



Metro | *Memo*

Date: Friday, June 29, 2012
To: Metro
From: Pam Welch, Records and Information Analyst
Subject: Potential Missing Record – April 14, 1999 Greenspaces Technical Advisory
Committee (GTAC) Agenda

An attempt was made to locate the missing record by consulting with staff and going through meeting records from 1999. However, a copy of the agenda could not be found.

DRAFT

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 99-_____ TO ENDORSE PROPOSED FEDERAL LEGISLATION WHICH WOULD PRESERVE, PROTECT AND ENHANCE PARKS, OPEN SPACES, FISH & WILDLIFE HABITAT, TRAILS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Date: April 6, 1999

Presented by:

**Charles Ciecko
Mel Huie**

Proposed Action

Resolution No. 99-_____ requests Council endorsement of proposed federal legislation which would provide funds for grant programs for the preservation, protection, and enhancement of parks, open spaces, fish and wildlife habitat, streams & riparian corridors, trails and recreational facilities at the local, regional, and state levels. If the resolution is approved, Metro will urge N.W. Congressional members and other public agencies and nonprofit conservation organizations to support the proposed federal legislation.

The proposed legislation has already been endorsed by the National Association of Counties and the National Governors' Association, along with 3,000 businesses and nonprofit conservation organizations across the country. Governor John Kitzhaber is a member of the coalition supporting legislation to fund the aforementioned activities.

Background, History and Analysis

The Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999 (CARA) (H.R. 701 and S. 25) has been introduced in the House and Senate by a coalition of Democrats and Republicans. If approved, funding would be available to public agencies for land acquisition, purchase of easements, park development, construction of recreation facilities, habitat restoration & enhancement activities, wetland protection, planning and related environmental education programs.

The proposed revenue source for these programs and activities is from offshore oil drilling and gas leases. An estimated \$4.5 billion in federal taxes will be generated from offshore activities in FY 2000. Of this amount, a range of \$734 million (Senate bill) to \$1.06 billion (House bill) is proposed for funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) and Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery program (UPARR). The Teaming With Wildlife program (TWW) would receive an amount between \$325 million (Senate bill) and \$459 million (House bill).

These revenues have historically funded competitive grant programs supporting federal, state, regional and local conservation and park activities. The Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) and Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery (UPARR) program were two of the largest grant programs which funded land acquisition for parks, and the development of park and recreational facilities. But funding for these programs was dramatically reduced at the start of the Reagan administration in 1981. For example in 1998, Oregon had an allocation of less than \$300,000 from the LWCF to distribute statewide.

The proposed legislation would provide funds to revitalize the LWCF program. Oregon's allocation is estimated at \$5.2 million to \$7.3 million per year for the LWCF if the Reinvestment and Conservation Act of 1999 is approved by Congress. These grant programs could significantly leverage local funds available for acquisition and development purposes.

Teaming With Wildlife (TWW), which is non-game oriented, is a new program emphasizing the preservation, protection and enhancement of fish and wildlife habitat. Eligible activities would include land acquisition, habitat restoration activities, wetlands conservation, watershed planning and protection activities, environmental education activities, and construction of interpretive centers, kiosks, viewing blinds, etc. Funds would be administered by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW).

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) has developed a list of potential projects and activities under its potential TWW program. An estimated \$6 to \$9 million per year for Oregon's TWW program could be available if legislation is approved.

Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces staff have worked with ODFW to include a "Teaming Up With Metro Greenspaces" initiative. TWW funds could be matched with Metro funds for land acquisition, habitat enhancement and restoration activities, planning and habitat inventories, environmental education programs, and construction of nature centers, interpretive signs, viewing blinds and kiosks. Metro funds could be leveraged significantly.

Budget Impact

No budget impact at this time.

If Congress approves funding for these new initiatives, Metro would be eligible to apply for funds beginning in federal FY 2000 or FY 2001. Most likely, the funds would be administered by Oregon State Parks and Recreation Department (LWCF and UPARR) and Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (TWW). All grant programs will be competitive in nature and require "local matches."

Executive Officer's Recommendation

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution No. 99-_____.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE TO ENDORSE)
PROPOSED FEDERAL LEGISLATION)
WHICH WOULD PRESERVE, PROTECT)
& ENHANCE PARKS, OPEN SPACES,)
FISH & WILDLIFE HABITAT, TRAILS AND)
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES)

RESOLUTION NO. 99-_____
Introduced by Mike Burton
Executive Officer

WHEREAS, Congress is currently debating proposed legislation, "The Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999" (CARA) (H.R. 701 and S. 25) which would fund grant programs for: land acquisition for parks and open spaces; development of park and recreational facilities; habitat restoration activities; planning and environmental education projects; and

WHEREAS, CARA would authorize funds to the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), the Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery Act (UPARR) and the Teaming With Wildlife (TWW) programs, which in turn would make funds available to state, regional and local park providers through competitive grants processes; and

WHEREAS, funding for these programs would come from offshore oil drilling and gas leases which already are being paid to the U.S. Treasury (an estimated \$4.5 billion in FY 2000); and

WHEREAS, Oregon's allocation of LWCF revenues is estimated at \$5.2 million to \$7.3 million per year; and

WHEREAS, Oregon's allocation of TWW revenues is estimated at \$6 to \$9 million per year; and

WHEREAS, Metro and local government park providers could compete for funding from each federal program and thereby leverage limited local funds; and

WHEREAS, ODFW has developed preliminary projects to be funded under its Teaming With Wildlife (TWW) program, if Congress approves the Reinvestment and Conservation Act of 1999; and

WHEREAS, in cooperation with Metro's Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department,

*this is one of
my pet pukes*

ODFW has proposed a "Teaming With Metro Greenspaces" initiative under its TWW program which would allow the federal funds to be matched with Metro funds for land acquisition, habitat restoration, stream and wetland enhancement activities, planning and habitat inventories, environmental education programs, and interpretive centers, kiosks, viewing blinds, and signs.

WHEREAS, Metro general funds and Open Space bond revenues, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service funds appropriated for Regional Parks and Greenspaces programs could be significantly leveraged by the proposed Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999, and

WHEREAS, the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee was briefed about the proposed federal legislation and grant programs at its April 6, 1999 meeting and voted to support the legislation; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED

That the Metro Council endorses the proposed federal legislation known as the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999 or comparable legislation which includes funding for Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery program (UPARR), and Teaming With Wildlife (TWW).

ADOPTED By the Metro Council this _____ day of _____ 1999.

Rod Monroe, Presiding Officer

Approved as to form:

Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel

Portland Metro Inventory and Mapping Project Summary

Project Objectives:

- 1) To determine the *Urban Forest Canopy Cover* for the Portland Metropolitan area and its surroundings, which include urban, residential, commercial, and natural areas. Urban forestry canopy cover is the covering provided by the uppermost spreading branch layer of a tree.
- 2) To determine the *Land Cover* for the Portland Metropolitan area and its surroundings.
- 3) To determine *Vegetation Classification/Characterization for Natural Areas* identified through the land cover classification.

Project Products: The following deliverable products will be provided to Metro upon completion of this project:

Digital Data

- Final raster GRID coverage of Urban Forest Canopy Cover
- Final and draft raster GRID coverages of Land Cover
- Final vector ARC coverage of Natural Areas with associated characterization database
- Raw, unclassified 1991 and 1998 Landsat Thematic Mapper satellite imagery

Hardcopy Data

- Two small scale maps of raster Urban Forest Canopy Cover and Land Cover classifications (33"x44" and 11"x44")
- Two small scale maps of vector Natural Areas (33"x44" and 11"x44")
- Project documentation of procedures, results, and recommendations for future applications

General Project Procedures:

This outlines Ecotrust's strategy for producing the information products by incorporating a hybrid approach of manual photo-interpretation *and* digital image classification. The approach retains the most effective advantages of photo-interpretation and digital image processing while minimizing the limitations of each in the land cover mapping process.

Urban Forest Canopy Layer

The classification and mapping of urban forest canopy cover will be accomplished using a cloud-free, high quality Landsat TM scene captured in August of 1998.

Urban forest canopy cover will be classified into three categories:

- 1) 0 - 25% Forest Canopy Cover
- 2) 26 - 50% Forest Canopy Cover
- 3) 51 - 75% Forest Canopy Cover
- 4) 76 - 100% Forest Canopy Cover

These forest canopy cover classes have been selected due to the proven ability of Landsat TM imagery to effectively discriminate this level of forest cover detail. In addition, other forest canopy cover mapping

projects in and surrounding the Willamette Valley have chosen these same or similar canopy cover class discriminations based on their effectiveness for characterizing wildlife habitat and utilization.

Unsupervised classification techniques will be used to discriminate and map forest canopy cover. The goal in any image classification project is to determine when the image is a good predictor of the vegetative characteristic of interest, such as forest canopy cover. In the Willamette Valley, including the Portland Metro area, Landsat TM imagery has been found to be a good predictor of forest canopy cover. ERDAS Imagine digital image processing software will be utilized to stratify the Landsat TM imagery into approximately 150 spectral classes based solely on the spectral information in the image data set. Spectral responses in the imagery, aerial photo and digital orthophotography interpretation, and ancillary GIS data will be utilized to determine which spectral classes represent forested areas and subsequently to categorize each forested spectral class into the appropriate canopy cover class. While more sophisticated supervised image classification techniques may be applied to the classification of forest canopy cover, this approach will render a forest canopy cover classification of equal accuracy and consistency to the more complex classification approaches. This approach, however, provides significant savings in time and cost.

All forested areas in the study area will be classified into a forest canopy cover class regardless of land use status. For instance, 51 to 75% tree canopy cover in a residential area will be categorized into the same class as an area of 51 to 75% forest canopy cover in a natural area. Discrimination of land cover and land use types will occur in later phases of the project.

This phase of the project will result in a digital raster GIS data layer extending across the entire study area classified according to the canopy cover classification scheme presented above.

