

METRO REGIONAL PARKS AND GREENSPACES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTICE

Date: Tuesday, October 15, 1996
Time: 6:00PM - 8:00PM
Place: Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Ave, Portland
Room 270

AGENDA

- I. Introductory comments and announcements (5 min)
- II. RPAG Advisory Committee representation on WRPAC (Jennifer Budhabhatti) (15 min)
Appointment of new committee representative
- III. Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC) (Rosemary Furfy) (30 min)
It's purpose, what needs to be done, RPAGAC's role
- IV. Rails/Trails Regional Study (Mel Huie) (30 min)
Study overview and use in planning trail projects
- V. **The Nature of Metropolitan Greenspaces; video (10 min)**

The October meeting will continue to focus on the Region 2040 process and how the RPAGAC will be involved. A new representative needs to be selected to participate on WRPAC (Ivy Frances has resigned because of conflict of interest concerns related to her work). Rosemary Furfy (Metro staff liaison to WRPAC) will be on hand to provide a summary of WRPAC activities and what needs to be done in the near future. Mel Huie will provide an update of the rails/trails regional study and review the status of trails projects.

Next meeting: November 19, 1996, 6PM, at Metro Regional Center, Room 270

Come to the Salmon Festival at Oxbow Regional Park on October 12 & 13



METRO
Regional Parks and Greenspaces
600 NE GRAND AVE. PORTLAND, OR 97232-2736 (503) 797-1850



METRO

Date: October 9, 1996

To: Metro Councilors
Executive Officer

From: Charles Ciecko, Director, Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department *e'ko*
Jim Desmond, Manager, Open Spaces Acquisition Division *ju*

Subject: **Quarterly Report -- Open Spaces Bond Measure**

Period Covered: July 1, 1996 - September 30, 1996

Pursuant to the Open Spaces Implementation Work Plan, the Executive Officer or his designee is required to prepare and present a quarterly update to the Council summarizing activity in each of the target areas. The Executive Officer has asked the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department to prepare the summary which follows.

Acquisition:

Total to date:	1155 acres acquired
FY95-96:	921.05 acres acquired
FY96-97 goal:	1,200 acres
This quarter:	233.95 acres acquired

(1st quarter acquisitions are highlighted in bold type)

Clear Creek: 109% of acre goal; 75% of allocated dollars

- **342.02 acres: Goheen**
- **32 acres: Lewis**

East Buttes/Boring Lava Domes: 3% of acre goal; 34% of Options allocated dollars; 0% of allocated dollars for East Buttes/Boring Lava Domes

- **19 acres: Jenne Butte**

Fanno Creek Greenway: goal: up to 12 miles of greenway

- **2.14 acres: Shiels (\$100,000 contributed by THPRD)**

Forest Park: 38% of acre goal; 7% of allocated dollars

- **115 acres: J.J & Associates**
- **1.7 acres: Portland Area Camp Fire Council**
- **4.75 acres: Wyatt**

Gales Creek: 6% of acre goal; 10% of allocated dollars

- **43.11 acres: AMT Resources, Inc.**

Newell Creek: 17% of acre goal; 23% of allocated dollars

- 9.16 acres: McEwen
- 45 acres: Northridge Development
- 10.47 acres: Younger

Sandy River: 43% of acre goal; 22% of allocated dollars

- **160 acres: Elhart**
- 148.5 acres: Spencer
- 39.85 acres: J.J. & Associates

Tryon Creek Linkages: 114% of acre goal; 63% of allocated dollars

- **9.6 acres: Tree Products Enterprises/Foley**
- **2.24 acres: Jensen**
- 11 acres: Lindstrom

Tualatin River Greenway: 43% of acre goal; 6% of allocated dollars

- 114 acres: Stahlke

Willamette River Greenway: 2% of acre goal; 5% of allocated dollars

- 27 acres: Trust for Public Land (Willamette Cove)

Marquam Woods: 100 % of acre goal; 74% of allocated dollars

- 18.8 acres: The Trust For Public Land (\$140,000 from Portland local share bond money)

Due Diligence:

Completed on all closed properties listed above; commenced on 30-35 additional properties currently under option, being negotiated or otherwise under consideration for acquisition.

