regulatory options

Develop proposals for implementing:

- Technical assistance to property owners, developers or local jurisdiction staff
- Grants for restoration and protection on both private and public lands
- Willing-seller acquisition for open space preservation and the development of a revolving acquisition fund
- Property tax reduction programs particularly as an incentive to encourage landowners to work cooperatively to leverage ecological improvements



Program direction

- Clearly define what is meant by "limit"
- Clarify effects on existing development and redevelopment
- Explore opportunities for regulatory and program flexibility
- Research effective means of mitigation, mitigation banking and restoration
- Maintain a habitat inventory correction process
- Define program monitoring
- Define implementation strategy for nonregulatory programs