Land Cover Classification

Ecotrust will utilize existing land cover classification products in the development of a 1998-based land cover map. Ecotrust will use the same August 1998 Landsat TM scene (shown in Figure 1) used in the forest canopy cover classification described above to update the land use and land cover map. The July 7, 1991 Landsat TM scene used to create the 1992 land use and land cover map will also be used in this phase.

As the first task of this phase the team will ensure the exact co-registration of the two 1991 and 1998 Landsat images. Since the existing land cover map was derived from the 1991 image, any spatial modifications needed to co-register the images will be applied only to the 1998 image so as to assure the spatial integrity of any newly derived land cover data. Once co-registered, a multi-temporal image data set will be produced by combining one or more bands from each date of imagery into a single image data set. A simple classification of this merged data set will identify areas that have undergone land cover change between 1991 through 1998. Digital image processing techniques will be used to digitally discriminate and map those areas of significant land cover change since 1991. This approach will allow for the quick, consistent, and accurate identification and delineation of areas of change throughout the entire study area.

Once the areas of change are identified their current land cover and land use status will be classified primarily through manual photo-interpretation. In the 1992 mapping project, the classification of Landsat TM data alone was found to be incapable of reliably classifying the land cover and land use detail of the 1992 classification scheme. Although the limitations were identified, addressed and overcome, failure to apply the knowledge gained in this earlier experience to the current proposed project would be inappropriate. In order to overcome the limitations of automated image classification in this project, aerial photography and field reconnaissance will be the primary means for updating the classification of the changed areas.

As areas of change are identified, aerial photography will be interpreted in stereo as to the 1998 land cover and/or land use. Once the updated areas of change are digitally captured and mapped, the GIS layer(s) containing the updates will be integrated with the existing land cover map producing a new 1998-current land cover classification for the previously mapped area.

Classification of any new areas in the project study area that were not previously mapped in the 1992 classification will be accomplished using a combination of the 1998 Landsat TM imagery, aerial photography, digital orthophotos, field reconnaissance, and GIS modeling. A two-acre minimum mapping unit will be utilized in the updating and development of the 1998 land cover classification.

This phase of the project will result in a digital raster GIS data layer in which the entire study area is classified according to the classification scheme of the 1992 land cover map.

Natural Area Classification / Characterization

In this phase of the project natural areas will be identified, classified and characterized. This will be accomplished through a combination of GIS modeling techniques and stereo photo-interpretation.

Upon completion of the updated land cover classification layer for the study area, the Ecotrust team will work closely with Metro to define natural areas based on the new land cover classification. Once defined, a GIS model will be developed to extract the defined natural areas from the 1998 land cover map. Only natural areas of 2 acres and larger will be extracted and characterized in this phase of the project. Standard GIS modeling techniques utilizing existing GIS data will be used to classify each natural area and to develop the following characteristic attributes:

- patch size - developed by calculating the areal extent of each natural area;
- water availability - developed by modeling the proximity to water of each natural area using existing hydrography data;
- vegetation community - developed partially by noting each natural area's land cover classification designation from the 1998 land cover map;
- spatial heterogeneity of patch - developed partially by calculating a "heterogeneity index" value from the 1998 land cover classification; this portion of the measure of patch heterogeneity will indicate the variation of land cover classes within the natural area;
- adjacent land uses to patch - developed by modeling from existing land ownership coverages as well as from land use designations from the 1998 land cover classification layer.

Depending on the total number of natural areas defined through the mapping process as well as the potential political significance of the natural areas, as defined by Metro, approximately 15-20% of the entire population of natural areas will be field verified to ensure the consistency and accuracy of the characterization process. Ecotrust will work closely with Metro's volunteer coordinator to integrate potential assistance from student volunteers to supplement the collection of field data for the natural area characterization process.

As with the previous two deliverable map layers, this phase will result in both a digital map layer as well as hard copy map products.

Ecotrust

Ecotrust is a nonprofit 501(c)3 organization, incorporated in Oregon in February 1991. Ecotrust's mission is to support the emergence of a conservation economy in the Coastal Temperate Rainforest Bioregion of the Pacific Northwest. Ecotrust offers tools and resources to people and organizations that promote positive change at the intersection of ecosystem restoration, economic opportunity, and community vitality. Ecotrust's services include natural resource mapping; geographic information system (GIS) development, analysis and training; social and economic analysis; Internet website development and service; economic development and assistance; and landscape analysis, design, and planning.

DRAFT PAPER OUTLINE – JANUARY 7

- 1. Introduction**
Purpose of the paper
Background and policy framework
(incl. brief review of Metro Charter and related policy documents)
Organization
- 2. Elements of Successful Conservation Incentives**
A review of some key features of successful programs; what are the essential (active) ingredients based on feedback from program administrators and stakeholders?
- 3. Key Incentive Strategies for Conservation of Private Urban Lands**
This section highlights a selection of successful non-regulatory and regulatory strategies identified through the research process and summarized in Section 4. Model programs that have proven effective in protecting open space using these strategies are examined.
 - A. Non-Regulatory Strategies**
 - 1. Strategy** (hypothetical example: Sponsor demonstration project on private land—perhaps one urban and one semi-rural project—employing successful incentives and documenting costs/benefits from the “good steward” landowner perspective)
Discussion of approach
General discussion of the mechanics and use of this approach
Successful applications
Review of 1 or 2 model programs that have implemented this type of strategy
Policy issues
Summary of potential coordination, funding, legal, legislative, related issues
 - 2. Et cetera**
 - B. Regulatory Strategies**
 - 1. Strategy** (hypothetical example: Streamlined zoning provisions that allow development outright when resource area is not disturbed; provides landowner certainty, avoids lengthy land use review, saves application and consultant costs)
Discussion of approach
General discussion of the mechanics and use of this approach
Successful applications
Review of 1 or 2 model programs that have implemented this type of strategy
Policy issues
Summary of potential coordination, funding, legal, legislative, related issues
 - 2. Et cetera**
- 4. Summary of Policies and Incentives**
A matrix of promising regulatory and non-regulatory programs summarizing key attributes, such as: program objectives, types of resources/land uses affected, legal issues, contributing factors to success, limiting factors, contact names and phone numbers.
- 5. Conclusion**

Appendix A: Stakeholder Interviews
Results and discussion

Appendix B: References

METRO PARKS AND GREENSPACES
NATURAL RESOURCE POLICY RESEARCH

DRAFT INTERVIEW LIST

Name	Phone	Address	Interest/Affiliation	Contact	Date
Lois Bitmars	292-1981	J. Peterkort & Co 9755 SW Barnes Road Portland OR 97225	Private landowner	Contact initiated/message left Discussed/faxed information Interview (personal/phone)	_____ _____ _____
Nancy Buley	663-4128	Schmidt Family Farm 9500 SE 327 th Boring OR 97009	Private landowner	Contact initiated/message left Discussed/faxed information Interview (personal/phone)	_____ _____ _____
Diane Cambell, Parks Planner	794-8002	N. Clackamas Parks & Recreation 11022 SE 37 th Milwaukie OR 97222	Public landowner	Contact initiated/message left Discussed/faxed information Interview (personal/phone)	_____ _____ _____
Ralph Cook, Naturalist	645-6433 (direct 645-3539)	Tualatin Hills Parks & Recreation Div. 15707 SW Walker Rd Beaverton OR 97006	Public landowner	Contact initiated/message left Discussed/faxed information Interview (personal/phone)	_____ _____ _____
John Emerick	614-4600		Business owner	Contact initiated/message left Discussed/faxed information Interview (personal/phone)	_____ _____ _____
Phil Gentemann	656-8411	Centurion Homes 2137 Marylwood Ct West Linn OR 97068	Developer/Homeowner	Contact initiated/message left Discussed/faxed information Interview (personal/phone)	_____ _____ _____
Lisa Hix	360 735-8830	Parks Box 1995 Vancouver, WA 98668-1995	Public landowner	Contact initiated/message left Discussed/faxed information Interview (personal/phone)	_____ _____ _____
Mike McKeel	665-8888		Private landowner	Contact initiated/message left Discussed/faxed information Interview (personal/phone)	_____ _____ _____
Al Mirati	872-5252 ext. 5590		Private landowner	Contact initiated/message left Discussed/faxed information Interview (personal/phone)	_____ _____ _____
Liz Newton	639-4171	City of Tigard Parks Dept. 13125 SW Hall Blvd. Tigard, OR 97223	Public landowner	Contact initiated/message left Discussed/faxed information Interview (personal/phone)	_____ _____ _____

Metro Interview List

Page 2

Steve Puls (Alisa Bershaw, assistant)	699-9660	Centex Homes 4000 Kruse Way PL, Bdg. 2, St. 300 Lake Oswego, OR 97035	Developer	Contact initiated/message left Discussed/faxed information Interview (personal/phone)	_____ _____ _____
Kelly Scott	788-6086	Trillium Hollow	Private Landowner	Contact initiated/message left Discussed/faxed information Interview (personal/phone)	_____ _____ _____
Bob Strebin	665-2756	Troutdale (V. Lantz contact)	Private landowner	Contact initiated/message left Discussed/faxed information Interview (personal/phone)	_____ _____ _____
Teresa Talbott, Acquisition Spec.	618-2667	Gresham Parks 1333 NW Eastman Pkwy Gresham OR 97030	Public landowner	Contact initiated/message left Discussed/faxed information Interview (personal/phone)	_____ _____ _____
Homer Williams	227-6593	HGW 1325 NW Flanders Portland OR 97209	Developer	Contact initiated/message left Discussed/faxed information Interview (personal/phone)	_____ _____ _____

**METRO PARKS AND GREENSPACES
NATURAL RESOURCE POLICY RESEARCH**

STAKEHOLDER SURVEY INTERVIEW FORM

Name, Address and Telephone

Interviewed by:

General Background

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this survey about conservation programs and incentives. Metro is studying programs and incentives that may assist and support landowners with efforts to conserve the natural resources on their land. Your answers to the following questions will help Metro understand what programs may be of most interest to landowners and why.