Refinement:

Refinements have been adopted by Council for the following twenty-one (21) regional target areas (1st quarter adoptions are highlighted in bold):

Jackson Bottom/McKay Creek/Dairy Creek
Gales Creek
Beaver Creek Canyon
Sandy River Gorge
Multnomah Channel
East Buttes/Boring Lava Domes
OMSI to Springwater Corridor Trail

Refinement (continued):

Forest Park
Cooper Mountain
Tonquin Geologic Area
Tualatin River Access Points
Rock Creek
Newell Creek Canyon
Canemah Bluff (Willamette River Greenway)
Willamette Narrows (Willamette River Greenway)
Clackamas River Greenway
Clear Creek Canyon
Tryon Creek Linkages
Fanno Creek
Willamette Cove (Willamette River Greenway)
Columbia River Shoreline

This represents refinement for all target areas. The refinement process was completed over eight months and included 41 public meetings and community workshops attended by approximately 1000 citizens.

Public Celebrations/Dedications/News Conferences/Tours

The Open Spaces Acquisition Division has organized or been involved in various public events announcing open spaces closings, working closely with the executive office, Council, local jurisdictions and community groups, as follows:

- July 1996 **Tualatin River Access Points (Metro):** Canoe trip with elected officials, the Tualatin Riverkeepers and local media.
- Aug. 1996 **Tryon Creek Linkages (Metro):** Ceremony at the Nature Center at Tryon Creek State Park with elected officials (Metro and local), friends groups, neighbors, media. Presentation of certificate of appreciation to former Presiding Officer Judy Wyer's family.
- Sept. 1996 **Camp Lowami (Beaverton and THPRD local share):** Ceremony and walking tour on site with elected officials (Metro and local), neighbors, friends groups, children, media.
- Sept. 1996 **Newell Creek Canyon (Metro):** Tour -- advertised to public through fall edition of GreenScene.
- Sept. 1996 **Springwater Corridor (Portland and Multnomah County local share):** Ribbon cutting and dedication on site with elected officials (Metro and local), neighbors, interest groups, users, children.

Public Outreach

GreenScene: Includes full page dedicated to open spaces acquisition efforts in one target area (fall edition: Tualatin River). Circulation: 30,000

Landowner brochure: A guide for owners of land with targeted natural areas. Printed 2,000 (copy attached for Executive Officer and each Councilor)

Local Share:

A local share project managers' meeting was held on September 24th and attended by 28 people. Staff developed and delivered signs to be displayed at all local share sites designating that site was acquired or improved using funds from May 1995 Metro bond measure for open space, parks and streams. Fred Wert, outside consultant, made a presentation on "rails to trails" and "rails with trails" projects in other jurisdictions with specific application to projects in the Metro area. Judith Reese, City of Portland Green Spaces Program Manager, did a presentation on City of Portland's local share program (\$7.5 million).

To date, fourteen (14) jurisdictions/providers have drawn down funds from the local share fund for 21 different projects. A summary of local share draws is attached. The following is a summary of local share activity to date:

Total local share bond funds disbursed to date:	\$4,453,020
Total local share bond funds disbursed 1st quarter	\$64,747
% of bond local share (\$25 million) disbursed to date:	18%
Number of local share projects funded to date:	21
Local share funds remaining:	\$20,546,980