Metro is conducting a nationwide survey of successful conservation approaches as part of its implementation strategy for the Regional Framework Plan. Using information collected through this survey, Metro plans to develop policies to protect and manage components of the regional system of natural areas, open spaces, parks, trails and greenways. Interviews with local stakeholders such as yourself are a critical component of this survey and will be used to evaluate and help develop Metro policy proposals.

The first set of questions relates to your experience with conservation incentive programs and regulations. Here we are interested in any programs that you may have used or are familiar with, including programs that you may have used in the past but which are no longer available.

1. Using a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being well aware or informed, how aware or informed are you of programs to conserve open space and natural resources that provide financial, technical, educational, or other forms of assistance to landowners? An example of such a program would be a tax-based program such as Oregon's Riparian Tax Incentive or Multnomah County Farm Deferral.

	unaware or uninformed			well aware or informed	
Ranking:	1	2	3	4	5

Please identify and describe your experience with these programs.

2. Using a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being very effective, how effective is each of the programs you have mentioned above? (An effective program for the purposes of this question would be one that successfully conserves resources and provides a practical benefit to landowners.)

Program	ineffective			very effective	
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5

3. What features of these programs do you think make them effective?

4. What features of these programs make them ineffective?

5. What changes do you think could improve these programs and make them more attractive to landowners?

6. Using a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being well aware or informed, how aware or informed are you of local, state or federal regulations regarding conservation of open space and natural resources such as streams, vegetation and wildlife habitat? An example of such a regulation would be Oregon's wetland fill/removal law or Portland's environmental overlay zones.

	unaware or uninformed			well aware or informed	
Ranking:	1	2	3	4	5

Please identify and describe your experience with these regulations.

7. Using a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being very effective, how effective do you consider each of the regulations you have mentioned? (An effective regulation for the purposes of this question would be one that successfully conserves resources while providing practical options for landowners.)

Regulation	ineffective			very effective	
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5

8. What features of these regulations do you think make them effective?

9. What features of these regulations make them not effective?

10. What changes do you think could improve these regulations and make them more attractive to landowners?

For the next set of questions, we would like to get your impression of various types of conservation approaches and your assessment of approaches that you would be most likely to use. There are two broad categories of approaches: non-regulatory (such as education and incentive programs) and regulatory (such as government agency requirements). Some of these approaches may have been raised in your answers to the previous questions. The first question addresses non-regulatory approaches and the second addresses regulatory approaches.

11. Using a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being an approach to which you would be most receptive, please rank each of the following non-regulatory approaches.

<i>Type of Approach</i>		<i>not receptive</i>			<i>receptive</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5
A	Education Education can be offered to landowners in a variety of ways. For example, printed materials could provide information on how to control invasive plants, how to improve fish habitat in streams, or on what funding sources or other resources are available for landowners. Field trips, courses, workshops, or technical assistance are other options.					
B	Grants and Loans Grant and loans can support landowner's efforts to manage natural resources and can provide funding for education, technical assistance or acquisition. Oregon's Governor's Watershed Enhancement Board is a statewide grant program that has provided more than \$10 million to landowners, watershed councils, and others to assist with watershed assessment and monitoring, restoration projects, and education/outreach efforts across the state. Metro's Habitat Restoration and Environmental Education Grants or King County, Washington's Urban Reforestation and Habitat Restoration Grants are other programs with similar goals.					

<i>Type of Approach</i>		<i>not receptive</i>			<i>receptive</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5
C	<i>Preferential Tax Treatment</i> A variety of local, state and federal programs offer landowners tax incentives for preserving certain uses or resources on their land. Examples include current use assessments that require taxes to reflect actual current uses rather than the "highest and best" use. Designated Forestland in Oregon is valued and taxed at its value for forest use rather than its market value. The Riparian Lands tax incentive program provides a tax exemption for protection of 100-foot wide riparian lands adjacent to streams. Open Space Lands provides for designation and assessment of lands where open space use is the highest and best use.					
D	<i>Conservation Employment Programs</i> This type of program provides training and employment opportunities in areas such as habitat restoration, resource data collection, outreach assistance, and program administration. An example is the Hire the Fishers Program that provides work for fishers and other fisheries reduction-impacted workers to restore streams and improve salmon habitat; also, Jobs in the Woods (NW forests)					
E	<i>Landowner Recognition/Stewardship Certification</i> Several public and private organizations have initiated programs that recognize the special conservation efforts of landowners, including programs that offer awards and financial support. A related approach provides opportunities for landowners to have their land management operations sanctioned or certified according to established criteria.					
F	<i>Easements, Leases and Purchase of Development Rights</i> These programs allow the landowner to retain ownership of land and reserve specific rights while selling or donating certain land development rights. Such programs do not necessarily require landowners to alter current or intended use of their land. Examples include conservation leases (a service contract) and conservation easements (a legal restriction on specified development rights).					
G	<i>Acquisition</i> Acquisition programs generally fall into two categories: "fee ownership" and "leaseback" or "development rights" programs (discussion above). A landowner can sell or donate a fee simple interest in all or part of their land. Metro's Greenspaces Bond Measure is an example of such a program. In some cases, landowners have retained their homes and sold the undeveloped portion of the land.					
H	<i>Life Estates</i> Life estates can provide income for landowners who want to live on their land and preserve it in its current use, rather than develop it. A local government or conservation group could purchase a life estate in the land and lease the property back to the current owners during their lifetime. Owners could pass their land to their children without deed or other restrictions.					

<i>Type of Approach</i>		<i>not receptive</i>			<i>receptive</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5
I	Demonstration Projects Demonstration projects are a type of educational approach, similar to those mentioned in item A above, but which typically offer on-the-ground examples of certain stewardship concepts. They include such projects as the ODFW "Wild in the City" garden, Naturescaping "Wildlife Gardens," and similar gardens including backyard habitat and native plant gardens. In addition to demonstrating stewardship actions, such projects can also show how incentive or regulatory programs work, and may include innovative ideas or promotions (e.g., a landowner might win a backyard habitat installed free of charge by a local nursery).					
J	Other Please add any other non-regulatory approaches that you may be familiar with, and indicate your receptiveness to them.					

12. Which three non-regulatory programs do you think are most appealing and why?

- 1) ___ why?
- 2) ___ why?
- 3) ___ why?

13. Which three programs do you think are least appealing and why?

- 1) ___ why?
- 2) ___ why?
- 3) ___ why?

14. Turning now to regulatory approaches, please rank each of the following approaches using a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being an approach that you would be most receptive to?

<i>Type of Approach</i>		<i>not receptive</i>			<i>receptive</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5
A	Open Space Zoning This type of regulatory approach has been used in situations where communities want to protect agricultural or open space lands or to protect specified resources through large-lot zoning programs. Some programs require that a specified percentage of each parcel must remain in open space. Such zoning options are more common in rural than in urban areas, but have been used to protect urban natural resources and as a way for urban landowners to reduce property or income taxes.					
B	Conservation Districts or Overlays Conservation zoning can include special districts, overlays, or standards that protect streams and other sensitive lands. Though it may limit the location of development through setbacks and similar restrictions, such zoning does not necessarily prevent otherwise allowed uses or reduce overall allowed density of a property. Greater flexibility in allowed uses, lot sizes, and setbacks is often permitted through cluster zoning (see below) or similar mechanisms.					

<i>Type of Approach</i>		<i>not receptive</i>			<i>receptive</i>	
		1	2	3	4	5
C	Other Zoning Approaches There is a range of other zoning mechanisms that focus on specific resources or land use activities. These approaches include tree protection or vegetation management ordinances, river corridor protection or buffer standards, and controls on fencing, vehicle access, or construction activity.					
D	Performance Standards Performance standards focus on limiting development impacts rather than uses or densities. They provide landowners with flexibility in how they use their land so long as they control impacts such as erosion, vegetation clearing, noise, or glare. Such impacts, however, can sometimes be difficult to measure.					
E	Density Bonuses Landowners are allowed to exceed zoned housing or commercial development limitations if they take certain actions to preserve open space or other resources. The amount of additional allowed density is normally in the range of a 25 to 50% bonus.					
F	Clustering Cluster zoning, planned unit developments, and similar zoning and subdivision mechanisms enable open space and other significant resources to be preserved without changing the allowable development density of a property. These provisions allow flexibility in lot size, dimensional standards and other zoning requirements. They also set minimum standards for the percentage of land set aside as open space.					
G	Transferable Development Rights Transferable Development Rights (TDRs) provide an opportunity for landowners to shift development rights from unsuitable or restricted lands to more appropriate development sites. One landowner may sell development rights in a "sending" area to another landowner in a "receiving" area, who increases his or her development potential in that area beyond what would otherwise be possible.					
H	Streamlining Regulations and Procedures Streamlining can take many forms, and can apply to both regulatory and non-regulatory conservation policies. Streamlining can include reducing paperwork, simplifying procedures and requirements, reducing review times, and coordinating the requirements of multiple agencies into one process with one point of contact. One example of a streamlined approach would be to eliminate an otherwise required land use review process for enhancement projects or for resource sensitive development.					
I	Other Please add any other regulatory approaches that you may be familiar with, and indicate your receptiveness to them.					

15. Which three regulatory approaches do you think are most appealing and why?

- 1) ____ why?
- 2) ____ why?
- 3) ____ why?

16. Which three approaches do you think are least appealing and why?

1) ____ why?

2) ____ why?

3) ____ why?

17. In your opinion, are regulatory, non-regulatory or a combination of these approaches more appropriate for conserving open space resources and meeting the needs of landowners?

____ Regulatory ____ Non-Regulatory ____ Combination

Please explain your answer:

18. In your opinion, what type of agency or organization, or combination of agencies and organizations, would be most appropriate to administer a stewardship program such as those addressed in this questionnaire (i.e., local, regional, state or federal government, land conservancy, watershed council, other group, or some combination)?

Please explain:

19. Are there particular programs that have been discussed above that you think are best suited to certain types of government or other administering agencies (e.g., the County might be best suited to administer a tax incentive program)?