Metro Open Spaces Local Share Projects and Draws
as of October 9, 1996

<u>Loc. Prov./Com.</u>	<u>Project/</u>	<u>Council</u>	<u>Draws</u>
		<u>Dist</u>	
Clackamas County			
904588	Barton Park Improvements	o/s	
	Springwater Corridor Acquisition	o/s	
	Clackamas River Acquisition	o/s	
	Damascas Area Acquisition	2	
	Clackamas River, Carver, Acquisitions	o/s	128,147
			128,147
NGP&RD			
904589	Kellogg Creek Acquisition	7	
	Boardman Slough Acquisition	7	
	Mt. Talbert Acquisition	2,6	
	Portland Traction Co. Acquisition	7,2	
			0
Gladstone			
904590	Meldrum Bar Park Improvements	2	
	Cross Park Improvements	2	
	Glen Echo Park Acq & Improvements	2	
			0
Happy Valley			
904591	Mt. Scott Creek Trail Improvements	2	
	Scott View Nature Park Improvements	2	
Amended 1/17/96			0
Lake Oswego			
904592	South Shore Natural Area Acquisition	2	697,166
FULLY DRAWN			697,166
Milwaukie			
904593			
	Milwaukie Waterfront Acquisition	7,2	
	Kellogg Lake Acquisition	7,2	
			0
Oregon City			
904594	High Rocks River Bank Acquisition	2	
	Barclay Hills Park Improvements	2	
	Clackamette Park Improvements	2	10,000
	Singer Creek and Holmes Lane Acquisition	2	
	River Access Trail Clackamette Park, Cap Im	2	
	Atkinson Park Natural Area Acquisition	2	
	Park Place Park Soft Trail Cap Improve.	2	
	High Rocks River Access Trail, Acquisition	2	
	Clackamette Park Fishing Dock Improvemen	2	
			10,000
Rivergrove			
904595	Tualatin River Boat Ramp Improvements	2	
			0
West Linn			
904596	Burnside Park Addition Acquisition	2	
	Not broken out		0
Wilsonville			
904597	Memorial Park Access Trail Improvements	3	18,477
	Restoration Projects at City Schools	3	672
	Wilsonville City Trail System Improvements	3	
	Gordons Run Improvements	3	
	Memorial Park Trail Improvements	3	
			19,149

Metro Open Spaces Local Share Projects and Draws
as of October 9, 1996

Loc. Prov./Com.	Project/	Council Dist	Draws
Multnomah County:			
904598	Whitaker Ponds Acquisition	5	3,888
	Hogan Cedars Acquisition	1	
	Tryon Creek Acquisition	7	
	FOFP Ancient Forest Improvements	5	
	Howell Territorial Park Improvements	o/s-5	
	Oxbow Park Improvements	o/s	
	Burlington Bottom Improvements	o/s-5	
	M. James Glisan Boat Ramp Improvements	5	
	Sauvie Island Boat Ramp Improvements	o/s-5	
	Blue Lake Park Improvements	1	
	Springwater Corridor Trail Improvements	1,6,7	
	Added Contingency		
			3,888
Fairview:			
904602	Fairview Creek Restoration & Improvements	1	
			0
Gresham:			
904600	Springwater Corridor Trail Improvements	1	
	Fairview Creek Restoration & Improvements	1	
	Butler Creek Trail Improvements	1	
	Kelly Creek Greenway Acquisition	1	
	Kelly Creek Greenway Improvements	1	
			0
Portland:			
904599	Terwilliger/Marquam Acquisition	7	902,903
	Columbia Slough/Johnson Creek Acqs.	1,6,5	460,188
	Southwest Portland Acquisitions	7	218,358
	Hoyt Arb/Leach Gdns/Crystal Spgs Acqs	7/6,1/7	1,579
	Trail Acquisitions and Improvements	1,6,5,7	363,073
	Forest Pk/Powell Bte/Oaks Btm Impvmnts	5/1/07	6,311
			1,952,414
Troutdale:			
904601	Beaver Creek Greenway Acquisition	1	
	Beaver Creek Trail Improvements	1	
	Beaver Creek Restoration Projects	1	
			0
Wood Village:			
904603	Wood Village Park Acq & Improvements	1	23,422
			23,422
Washington County:			
904604	Henry Hagg Lake Improvements	o/s	
	Bethany/Reedville/Cedar Mill/ Bull Mtn Acqs	3/4	
			0
THP&RD:			
904605	Johnson Creek (Bvrtn) Acquisition	3	552,834
	Koll Center Acquisition & Improvements	3	
	Cedar Mill Creek Acquisition	3	
	Fanno Creek Greenway Improvements	3	
	Golf Creek Corridor Acquisition	3	
			552,834