20. What would it take for you to protect natural resources on your land (i.e., what are the obstacles and what would it take to remove them)?

Title 3: Water Quality and Flood Management Conservation

PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE METRO ANALYSIS OF GOAL 5 REGIONAL RESOURCES FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT PROTECTION, ENHANCEMENT AND RESTORATION

October 1998

I. Project Goal

The goal of this project is to identify, map, analyze and determine protection, enhancement and restoration measures for Goal 5 regional resources for fish and wildlife habitat. The directive for Metro to carry out this work is described in Title 3, Section 5 in the Metro *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (Functional Plan)*. The purpose of Title 3, Section 5 is to: *"conserve, protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat within the fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas to be identified on the water quality and flood management area map by establishing performance standards and promoting coordination by Metro of regional urban watersheds."*

Metro's objectives in carrying out this work are to: 1) identify gaps in current protection of Goal 5 regional resources to protect, enhance and restore fish and wildlife habitat; 2) identify a range of protection, enhancement and restoration measures to address these gaps and inadequately protected fish and wildlife habitat; and 3) to serve a coordination and technical assistance role among the 27 jurisdictions in the Metro region to address the protection, enhancement and restoration of Goal 5 regional resources within urban watersheds.

II. Background

Metro's Charter requires it to address issues of regional significance such as land use and transportation planning as well as regional parks and open spaces. Protecting streams, floodplains, and fish and wildlife habitat is part of a larger effort to create livable communities now and for future generations. The Regional Framework Plan, adopted by the Metro Council in December 1997, outlines strategies for protecting the values that citizens have said are most important: access to nature, ability to get around the region, resources for future generations, a strong regional economy, clean air and water, and safe and stable neighborhoods.

Title 3, the Stream and Floodplain Protection Plan, is one chapter in a 10-chapter Urban Growth Management Functional Plan. This Functional Plan establishes policies that apply to all 24 cities and three counties within the Metro boundary, and includes recommendations and requirements for local governments to meet. Title 3 implementation has been on a different schedule from the other chapters of the Functional Plan. The Metro Council required staff to create maps showing all lands affected by Title 3, and to develop a model ordinance which can be used by cities and counties as one way to achieve the performance standards.

The Metro Council adopted the Title 3 maps and model ordinance on June 18, 1998. The remaining planning requirements from Title 3, Section 5 address fish and wildlife habitat conservation. This work plan describes the tasks Metro will carry out to meet the requirements of Title 3, Section 5. In addition, staff will use the 1996 Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) amended Goal 5 Rule as guidance in carrying out this work plan.

In March 1998, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) listed steelhead as a threatened species in the lower Columbia River, which includes a major portion of the Metro region. The NMFS listing has implications for this Goal 5 work plan. Metro seeks to ensure this work plan is consistent with protection measures that may be required by NMFS or other measures identified by Metro, which may exceed NMFS requirements. As the work plan is being carried out, Metro staff will adjust the work plan as need to respond to species recovery and protection requirements. In order to ensure the work plan tasks are coordinated with and

complementary to future recovery and protection efforts, a staff member from the NMFS will participate on the Goal 5 Technical Committee.

This work plan will not, however, focus only on threatened steelhead or any other individual species. This work plan uses a multiple species approach and it is intended to address a range of species and habitats within Metro's jurisdiction.

This work plan is based upon the following key assumptions:

An interdisciplinary Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) will be formed to advise staff on the monthly progress of work plan implementation. Metro staff will report periodically to the Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC) and the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) to report on progress and present work products as tasks are completed.

The work plan will track and coordinate with the regional and state response to the NMFS Steelhead listing in the lower Columbia River and work to promote and support comprehensive recovery efforts within the Metro region.

This work plan addresses Goal 5 "regional resources" as authorized by OAR 660-23-080. This is the section in the 1996 amended State Land Use Goal 5 Rule entitled: Metro Regional Resources and includes the following language:

"Metro Regional Resources

660-23-080 (1) For purposes of this rule, the following definitions apply:

(a) "Metro" is the Metropolitan Service District organized under ORS Chapter 268, and operating under the 1992 Metro Charter, for 24 cities and certain urban portions of Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington counties.

(b) "Regional resource" is a site containing a significant Goal 5 resource, including but not limited to a riparian corridor, wetland, or open space area, which is identified as a regional resource on a map adopted by Metro ordinance.

(2) Local governments shall complete the Goal 5 process in this division for all regional resources prior to or during the first periodic review following Metro's adoption of a regional resources map, unless Metro adopts a regional functional plan by ordinance to establish a uniform time for all local governments to complete the Goal 5 process for particular regional resource sites.

(3) Metro may adopt one or more regional functional plans to address all applicable requirements of Goal 5 and this division for one or more resource categories and to provide time limits for local governments to implement the plan. Such functional plans shall be submitted for acknowledgement under the provisions of ORS 197.251 and 197.274. Upon acknowledgement of Metro's regional resource functional plan, local governments within Metro's jurisdiction shall apply the requirements of the functional plan for regional resources rather than the requirements of this division."

Metro will convene a Peer Review Committee to review and evaluate the technical scientific findings paper, technical products and the final products. It will also review an outline of the technical paper to ensure the content is adequate.

A "core team" of Metro staff from the Growth Management Services, and Parks and Greenspaces Departments will carry out this work plan. A larger "extended team" of Metro staff from both departments will be kept informed of progress in carrying the work plan and will assist in specific tasks as identified in the work plan.

Metro will develop and implement a public information and involvement plan for this project. Metro will inform and seek input from the public, landowners, local jurisdictions and special interest groups as the project is carried out.

**Metro Analysis of Goal 5 Regional Resources for Fish and Wildlife Habitat
Outline of Work Plan Tasks
October 1998**

Section I: Process for Carrying Out the Work Plan and Involving the Public

- Task 1: Form Technical Advisory Committee and Finalize Scope of Work
- Task 2: Form a Peer Review Committee
- Task 3: Develop and Implement a Public Involvement Plan

Section II: Standards, Criteria and Methodologies for Goal 5 Regional Resource Fish and Wildlife Habitat

- Task 4: Establish Criteria and Standards to Define Regional Resources for Goal 5 Fish and Wildlife Habitat
- Task 5: Produce Technical Paper and Scientific Findings
- Task 6: Determine a Fish and Wildlife Habitat Assessment Methodology
- Task 7: Determine the Metro ESEE Methodology
- Task 8: Establish Criteria to Assess and Evaluate Local Goal 5 Protection

Section III: Inventory Preparation and Assessment

- Task 9: Inventory and Map Existing Local Goal 5 Fish and Wildlife Habitat Data
- Task 10: Inventory and Map Fish and Wildlife Habitat Data from Other Data Sources
- Task 11: Create Composite Map No. 3 by Combining Existing Local Goal 5 Data and Other Fish and Wildlife Habitat Data
- Task 12: Apply Metro's Goal 5 Fish and Wildlife Regional Significance Criteria to Identify and Map Goal 5 Regional Resource Fish and Wildlife Habitat
- Task 13: Identify and Analyze Data Gaps
- Task 14: Map Goal 5 Regional Resource Fish and Wildlife Habitat
- Task 15: Evaluate and Identify How Goal 5 Products will Integrate with Metro's Greenspaces Master Plan

Section IV: Protection Measures

- Task 16: Identify Conflicting Uses in Habitat Areas Determined to be Regional Resources
- Task 17: Determine the Impact Area
- Task 18: Decide Whether to Apply Safe Harbor or Conduct ESEE
- Task 19: Apply Safe Harbor or Analyze the ESEE Consequences

Section V: Program for Protection

- Task 20: Conduct General Research to Identify a Range of Resource Protection Measures
- Task 21: Prepare an Inventory of Resource Protection Measures that May Be Applied by Metro
- Task 22: Establish Performance Standards for Protection of Goal 5 Regional Resource Habitat Based on ESEE Conflict Analysis
- Task 23: Public Review and Metro Council Adoption of Goal 5 Regional Resource Protection Measures and/or Performance Standards and Map

**Metro Analysis of Goal 5 Regional Resource Fish and Wildlife Habitat Work Plan Tasks
October 1998**

Section I: Process for Carrying Out the Work Plan and Involving the Public

Task 1: Form Technical Advisory Committee and Finalize Scope of Work

Identify candidates and form a TAC made up of a multi-disciplinary team of technical experts from the Portland metropolitan region that will advise the Metro staff team on implementation of the project. The TAC will review the draft scope of work and taking into consideration the recent Steelhead listing for the lower Columbia River, revise the draft work plan accordingly.

- 1.a. Identify potential TAC members.
- 1.b. Form committee, finalize membership and define roles and responsibilities.
- 1.c. TAC will meet and be presented draft scope of work.
- 1.d. TAC reviews scope of work and finalizes scope of work.

Participants: Metro core team, TAC Members: selected WRPAC, RPAG and GTAC members, and other experts in the region, including the NMFS.

Total Task 1 Time Requirement: 70 hours

Product: Final scope of work approved by the TAC.

Task 2: Form a Peer Review Committee

Identify candidates and form a Peer Review Committee that will review and comment of key products during project implementation and the final product. The peer review committee will review an outline of the Technical Paper to ensure its content is adequate. This group will communicate primarily by mail in order to review documents and comment on selected products.

- 2.a. Identify potential Peer Review Committee members.
- 2.b. Form committee, finalize membership and define roles and responsibilities.
- 2.c. Peer Review Committee formed; mail, e-mail or fax scope of work and their tasks.

Participants: Selected experts from the Oregon and Pacific Northwest, approximately six members.

Total Task 2 Time Requirement: 60 hours

Product: Peer Review Committee established, tasks identified and agreed upon.

Task 3: Develop and Implement a Public Involvement Plan

Metro shall develop and carry out a public involvement program that informs and involves local jurisdictions, landowners, public natural resource agencies and citizens during all stages of program implementation. Information about the project and interim products will be shared with target audiences and the general public. Metro staff will coordinate with the Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement (MCCI) to seek its advice in communicating with citizens and interest groups.