Metro Open Spaces Local Share Projects and Draws
as of October 9, 1996

Loc. Prov./Com.	Project/	Council	
		Dist	Draws
Beaverton			
904606	Johnson Creek Acquisition #1	3	550,037
	Johnson Creek Acquisition #2	3	
	Stonegate Woods Acquisition	3	
	Forest Glen Park Improvements	3	
	Additional Projects To Be Added	3	
			550,037
Cornelius			
904607	12 and Baseline Nature Park Acquisition	4	102,313
	12 and Baseline Nature Park Acquisition	4	
	Cornelius Acquisition	4	
			102,313
Durham	X 219234		
904608	Durham City Park Trail Improvements	3	7,135
			7,135
Forest Grove			
904609	David Hill Forest Park Acquisition	4	
	Gales Creek Linear Park Acquisition	4	
	Fernhill Wetlands Improvements	4	
			0
Hillsboro			
904610	Noble Woods Park Improvements	4	36,878
	Rood Bridge Road Park Improvements	4	179,789
	Rock Creek Greenway Acquisition	4	
			216,667
Sherwood			
904611	Cedar Creek Greenway Acquisition		
	Cedar Creek Greenway Trail Improvements		
			0
Tigard			
904612	Fanno/Summer Creek Greenway Imprvmnts	3	
	Park Acquisition	3	
	Fern Street Project Acquisition	3	125,000
	Cook Park Addition	3	
	Bull Mountain Area Addition	3	
	Bond St & 82nd Ave Proj Add	3	
	Fanno Creek Trail Hall-Durham	3	
	Fanno Creek Trail Main -Tiedmon	3	
			125,000
Tualatin			
904613	Tualatin River Greenway Acquisition	3	64,850
			64,850
	TOTAL		4,453,020



METRO

October 22, 1996

Jim Battan
1804 SE 73rd Avenue
Hillsboro OR 97123

Dear Jim:

As a member of the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee (RPAGAC), I invite you to participate on a growth management work group. On October 15, 1996, Seth Tane agreed to represent the RPAGAC as a voting member of the Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC). Rick Charriere agreed to serve as an alternate. WRPAC is currently developing policy standards as it relates to floodplain and water quality management in the region.

The Region 2040 process is now on a fast track toward identifying future urban reserves and an urban growth management functional plan, all leading to the approval of the Regional Framework Plan in 1997. The work group will discuss issues and shape positions in the interest of parks and natural areas. Jennifer Budhabhatti will staff and convene the group as needed to more effectively participate in the Region 2040 process and to support Seth and Rick on WRPAC.

If you are interested in participating in the work group, please call me at 797-1774. Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Ron Klein
Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces

cc: Charles Ciecko, Pat Lee, Jennifer Budhabhatti, Seth Tane, Rick Charriere

**METRO**

October 22, 1996

Michael Reid
2920 NE 24th Avenue
Portland OR 97212

Dear Michael:

As a member of the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee (RPAGAC), I invite you to participate on a growth management work group. On October 15, 1996, Seth Tane agreed to represent the RPAGAC as a voting member of the Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC). Rick Charriere agreed to serve as an alternate. WRPAC is currently developing policy standards as it relates to floodplain and water quality management in the region.

The Region 2040 process is now on a fast track toward identifying future urban reserves and an urban growth management functional plan, all leading to the approval of the Regional Framework Plan in 1997. The work group will discuss issues and shape positions in the interest of parks and natural areas. Jennifer Budhabhatti will staff and convene the group as needed to more effectively participate in the Region 2040 process and to support Seth and Rick on WRPAC.

If you are interested in participating in the work group, please call me at 797-1774.
Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Ron Klein
Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces

cc: Charles Ciecko, Pat Lee, Jennifer Budhabhatti, Seth Tane, Rick Charriere



METRO

October 22, 1996

Brian Scott
1725 NE 61st Avenue
Portland OR 97213

Dear Brian:

As a member of the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee (RPAGAC), I invite you to participate on a growth management work group. On October 15, 1996, Seth Tane agreed to represent the RPAGAC as a voting member of the Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC). Rick Charriere agreed to serve as an alternate. WRPAC is currently developing policy standards as it relates to floodplain and water quality management in the region.

The Region 2040 process is now on a fast track toward identifying future urban reserves and an urban growth management functional plan, all leading to the approval of the Regional Framework Plan in 1997. The work group will discuss issues and shape positions in the interest of parks and natural areas. Jennifer Budhabhatti will staff and convene the group as needed to more effectively participate in the Region 2040 process and to support Seth and Rick on WRPAC.

If you are interested in participating in the work group, please call me at 797-1774. Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Ron Klein
Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces

cc: Charles Ciecko, Pat Lee, Jennifer Budhabhatti, Seth Tane, Rick Charriere



METRO

October 22, 1996

Katharine Diack
1041 SW Westwood Ct
Portland OR 97201

Dear Katharine:

As a member of the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee (RPAGAC), I invite you to participate on a growth management work group. On October 15, 1996, Seth Tane agreed to represent the RPAGAC as a voting member of the Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC). Rick Charriere agreed to serve as an alternate. WRPAC is currently developing policy standards as it relates to floodplain and water quality management in the region.

The Region 2040 process is now on a fast track toward identifying future urban reserves and an urban growth management functional plan, all leading to the approval of the Regional Framework Plan in 1997. The work group will discuss issues and shape positions in the interest of parks and natural areas. Jennifer Budhabhatti will staff and convene the group as needed to more effectively participate in the Region 2040 process and to support Seth and Rick on WRPAC.

If you are interested in participating in the work group, please call me at 797-1774. Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Ron Klein
Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces

cc: Charles Ciecko, Pat Lee, Jennifer Budhabhatti, Seth Tane, Rick Charriere



METRO

October 22, 1996

Faun Hosey
13515 NW Jackson Quarry Road
Hillsboro OR 97124

Dear Faun:

As a member of the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee (RPAGAC), I invite you to participate on a growth management work group. On October 15, 1996, Seth Tane agreed to represent the RPAGAC as a voting member of the Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC). Rick Charriere agreed to serve as an alternate. WRPAC is currently developing policy standards as it relates to floodplain and water quality management in the region.

The Region 2040 process is now on a fast track toward identifying future urban reserves and an urban growth management functional plan, all leading to the approval of the Regional Framework Plan in 1997. The work group will discuss issues and shape positions in the interest of parks and natural areas. Jennifer Budhabhatti will staff and convene the group as needed to more effectively participate in the Region 2040 process and to support Seth and Rick on WRPAC.

If you are interested in participating in the work group, please call me at 797-1774.
Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ron". The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping initial "R" and a cursive "on".

Ron Klein
Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces

cc: Charles Ciecko, Pat Lee, Jennifer Budhabhatti, Seth Tane, Rick Charriere

**METRO**

October 22, 1996

Julie Garver
1301 Officers Row
Vancouver WA 98661

Dear Julie:

As a member of the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee (RPAGAC), I invite you to participate on a growth management work group. On October 15, 1996, Seth Tane agreed to represent the RPAGAC as a voting member of the Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC). Rick Charriere agreed to serve as an alternate. WRPAC is currently developing policy standards as it relates to floodplain and water quality management in the region.

The Region 2040 process is now on a fast track toward identifying future urban reserves and an urban growth management functional plan, all leading to the approval of the Regional Framework Plan in 1997. The work group will discuss issues and shape positions in the interest of parks and natural areas. Jennifer Budhabhatti will staff and convene the group as needed to more effectively participate in the Region 2040 process and to support Seth and Rick on WRPAC.

If you are interested in participating in the work group, please call me at 797-1774.
Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ron". The signature is stylized with a long horizontal stroke at the top.

Ron Klein
Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces

cc: Charles Ciecko, Pat Lee, Jennifer Budhabhatti, Seth Tane, Rick Charriere



METRO

October 22, 1996

John Griffiths
10245 SW 153rd Avenue
Beaverton OR 97007

Dear John:

As a member of the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee (RPAGAC), I invite you to participate on a growth management work group. On October 15, 1996, Seth Tane agreed to represent the RPAGAC as a voting member of the Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC). Rick Charriere agreed to serve as an alternate. WRPAC is currently developing policy standards as it relates to floodplain and water quality management in the region.