Depending on the availability of financial resources, Metro will:

- 3.a. Develop public information and multi-media materials to inform and seek input from the public, landowners and target audiences about the program. This should include identification and communication with key stakeholders at the beginning of the public involvement effort and continued communication with those stakeholders as the work plan is implemented.
- 3.b. Develop and carry out a public involvement program to inform target audiences about the project and seek input and review of interim products. This will be carried out through a variety of public involvement strategies such as: a) targeted media campaign to generate stories and notices about the project, b) notification and information to individual landowners, c) conducting public workshops and open houses, d) display of materials and interim products at different public events, e) posting of information on the Metro web site, f) use of Metro Growth Management Services Department hotline for dispensing program information and taking comments, f) activate WRPAC speakers bureau to inform neighborhoods and CPOs and g) public hearings and work sessions with the Metro Council and Metro committees.
- 3.c. Revise products based on public input as needed.

Participants: Citizens, key stakeholders, landowners, public natural resource agencies, local cities and counties, Metro staff and public involvement staff, MCCI, WRPAC, MTAC and GTAC members.

Total Task 3 Time Requirements: 400 hours

Products: Written materials, display materials, landowner mailings, public notices, multi-media displays, newspaper articles, Metro web site and hotline information, and stakeholder surveys.

Section II: Standards, Criteria and Methodologies for Goal 5 Regional Resources for Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Task 4: Establish Criteria and Standards to Define Goal 5 Regional Resources to Protect Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Metro staff, with guidance from the TAC, will establish criteria and standards to define and identify "regional resources" to protect, enhance and restore fish and wildlife habitat. The standards and definition of "regional resources" will be closely tied to the method for identifying "significant" resources under the Goal 5 Rule. These guidelines are set out at OAR 660-23-030(4). Therefore the criteria and standards may include the following: a) the scale and scope of significance, b) presence of sensitive species and habitat, c) the quality, quantity and location of the habitat, d) whether the resource crosses jurisdictional boundaries, e) any additional criteria adopted by the local government, i.e. Metro, such as criteria from the Greenspaces Master Plan, Region 2040 Concept, Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOs) and the Regional Framework Plan, and f) other significance criteria set forth in the Goal 5 Rule, such as in the "riparian corridor" section. The Metro Council will adopt the criteria that are recommended by staff and the TAC.

The Goal 5 Rule identifies a "regional resource" in OAR 660-23-080(b) as a site containing a significant Goal 5 resource, including but not limited to a riparian corridor, wetland or open space area, which is identified as a regional resource on a map adopted by Metro ordinance.

* The TAC will also identify how to address the issue of enhancing degraded regional resources habitat and how to incorporate and address habitat restoration in the Goal 5 regional resource protection program.

* The TAC will also establish the geographic boundary for the project. For the purposes of the study, it is possible the analysis may be carried out outside Metro's boundary. It is understood, however, that Metro only has authority within its jurisdictional boundary.

✓ 4.a. Define what is meant by Goal 5 "regional resources" to protect fish and wildlife habitat and define the boundary of the study area. This definition must include consideration of how the region will respond to the recent Steelhead listing as specified by the NMFS in order to assist in the protection and recovery of threatened species.

✓ 4.b. Use relevant information from the Goal 5 Fish and Wildlife Technical Paper (Task 5) and other technical information to establish criteria and scope of "regional resources".

✓ 4.c. Review draft criteria and study boundary with WRPAC, MTAC, GTAC, MPAC and Metro Council.

✓ 4.d. Develop public information and seek public comment on criteria and study boundary. *

4.e. Adopt criteria, definition of Goal 5 "regional resources" to protect fish and wildlife habitat and the adopted geographic boundary for the study area by Metro Council.

4.f. The definition may include a description or criteria for determining what is not a significant resource.

Participants: Metro core team, Metro public involvement staff, extended team, department managers, TAC, Metro committees, Metro Council and the public.

Total Task 4 Time Requirement: 40 hours

Product: Criteria and standards for identifying Goal 5 regional resources for fish and wildlife habitat are established and adopted by the Metro Council for the purposes of this study. The Metro Council will also adopt the geographic boundary for the study.

Task 5: Produce Technical Paper and Scientific Findings

A research paper will be produced which provides technical background, findings and scientific substantiation for the methodologies, criteria and standards used to carry out this work plan. Research and write a technical scientific paper on methodologies for identifying and evaluating Goal 5 regional resources for protecting fish and wildlife habitat and establish a Metro ESEE conflicts analysis methodology. Topics that will be researched include:

Define the issues, problem and needs statement for protection, enhancement and restoration of regionally significant fish and wildlife habitat.

Identify and evaluate different methodologies used to assess and evaluate upland, wetland, stream and riparian fish and wildlife habitat. Recommend a methodology Metro can use to evaluate the location, quantity and quality of fish and wildlife habitat.

Research and identify different ways to determine Goal 5 regional resource criteria and standards. Make recommendations for criteria and standards to be included in the definition of Goal 5 regional resource to protect fish and wildlife habitat.

Identify ways to inventory the location, quality and quantity of Goal 5 regional resources to protect fish and wildlife habitat.

Determine which Goal 5 resources will be reviewed which could include "riparian corridors," "wetlands," "open space" and "wildlife habitat."

Evaluate different ESEE conflicts analysis methods used to evaluate significant Goal 5 fish and wildlife habitat resources. Make recommendations for a Metro analysis method based on this evaluation.

Define Metro's ESEE conflicts analysis methods.

Determine criteria to evaluate the adequacy of local Goal 5 fish and wildlife habitat protection.

5.a. Research and write draft paper.

5.b. Review of draft paper by TAC, WRPAC, MTAC and Peer Review Committee.

5.c. Revise draft and incorporate comments.

5.d. Finalize paper.

Participants: Metro core team, technical writer, TAC and Peer Review Committee, WRPAC and MTAC.

Total Task 5 Time Requirement: 700 hours

Product: Technical paper and scientific findings.

Task 6: Determine a Fish and Wildlife Habitat Assessment Methodology

Based on the results from the Technical Paper and review of habitat assessment methodologies, develop a Metro Fish and Wildlife Habitat Assessment Methodology for upland wildlife, riparian habitat and fish habitat. This methodology will be based on review and evaluation of existing assessment methods and selecting a methodology that best meets Metro's needs.

6.a. Select Goal 5 resources to be inventoried.

6.b. Review and evaluate existing assessment methodologies.

6.c. Define a fish and wildlife habitat assessment methodology that best meets the program's needs.

6.d. Use the methodology as needed.

Participants: Metro core team and TAC.

Total Task 6 Time Requirement: 260 hours

Product: Fish and wildlife habitat assessment methodology adopted for this project.

Task 7: Determine the Metro Economic, Social, Environmental and Energy (ESEE) Methodology

Based on the results from the Technical Paper and review of different types of ESEE conflict analysis methodology, develop an analysis method for evaluating the ESEE consequences that could result from a decision to allow, limit or prohibit a conflicting use. Metro may identify a number of subfactors under the "economic, social, environmental and energy" analysis. These subfactors will have to be related to the four ESEE consequences. Metro may also evaluate guidelines for determining "conflicting uses" OAR 660-23-040(2). Metro also anticipates that other Goal 5 resources will conflict with the "regional resources" Metro identifies. For example, aggregate resource sites are likely to conflict with riparian corridor and wetland protection measures.

7.a. Evaluate different ways of conducting and analyzing ESEE conflict consequences.

7.b. Identify how Metro will determine the impact area. This will include an analysis of how an impact area could be measured and this will be substantiated from the Technical Scientific Paper and Findings (Task 5).

7.c. Develop an ESEE analysis process that will be used for this project.

Participants: Metro core team and TAC.

Total Task 7 Time Requirement: 400 hours

Product: A Metro ESEE conflict analysis methodology.

Task 8: Establish Criteria to Assess and Evaluate Local Goal 5 Protection

Develop criteria to assess and evaluate local Goal 5 protection for habitat that has been identified as regional resource fish and wildlife habitat and is currently protected by a local jurisdiction.

8.a. Develop the criteria to assess and evaluate local Goal 5 protection.

8.b. Test the criteria on selected habitat areas and refine it based on the testing.

8.c. Produce final set of criteria.

Participants: Metro core team, TAC and Peer Review Committee.

Total Task 8 Time Requirement: 40 hours

Product: Criteria to assess and evaluate local Goal 5 protection.

Section III: Inventory Preparation and Assessment

Task 9: Inventory and Map Existing Local Goal 5 Fish and Wildlife Habitat Data

Compile existing Goal 5 fish and wildlife habitat data from both map, tabular and written sources from city and county comprehensive plans into the Metro geographic information system (GIS). Produce a composite map summarizing the data currently available at the local level. Local cities and counties will review the initial draft map for accuracy. In addition to summarizing data in map form, produce a matrix summarizing the status of Goal 5 fish and habitat comprehensive plan compliance for the Metro region. The TAC will have to address the fact that many local Goal 5

inventories were carried out using the old OAR for Goal 5. The TAC will have to address how to reconcile the different inventory methods that have been used over the years based on different OARs.

9.a. Work with local cities and counties and Metro data sources to compile all available GIS, hard copy, reports and other relevant fish and wildlife habitat data available in local comprehensive plans.

9.b. Digitize all data for the region.

9.c. Produce a draft map and share with cities and counties to conduct review for accuracy by local cities and counties. (This task may require an extra round of review between Metro and local jurisdiction based on quality of the data.)

9.d. Revise map based on local jurisdiction review and comments: Product: *Map No. 1: Local Goal 5 Fish and Wildlife Habitat Map.*

9.e. Summarize and produce matrix of status of local jurisdiction Goal 5 fish and habitat work.

Participants: Metro core team, selected extended team members, city and county planners and GIS staff, regional DLCD staff.