The Region 2040 process is now on a fast track toward identifying future urban reserves and an urban growth management functional plan, all leading to the approval of the Regional Framework Plan in 1997. The work group will discuss issues and shape positions in the interest of parks and natural areas. Jennifer Budhabhatti will staff and convene the group as needed to more effectively participate in the Region 2040 process and to support Seth and Rick on WRPAC.

If you are interested in participating in the work group, please call me at 797-1774. Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Ron Klein
Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces

cc: Charles Ciecko, Pat Lee, Jennifer Budhabhatti, Seth Tane, Rick Charriere

**METRO**

October 22, 1996

Robert Akers
1038 SE 224th
Gresham OR 97030

Dear Bob:

As a member of the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee (RPAGAC), I invite you to participate on a growth management work group. On October 15, 1996, Seth Tane agreed to represent the RPAGAC as a voting member of the Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC). Rick Charriere agreed to serve as an alternate. WRPAC is currently developing policy standards as it relates to floodplain and water quality management in the region.

The Region 2040 process is now on a fast track toward identifying future urban reserves and an urban growth management functional plan, all leading to the approval of the Regional Framework Plan in 1997. The work group will discuss issues and shape positions in the interest of parks and natural areas. Jennifer Budhabhatti will staff and convene the group as needed to more effectively participate in the Region 2040 process and to support Seth and Rick on WRPAC.

If you are interested in participating in the work group, please call me at 797-1774. Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Ron Klein
Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces

cc: Charles Ciecko, Pat Lee, Jennifer Budhabhatti, Seth Tane, Rick Charriere

**METRO**

October 22, 1996

Ivy Frances
1038 Bayberry Road
Lake Oswego OR 97034

Dear Ivy:

As a member of the Regional Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee (RPAGAC), I invite you to participate on a growth management work group. On October 15, 1996, Seth Tane agreed to represent the RPAGAC as a voting member of the Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC). Rick Charriere agreed to serve as an alternate. WRPAC is currently developing policy standards as it relates to floodplain and water quality management in the region.

The Region 2040 process is now on a fast track toward identifying future urban reserves and an urban growth management functional plan, all leading to the approval of the Regional Framework Plan in 1997. The work group will discuss issues and shape positions in the interest of parks and natural areas. Jennifer Budhabhatti will staff and convene the group as needed to more effectively participate in the Region 2040 process and to support Seth and Rick on WRPAC.

If you are interested in participating in the work group, please call me at 797-1774.
Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Ron Klein
Metro Regional Parks and Greenspaces

cc: Charles Ciecko, Pat Lee, Jennifer Budhabhatti, Seth Tane, Rick Charriere

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPOINTING
MEMBERS TO THE WATER RESOURCES
POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

)
)
)

RESOLUTION NO. 96-___

Introduced by: Councilor
Susan McLain

WHEREAS, the Metro Council established a Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee in the 1980s to provide technical advise on development of Metro's functional plans for Areawide Wastewater Management and Areawide Stormwater Management;

WHEREAS, the Metro Charter requires Metro to address water resource issues within the context of its growth management planning program and Regional Framework Plan;

WHEREAS, the Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee unanimously approved proposed revisions to its By-Laws at its March 27, 1996 meeting;

WHEREAS, the Metro Council approved the revisions to the By-Laws of the Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee as adopted in Council Resolution No. 96-2321B and directed the Committee to seek nominations to the voting and non-voting positions; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED

That the Metro Council appoints the following members to the Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee as described in Exhibit A attached hereto.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this ___ day of _____, 1996.

Jon Kvistad, Presiding Officer

Approved as to Form:

Daniel B. Cooper, General Council

STAFF REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 96-____ FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPOINTING MEMBERS TO THE METRO WATER RESOURCES POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Date: October 18, 1996

Presented by: Rosemary Furfey

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND INFORMATION

The Metro Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC) was formed in the early 1980s to advise the Metro Council on technical matters related to Metro's Areawide Wastewater and Areawide Stormwater Management Plans. The committee's by-laws were last revised in 1990.

WRPAC has met on a quarterly basis for the last six years and has traditionally advised the Metro Council on technical issues regarding annual updates to wastewater functional plans. During the last two years, however, WRPAC has taken an active role in providing technical expertise and advise to the Metro Council and Executive Officer regarding water issues in the Region 2040 planning program, Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOs), early implementation of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan Title 3 and model ordinance for Title 3.

Based on WRPAC's increasingly active advisory role, the committee has reviewed its mission statement and membership composition to ensure its by-laws reflect and support its growing role for Metro's growth management activities. WRPAC met in January and March, 1996 to discuss its by laws and forwarded its recommended revised by-laws to the Council.

The Metro Council reviewed and made several minor changes to the recommended by-laws. It adopted Resolution No. 96-2321 and directed Metro staff to solicit nominations to the different membership categories.

Staff contacted each agency or organization in the WRPAC membership list and solicited nominations for representative and alternate. All members have proposed the nominations listed on Exhibit A. The only organization which declined membership was the Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland (see Exhibit B). Staff have recommended a list of nominees for each position to WRPAC as listed in Exhibit A. The Metro Council will make the final appointment of membership.

PROPOSED ACTION

This resolution seeks appointment by the Metro Council of the proposed members to the Council's Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (Exhibit A) based on the revised by-laws adopted by the Council in Resolution No. 96-2321. In some cases there are more

than one nominee for an individual category and the Council will select its preferred nominee.

There are no implications to the Metro budget as a result of this resolution.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends adoption of Resolution No. 96-_____.

EXHIBIT A

Nominees for Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee Membership
Based on WRPAC Membership Approved in Metro Resolution No. 96-2321B
October 1996

Voting Members (one vote each):

Organization	Representative	Alternate
Metro Council	Councilor Susan McLain	None at this time
Tualatin Valley Water Dist.	Jesse Lowman	To be determined
Clackamas River Water	Dale Jutila	Alan Fletcher
Portland Water Bureau	Lorna Stickel	Michael Rosenberger
Unified Sewerage Agency (sewerage)	Bill Gaffi	John Jackson
Oak Lodge Sanitary Dist.	Tom Sandwick	Kent Squires
Gresham Envir. Services	Garry Ott	Greg DiLoreto
Unified Sewerage Agency (surface water)	Bill Gaffi	John Jackson
Clackamas County Utilities	David Benfield	Kurt Hohn
Portland Bur.Environmental Services	Cathryn Collis	Steve Kenworthy
Wash. Co. SWCD	Gary Clark	Dick Kover
Clackamas Co. SWCD	Don Guthridge	
E. Mult. SWCD	Patt Opdyke	None at this time
Oregon Envir. Council	Gail Killam	None at this time
Portland Audubon Society	Mike Houck	None at this time
Environmental Member at Large	nominated: Fans of Fanno Creek: Kendra Smith	nominated: Fans of Fanno Creek: John LeCavalier
Fishery Interest: (The following positions have been nominated as representative and alternate.)	<u>Native Fish Society</u> Jeffery Gottfried <u>Oregon Trout</u> Robin Hamblet	<u>Native Fish Society</u> Guy Orcutt <u>Oregon Trout</u> Gordon Ferlitch
Cities of Clackamas County	Mark Schoenig, Lake Oswego	Henry Mackenroth, Oregon City
Cities of Wash. County	David Winship, Beaverton	Mike McKillip, Tualatin
Metro Greenspaces Advis. Committee	Seth Tane	None at this time Rick CHARRIERS
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Steve Fedji	None at this time
→ Homebuilders Association	Declined Membership (see attached letter)	
High Tech Business	Bill Calder, Intel	Dave Schrott, Fujitsu
Nursery Operator	Brad Bloese, Panzer Nurs.	None at this time.