Total Task 9 Time Requirement: 460 hours

Products:

1. Map No.1: *"Local Goal 5 Fish and Wildlife Habitat from Local Comprehensive Plans in Metro Region"* summarizing Goal 5 fish and wildlife habitat data in local city and county comprehensive plans; and
2. Matrix summarizing status of local Goal 5 fish and wildlife habitat protection in comprehensive plans.

Task 10: Inventory and Map Fish and Wildlife Habitat Data from Other Data Sources

This task will compile and map fish and wildlife habitat data that are available from selected sources other than local Goal 5 comprehensive plans. This data will include Federal and State threatened, endangered and sensitive species data, and the Oregon Natural Heritage Database. Data from the updated 1998 Metro Regionally Significant Natural Areas Map will also be used to verify location and condition of habitat. A methodology similar to Task No. 9 will be used to seek relevant data from these existing sources (i.e., ODFW regional STEP biologists), compile the data onto a regional GIS map and produce a draft map for review and comment by those who provided the data.

- 10.a. Define criteria for data collection.
- 10.b. Collect and digitize data on fish and wildlife habitat from other sources.
- 10.c. Produce a draft map of these habitat areas.
- 10.d. Review and revise draft map with those who provided data.
- 10.e. Produce Map No. 2.

Participants: Metro core team, consultant, Federal and State Fish and Wildlife Management Agencies, Oregon Natural Heritage Database staff and Green City Data staff.

Total Task 10 Time Requirement: 320 hours

Product: Map No.2: " Other Fish and Wildlife Habitat Data"

Task 11: Create Composite Map No. 3 by Combining Map No. 1: Existing Local Goal 5 Fish and Wildlife Data, and Map No. 2: Other Fish and Wildlife Habitat Data

This task will combine the data from two maps: Map No. 1: Existing Local Goal 5 Fish and Wildlife Habitat Data, and Map No.2: Inventory of Fish and Wildlife Habitat Data. The product will be a composite Map No. 3, which summarizes all the data from Map No. 1 and Map No. 2. Map No. 3 will be the comprehensive fish and wildlife habitat database to which the Metro's Goal 5 Regional Resource Fish and Wildlife Habitat criteria will be applied. Field verification will be conducted on sites identified in the combined Map No. 3.

- 11.a. Combine Map No.1 and Map No. 2 using GIS to produce Map No. 3.
- 11.b. Develop a field sheet to evaluate condition of resources in Map No. 3.
- 11.c. Develop a method to select sites to field verify.
- 11.d. Field verify selected sites from Map No. 3 by consultant team and staff to verify data collection methodology and verify presence of the habitat.
- 11.e Conduct fieldwork to verify data.
- 11.f Revise Map No. 3 based on results of fieldwork.

Participants: Metro core team, consultant team, Metro extended team and TAC.

Total Task 11 Time Required: 40 hours

Product: Map No. 3: Composite Fish and Wildlife Habitat Map.

Task 12: Apply Metro's Goal 5 Regional Resources for Protection of Fish and Wildlife Habitat Criteria to Identify and Map Goal 5 Regional Resources for Protection of Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Use the regional resource criteria adopted by the Metro Council to evaluate and identify Metro's Goal 5 regional resource fish and wildlife habitat. These areas will be field checked. Metro will identify when and where there is adequate information to determine whether there is a "significant" resource.

- 12.a. Use the regional resource criteria developed in Task No. 4 to analyze and evaluate Map No.3.
- 12.b. Determine if "quantity" and "quality" of the information is adequate:
OAR 660-23-030(b and c)
- 12.c. Based on this analysis and evaluation, identify and map Goal 5 regional resource fish and wildlife habitat.
- 12.d. Field check regionally significant Goal 5 fish and wildlife habitat resources by consultant team and staff.
- 12.d. Revise map based on field verification.
- 12.e. Metro Council adopts Map No. 4.

Participants: Metro core team, Metro extended team, consultant team and TAC.

Total Task 12 Time Requirement: 60 hours

Product: Map No. 4: Metro Goal 5 Regional Resources to Protect Fish and Wildlife Habitat adopted by the Metro Council.

Task 13: Identify and Analyze ^{Protection} Data Maps

Compare the Local Goal 5 Inventory Map (Map No.1) and the Metro Goal 5 Regional Resources Fish and Wildlife Habitat Map (Map No. 4) to identify which Metro Goal 5 regional resource fish and wildlife habitat areas are and are not currently protected under local Goal 5 plans. This task will result in: a) identification and mapping of those areas not currently protected under local Goal 5 programs; and b) identification of habitat areas that are currently protected under local Goal 5 programs. This task will involve not only examining which resources are mapped for protection by local jurisdictions, but also examining the program decisions, which determine the level of protection.

Where the Metro Goal 5 Regional Resource Fish and Wildlife Habitat criteria overlaps with habitat identified in local Goal 5 plans, Metro will apply its criteria to evaluate the adequacy of local protection. Based on this evaluation, Metro will identify habitat that is not being adequately protected by local comprehensive plans. This habitat will then be evaluated by Metro in the safe harbor or ESEE conflict analysis.

- 13.a. Overlay Map No.1 and Map No.4 using Metro's GIS.

- 13.b. Identify Goal 5 regional resource fish and wildlife habitat that is and is not currently protected by local Goal 5 planning programs.
- 13.c. For regional resource habitat that is not currently protected by local Goal 5 programs, Metro will implement either safe harbor or conduct an ESEE analysis depending on the resource targeted for protection.
- 13.d. For regional resources habitat that is currently protected under local Goal 5 programs, Metro staff will apply the criteria to evaluate the adequacy of current protection measures. Where protection is deemed inadequate, Metro will implement either safe harbor or conduct an ESEE analysis. Metro will not further analyze habitat that is adequately protected by local comprehensive plans.

Participants: Metro core team, Metro extended team, and TAC.

Total Task 13 Time Requirement: 80 hours

Product: Habitat is identified that is not adequately protected by local comprehensive plans and will be further analyzed by Metro.

Task 14. Map Goal 5 Regional Resource Fish and Wildlife Habitat Requiring Additional Protection

Based on Task 12 and Task 13, map the Goal 5 regional resource fish and wildlife habitat.

- 14.a. Combine the data from previous maps that meets the criteria for regional resource fish and wildlife habitat and that is not adequately protected by local cities and counties.
- 14.b. Produce map.

Participants: Metro core team, Metro extended team and TAC.

Total Task 14 Time Requirement: 30 hours

Product: Map of Metro Goal 5 regional resource fish and wildlife habitat requiring additional protection.

Task 15: Evaluate and Identify How Goal 5 products will Integrate with Metro's Regionally Significant Natural Areas Plan

This task will be coordinated with the Metro Parks and Greenspaces Department. It will compare the Goal 5 Regional Resource Fish and Wildlife Habitat Map with the latest Regional Parks and Natural Areas maps. Identify which regionally significant natural areas are protected by Metro's Goal 5 performance standards and which Regional Resource natural areas are not protected. Identify strategies to protect these areas not covered by Goal 5 or Title 3.

- 15.a. Compare Map Produced in Task 14: Regional Resource Fish and Wildlife Habitat Map with the updated Regionally Significant Natural Areas Maps.
- 15.b. Identify which Greenspaces not protected as regional Goal 5 habitat.
- 15.c. Identify strategies and "tools" to protect these habitat areas not protected under Goal 5.

Participants: Metro core team and GTAC.

Total Task 15 Time Requirement: 24 hours

Product: Strategies and tools developed to protect Regionally Significant Natural Areas Map not identified in Goal 5. For more details, refer to the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Work Plan.

Section IV: Protection Measures

Task 16: Identify Conflicts in Habitat Areas Determined to be Regional Resources

Conflicting uses will be identified for habitat identified as regional resources.

16.a. Identify the conflicting uses for each habitat area with input from local jurisdictions.

16.b. Review conflicting uses with local jurisdictions and revise based on their comments.

Participants: Metro core team and TAC.

Total Task 16 Time Requirement: 200 hours

Product: Conflicts identified for habitats that will have an ESEE analysis conducted.

Task 17: Determine the Impact Area

The Impact Area will be determined for each habitat area to have an ESEE conflict analysis conducted. The Technical Scientific Paper and Findings (Task 5) will provide technical guidance and recommendations as to which factors to consider in determining the area of impact, which impacts to consider and the distance factors of the impact from the habitat based on the type of impact.

Determine the impact area for each habitat to be analyzed by the ESEE conflicts methodology.

Participants: Metro core team and TAC.

Total Task 17 Time Requirement: 20 hours

Product: Impact areas determined for each habitat to have an ESEE analysis.

Task 18: Decide Whether to Apply Safe Harbor or Conduct ESEE

Based on the analysis of conflicts, determine where to apply safe harbor protection and which properties will have an ESEE conflicts analysis carried out.

Evaluate each habitat and identify which will have safe harbor protection and which will have an ESEE conflicts analysis conducted.

Participants: Metro core team and TAC.

Total Task 18 Time Requirement: 100 hours

Product: List identifying which properties will have safe harbor protection and which will have an ESEE conflict analysis carried out.

Task 19: Apply Safe Harbor or ESEE Conflict Analysis

Determine which habitat areas will have safe harbor protection or where a Goal 5 ESEE conflict analysis will be conducted for the Goal 5 regional resource fish and wildlife habitat areas identified in Task 14.

- 19.a. Determine where Goal 5 safe harbor will be applied. Map these Goal 5 safe harbor areas.
- 19.b. Determine where Goal 5 ESEE conflict analyses will be conducted and map these areas.
- 19.c. Conduct ESEE conflict analysis for habitat areas identified in Task 14 using Metro's ESEE methodology described produced in Task 7. Use relevant data from updated Regionally Significant Natural Areas Plan in the ESEE evaluation and analysis where applicable.
- 19.d. Summarize and evaluate results of ESEE conflict analyses.

Participants: Metro core team, Metro extended team, consultants and TAC.

Total Task 19 Time Requirement: 600 hours

Products:

- 1. Map of Goal 5 Regional Resource Fish and Wildlife Habitat protected, enhanced and restored by safe harbor methods.
- 2. Map of habitat to be analyzed by the ESEE conflict analysis.
- 3. Results of ESEE conflict analyses.

Section V: Program for Protection

Task 20: Conduct General Research to Identify a Range of Resource Protection Measures

Conduct a general literature search and interview experts to identify a wide-range of potential fish and wildlife habitat protection, enhancement and restoration measures. This should also identify ways to enhance degraded habitat and identify how to incorporate restoration efforts into the protection measures.

- 20.a. Conduct a national, state and regional literature search of potential fish and wildlife habitat protection measures. This will include a wide range of potential protection measures such as incentive programs, regulatory and voluntary efforts.
- 20.b. Interview experts knowledgeable with a wide-range of protection measures.
- 20.c. Produce a written report summarizing the findings of this research.

Participants: Metro core team, consultants and TAC.

Total Task 20 Time Requirement: 50 hours

Product: Written report on wide-range of habitat protection, enhancement and restoration measures.

Task 21: Prepare an Inventory of Habitat Protection Measures that Metro May Apply

Prepare a written report summarizing the habitat protection, enhancement and restoration measures that Metro may use to protect regionally significant fish and wildlife habitat. The report prepared in Task No. 19 will serve as a basis for this report.

- 21.a. Identify a range of habitat protection, enhancement and restoration measures that Metro may use to protect regional resource fish and wildlife habitat.
- 21.b. Write a report identifying and describing the habitat protection, enhancement and restoration measures that Metro may use to protect regional resource fish and wildlife habitat.

Participants: Metro core team, consultants and TAC.

Total Task 21 Time Requirement: 50 hours

Product: Written report identifying and describing the protection, enhancement and restoration measures that Metro may use to protect regional resource fish and wildlife habitat.

Task 22: Establish Performance Standards for Protection, Enhancement and Restoration of Goal 5 Regional Resource Fish and Wildlife Habitat Based on ESEE Conflict Analysis

- 22.a. Develop draft performance standards.
- 22.b. Metro committees review draft performance standards.
- 22.c. Finalize draft performance standards.

Participants: Metro core team, TAC, MTAC, MPAC, GTAC and WRPAC.

Total Task 22 Time Requirement: 260 hours.

Product: Draft Performance standards to protect, enhance and restore Goal 5 Regional Resource Habitat.

Task 23: Public Review and Metro Council Adoption of Goal 5 Regional Resource Performance Standards and Map (Functional Plan Element)

Metro Council will review a range of draft Goal 5 protection, enhancement and restoration measures, which may include land owner incentives, recommendations, performance standards and conduct public hearings prior to adoption as additional Functional Plan elements in Title 3 or a separate Functional Plan element. Discussion at this time will also include the adoption timeline for local jurisdictions to achieve regional requirements or recommendations.

- 23.a. Metro Council review of draft protection, enhancement and restoration options or performance standards.
- 23.b. Public workshops and review of protection, enhancement and restoration options and/or performance standards.

- 23.c. Metro Council public hearings on draft performance standards.
- 23.d. Public testimony and adoption of protection, enhancement and protection options and/or performance standards.
- 23.e. Work with local jurisdictions to achieve program goals.

Participants: Metro core team and Metro Council.

Total Task 23 Time Requirement: 500 hours

Product: Goal 5 Regional Resource protection, enhancement and restoration measures and/or performance standards adopted by Metro Council.

RF/srb
I:\GM\RF\Goal 5\scopeofwork.doc

III. Project Schedule and Timeline

	1998		1999		2000
	J J A S O N D	J F M A M J J A S O N D	J F M		

Tasks

Section I: Process

Task 1

Form TAC

Task 2

Form Peer Review Group

Task 3

Develop and Implement Public Invol. Plan

Section II: Standards and Criteria

Task 4

Estab. Criteria for Reg. Sig. Habitat

Task 5

Produce Tech. Paper and Findings

Task 6

Determine Habitat Assess. Method.

Task 7

Determine Metro ESEE Method

Task 8

Estab. Criteria to Eval. Local Goal 5 Prot.

Section III: Inventory Prep. and Assessment

Task 9

Inventory and Map Existing Goal 5

Task 10

Inventory and Map Other Data

Task 11

Create Composite Map No. 3

Task 12

Apply Metro Reg. Sig. Criteria

Task 13

Identify and Analyze Data Gaps

Task 14

Map Reg. Sig. Goal 5 Habitat

Task 15

Eval. with Metro Greenspaces Plan

III. Project Schedule and Timeline (continued)

	1998					1999					2000				
	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A
Tasks															
Section IV: Protection Measures															
Task 16															
Identify Conflicting Uses															
Task 17															
Determine the Impact Area															
Task 18															
Decide to Apply Safe Harbor or Conduct ESEE															
Task 19															
Apply Safe Harbor or ESEE															
Section V: Program for Protection															
Task 20															
Conduct General Research															
Task 21															
Prepare Inven. of Prot. Measures															
Task 22															
Estab. Perf. Stand. for Protection															
Task 23															
Public Review and Adoption															

IV. Metro Regional Goal 5 Analysis for Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation

Project Scope Summary Table

Work Elements and Tasks	Time Requirements (Staff Hours)	Time Requirements (Consultant Hours)	Total Hours
FY 1998-99			
Task 1: Form Technical Committee and Finalize Scope of Work	70		70
Task 2: Form Peer Review Group	60		60
Task 3: Develop and Implement a Public Involvement Plan	400		400
Task 4: Establish Criteria and Stand. To Define Reg. Resource	40		40
Task 5: Produce Technical Paper And Scientific Findings	700		700
Task 6: Determine Fish and Wildlife Habitat Methodology	100	160	260
Task 7: Determine Metro ESEE Meth.	200	200	400
Task 8: Establish Criteria to Evaluate Local Goal 5 Protection	40		40
Task 9: Inventory and Map Existing Goal 5 Habitat Data	460		460
Task 10: Inventory and Map Other Data Sources	200	120	320
Task 11: Create Map No. 3	40		40
Task 12: Apply Goal 5 Sig. Criteria	60		60
Task 13: Identify and Analyze Data Gaps	40	40	80
Task 14: Map Reg. Sig. Goal 5 Data	30		30
Task 15: Evaluate and Id. Integration with Metro Greenspaces Program	24		24
Task 16: Ident. Conflicting Uses	40	160	200
Task 17: Determine the Impact Area	20		20
Task 18: Decide Whether to Apply Safe Harbor or ESEE Analysis	20	80	100
Task 19: Apply Safe Harbor or Analyze the ESEE	100	500	600

Work Elements and Tasks	Time Requirements (Staff Hours)	Time Requirements (Consultant Hours)	Total Hours
Consequences			
Task 20: Conduct General Research to Id. Range of Res. Prot. Measures	50		50
Task 21: Prepare Inventory of Protection Measures	50		50
Task 22: Est. Performance Stand.	100	160	260
Task 23: Public Review and Adoption	500		500
Contingency	420	210	530
Total Hours	3,760	1,630	5,294

RF/srb
I:\GM\RF\Goal 5\scopeofwork.doc

Metro Regional Streamside CPR Project – Registration Form

Please mail back or fax this form to John Donovan, Metro, 600 NE Grand Ave, Portland, OR 97232, FAX: 797-1911 ASAP. Questions? 797-1871.

Stakeholder Name: _____
Organization: _____
Address: _____
Phone: _____ 2nd phone: _____
Fax: _____ e-mail: _____

Metro's Regional Streamside CPR Project is part of Metro's work on regional fish and wildlife habitat protection that responds to the state's land use laws and the region's initial response to the federal government's endangered species listing of the salmon and steelhead species here in the Portland area.

Our goal is to educate the public and stakeholders about the condition of fish and wildlife habitat in the region and explore possible actions to pursue to improve degraded portions of our rivers and streams. We intend the final product to be a strategic framework for beginning to address the issues surrounding fish and wildlife habitat with a range of recommended actions to the Metro Council to protect the best quality habitat and improve the existing problems. We're working with stakeholders from all sectors of the community as well as interested members of the public.

Metro's Regional Streamside CPR Project involves a four-week process of intensive, multi-day policy workshops and public open houses around the region. The two weeks of workshops are particularly crucial and are scheduled for April 20-21 and May 11-12. Our design calls for a diverse group of participants from all the key stakeholder groups to meet in small group settings at specific times during the event.

The workshops will be held at Holladay's Market adjacent to Lloyd Center Mall in NE Portland. Time permitting, we'll be sending you more information prior to the workshops. There are four "sessions" of discussion available for each workshop week. To participate fully, you need to schedule two three-hour blocks – one for each week. Please indicate if more than one slot works for you. The available slots are:

Week #1	Tuesday, April 20 from 9:00 a.m. -12:00 noon	#1 _____	(Pre-registration requested, but drop-ins welcome for #1-3) (Public session)
	Tuesday, April 20 from 6:00-9:00 p.m.	#2 _____	
	Wednesday, April 21 from 1:00-4:00 p.m.	#3 _____	
	Wednesday, April 21 from 6:00-9:00 p.m.	#4 _____	
Week #2	Tuesday, May 11 from 9:00 a.m. -12:00 noon	#5 _____	(Pre-registration requested, but drop-ins welcome for #5-7) (Public session)
	Tuesday, May 11 from 6:00-9:00 p.m.	#6 _____	
	Wednesday, May 12 from 1:00-4:00 p.m.	#7 _____	
	Wednesday, May 12 from 6:00-9:00 p.m.	#8 _____	

We're trying to get the word out about our project as quickly as possible. Does your organization have communication tools that could help inform your organization's membership, such as:

newsletter _____, contact/phone: _____
phone tree _____, administrator: _____
e-mail list/website _____, administrator: _____

If you personally cannot attend, is there anyone else in your organization that you think might be willing to participate? _____ Phone number? _____

If you are the appropriate representative, but unable to attend, could we reach you some other way during the week of April 19-22? _____

Are there any other key groups or individuals you feel we need to invite to participate in this process?
_____ Phone? _____

**Because fish and wildlife
can't dial "9-1-1"**



StreamsideCPR

Conservation, Protection and Restoration

The Federal government recently listed salmon and other native fish as endangered species. Metro's Streamside CPR project responds to State land-use requirements and the endangered species listings.

Join us at any of Streamside CPR workshops to discuss:

- What does the Federal listing mean?
- What is the current health of streamside habitat in the region?
- What do we need to do, individually and collectively, to restore streamside fish and wildlife habitat?
- Should stricter regulations be placed on future development?

You can help answer these questions and give your input on a range of tools to conserve, protect and restore fish and wildlife habitat in this region.

CPR stands for:

Conservation – acquisition of open spaces and other key regional natural resources and incentives

Protection – regional and local regulatory policies intended to protect natural resources

Restoration – hands-on, volunteer enhancement and streamside restoration projects

To learn more about the project, call Metro's growth management information line at 797-1888 or visit Metro's website at www.metro-region.org.

The region's salmon are slipping away . . . unless we act now!

Please join us!

Try to attend one April and one May workshop or open house

April workshops

Review regional habitat information and discuss possible strategies

9 a.m. to noon or 6 to 9 p.m. Tuesday, April 20
Holladay's Market, 1200 NE Broadway, Portland

1 to 4 p.m. or 6 to 9 p.m. Wednesday, April 21
Holladay's Market, 1200 NE Broadway, Portland

May open houses

Visit interactive displays and give input on strategies

6:30 to 8:30 p.m. Tuesday, May 4
Tualatin Hills Nature Park Interpretive Center
15655 SW Millikan Way, Beaverton

6:30 to 8:30 p.m. Wednesday, May 5
Gresham City Hall conference rooms
1333 NW Eastman Parkway, Gresham

6:30 to 8:30 p.m. Thursday, May 6
Sunrise Middle School Commons
14331 SE 132nd Ave., Clackamas

May workshops

Review gathered input and refine strategies

9 a.m. to noon or 6 to 9 p.m. Tuesday, May 11
Holladay's Market, 1200 NE Broadway, Portland

1 to 4 p.m. or 6 to 9 p.m. Wednesday, May 12
Holladay's Market, 1200 NE Broadway, Portland



Metro Regional Services
Creating livable communities



Regional Parks and Greenspaces
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232-2736
(503) 797-1850

REGIONAL TRAILS COMMITTEE - IMPORTANT WORKSHOP

Title 3 and Trails

March 17, 1999 (Wed)
9:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

Metro Office
Conference Room 270

Learn about *Metro's Stream and Floodplain Protection Plan (Title 3 or Metro Code 3.07.3)* and how it will impact the design and construction of trails in the region. To comply with Title 3, local jurisdictions must amend their comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances to adopt all or part of the Title 3 model ordinance or other code language that substantially complies with the performance standards of Title 3, Section 4.

AGENDA

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | Welcome | Susan McLain, Deputy Presiding Officer
Metro Council |
| 2. | Update on Regional Trail Projects | Mel Huie, Regional Trails Coordinator
and Local Trail Planners |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Peninsula Crossing• Willamette River Greenway Study:
St. Johns Bridge to Steel Bridge• Eastbank Esplanade• OMSI to Springwater Corridor• PTC Trail (Milwaukie to Gladstone)• Fanno Creek Greenway Trail• Burlington Northern Rails to Trail• Fairview Gresham Trail• Local Share Trail Projects | |
| 3. | TEA - 21 Update | Bill Barber, Senior Transportation Planner
Metro Transportation Department |
| 4. | Background and Overview of Title 3 | Rosemary Furfey, Senior Regional Planner
Metro Growth Management Department |
| 5. | Update on Local Implementation
Notification | Rosemary Furfey |
| 6. | Question and Answer Period
Discussion | Everyone |

**For more information and Questions:
Call Mel Huie at 797-1731**



Regional Parks and Greenspaces
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232-2736
(503) 797-1850

**Level of Service Standards (LOS)
A Subcommittee of the
Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee (GTAC)**

**Meeting Summary
March 16, 1999**

In Attendance: Steve Bosak, Diane Kean Campbell, Valerie Lantz, Scott Talbot, Veronica Smith, Jim Sjulín, Mel Huie

1. February 16, 1999 Minutes

The meeting summary was handed out by Mel Huie. It will be mailed to the other subcommittee members.

2. Level of Service Standards Report

A draft of the LOS Report is due by July 1999. The body or chapters of the report need to be determined. Steve Bosak will prepare an outline of the LOS Report and present it at the April meeting of this subcommittee.

Also needed are a "Mission Statement" and the purpose for the report. A list of LOS guidelines and recommendations will be included in the report. The Appendix will include a glossary.

A list of standards (also known as criteria) for each type of park and recreational facility will be included in the LOS Report.

Examples of service standards need to be collected for other local, regional and state park providers. Mel Huie should gather this information. NRPA guidelines have already been collected.

It was suggested the NRPA LOS Report be condensed and carefully critiqued by subcommittee members. The report could become the basis for our LOS Report.

3. Demand vs. Supply

Jim Sjulín stated the need to assess the public's needs for parks, open spaces, trails and recreational facilities. Are we meeting the demand? Are we adequately serving the public? The subcommittee should consider surveying the community on these issues.

If a survey instrument is sent out, common language and definitions of parks, open spaces and recreational facilities should be used. The city of Portland is finalizing such a list. The LOS subcommittee also has developed a glossary of terms. Any survey of demand needs would be the responsibility of local park providers.

4. Coordination and Joint Use of Existing and Future Facilities

Local park providers need to share information on existing facilities, which could be jointly shared. New facilities could be planned and financed and developed jointly. Partnerships between local park agencies and school districts are common and should be encouraged.

Some facilities may be developed by a consortium of agencies. Local and neighborhood facilities should be developed by local park providers, and regional facilities should be developed by Metro or another regional / state / federal parks provider.

5. Guidelines vs. Mandatory LOS Criteria

The subcommittee reiterated its preference that any LOS recommendations be just that. Guidelines must be the rule. Mandatory requirements will not bode well at the local level.

6. Parks Deficiency, Geographic Distribution and Accessibility

It was suggested that these criteria be addressed as well in the LOS report. The subcommittee wants to look at the traditional standards such as acres per 1,000 population or square feet for a community center per 1,000 population, as well as the location of parks and recreational facilities. Analysis has been done by Metro's Data Resource Center on accessibility, park deficient areas and maps showing the location of these facilities.

A standard could be to "require" facilities no farther than a 15-minute walk from all households for a neighborhood park and some other standard as to accessibility to a regional facility. Economic access should also be considered. Are there user fees?

7. Lists of Facilities Which Standards Need to be Applied To

- Parks (neighborhood, city-wide, county, regional)
- Open Spaces
- Urban Plazas
- Natural Areas and Nature Parks
- Trails
- Athletic Fields (ball fields, soccer, general activities)
- Community Centers / Senior Centers
- Interpretive Centers for Nature Parks
- Environmental Education
- Cultural Facilities and Historical Sites
- Community Gardens
- Playgrounds
- Fairgrounds and large gathering places
- Amphitheaters
- Picnic Areas
- Camping
- Sports Centers (tennis/ basketball)
- Aquatic Parks and Facilities (swim centers and beaches)
- Community Gardens
- Botanical and Specialized Gardens
- Golf Courses
- Skateboard Parks
- Water (boat and canoe launches, river access facilities, marinas, fishing piers)
- Forest Canopy (tree inventories)

8. Information Needs to be Shared Among All Park Providers

The LOS Report, data, maps, inventories, standards, etc. need to be readily available. A Web site could be maintained and managed by one agency. This will require further investigation.

9. Outreach Plan and Efforts

Julee Conway and Mel Huie will develop a draft plan and report back to the LOS subcommittee.

10. Next Meeting: April 20, 1999 (Tue) 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. at Metro. Rm. 275.

5. Guidelines vs. Mandatory LOS Criteria

The subcommittee reiterated its preference that any LOS recommendations be just that. Guidelines must be the rule. Mandatory requirements will not bode well at the local level.

6. Parks Deficiency, Geographic Distribution and Accessibility

It was suggested that these criteria be addressed as well in the LOS report. The subcommittee wants to look at the traditional standards such as acres per 1,000 population or square feet for a community center per 1,000 population, as well as the location of parks and recreational facilities. Analysis has been done by Metro's Data Resource Center on accessibility, park deficient areas and maps showing the location of these facilities.

A standard could be to "require" facilities no farther than a 15-minute walk from all households for a neighborhood park and some other standard as to accessibility to a regional facility. Economic access should also be considered. Are there user fees?

7. Lists of Facilities Which Standards Need to be Applied To

- Parks (neighborhood, city-wide, county, regional)
- Open Spaces
- Urban Plazas
- Natural Areas and Nature Parks
- Trails
- Athletic Fields (ball fields, soccer, general activities)
- Community Centers / Senior Centers
- Interpretive Centers for Nature Parks
- Environmental Education
- Cultural Facilities and Historical Sites
- Community Gardens
- Playgrounds
- Fairgrounds and large gathering places
- Amphitheaters
- Picnic Areas
- Camping
- Sports Centers (tennis/ basketball)
- Aquatic Parks and Facilities (swim centers and beaches)
- Community Gardens
- Botanical and Specialized Gardens
- Golf Courses
- Skateboard Parks
- Water (boat and canoe launches, river access facilities, marinas, fishing piers)
- Forest Canopy (tree inventories)

8. Information Needs to be Shared Among All Park Providers

The LOS Report, data, maps, inventories, standards, etc. need to be readily available. A Web site could be maintained and managed by one agency. This will require further investigation.

9. Outreach Plan and Efforts

Julee Conway and Mel Huie will develop a draft plan and report back to the LOS subcommittee.

10. Next Meeting: April 20, 1999 (Tue) 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. at Metro. Rm. 275.