Citizen: Tualatin River Watershed	Nominated: Representative Tualatin Basin Watershed Council: Jacqueline Dingfelder	Nominated: Alternate Tualatin Basin Watershed Council: April Olbrich
Citizen: Clackamas River Watershed	Nominated: Representative Friends of Barton Park: Scott Forrester	Nominated: Representative Bruce Hamilton Friends of the Clackamas River
Citizen: Lower Willamette River Watershed	Nominated: Representative Tryon Resource Management Partnership: Skip Haak	Nominated: Representative Columbia Slough Watershed Council: Council Coordinator; Johnson Creek Corridor Committee: Michael Carleson
Non-Voting Members:		
Organization	Representative	Alternate
Dept. of Land Conservation and Development	Jim Sitzman	None at this time
Corps of Engineers	Carie Fox	None at this time
Port of Portland	Mary Hopkins	Preston Beck
Environmental Protection Agency	Ralph Rogers	None at this time
Portland General Electric	Dave Heintzman	Gary Hackett
Lower Columbia National Estuary Program	Bill Young	Debrah Marriott
Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality	Kevin Downing	Bob Baumgartner
Oregon Water Resources Department	Tom Paul	Rebecca Geisen
Oregon Department of Agriculture	Marc Peters	None at this time
Oregon Department of Forestry	Ken Kushman, Mollala Field Office	None at this time
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Jay Massey or other, District Fish Biologist	None at this time
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Jennifer Thompson	John Marshall



Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland

503/684-1880

Fax # 503/684-0588

15555 S.W. Bangy Rd., Suite 301 • Lake Oswego, OR 97035

RECEIVED

SEP 13 1996

EXECUTIVE OFFICER

September 11, 1996

Mike Burton, Exec. Director &
Jon Kvistad, Presiding Officer
Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232

Dear Mike & Jon:

Recently, the Home Builders Association of Metro Portland was invited to join the Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC) as a voting member. This invitation, while appreciated, highlighted an issue that I believe Metro needs to address: the absence of any sustained, meaningful opportunity for the business community to participate in policy discussions. We are therefore requesting that Metro form a permanent, ongoing policy advisory committee made up of business and private sector members, similar to what was done with 2040 Means Business.

I have been a member of MTAC for the last five or six years. Other private sector representatives have served on other Metro committees, but our input is in almost every case lost in the background noise. With regard to the invitation to join WRPAC, while I appreciate Metro's interest in hearing our position on important policy issues, I have absolutely no interest in serving on another committee where nothing substantive will come of my participation. If Metro is truly concerned with the view of the private sector, which I hope it is, then we need our own committee; we do not need another opportunity to be outvoted.

Please let me know when this request can be acted upon. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me.

Very truly yours,

Jon A. Chandler

cc: Dan Cooper, Metro General Counsel
HBA Board

BUDGET SCHEDULE FOR FY 1997-98 BUDGET

DUE DATE	ITEM
September 25	1. Draft Policy Issues for Department 2. Draft Work Plan Items for FY 97-98 for budget inclusion.
September 27	Final Policy Issues for Department
September 30-October 4	Meetings with Mike Burton on Budget Policy Issues & Direction.
October 1	1:30, Meeting Mike Burton, C Ciecko, P Lee, and K Feher on CIP requests.
October 3	Budget Manual released from Financial Planning
October 14	All Funds and Divisions Revenue Budget due
October 15	Present Policy issues to RP&GAC
October 28	Expenditure line items due for all Funds and Divisions Program & Division Narratives Due Line item justifications due.
October 28 - November 1	Karen and Charlie review budget submittals
November 4 - November 11	Complete final revisions from reviews.
November 11 - November 15	Proof and copy budget
November 15	Submit Budget to Financial Planning
November 15 - December 9	Financial Planning Review
November 19	Present Requested budget to RP&GAC for review
November 11 - December 13	Council review of CIP
December 17	RP&GAC Requested budget feedback.
December 9 - December 20	Executive Officer Budget Review and Meetings.
January 6 - January 13	Final Review with Executive
February 6	Release of Proposed Budget to Staff
February 13	Budget presented to Council
February 17 - April 30	Council review of budget
May 1	Council approval of budget
May 15	Approved budget to TSCC
June 5 - June 13	TSCC Hearing on Budget
June 19	Council Adoption of Budget

STUDY FINDINGS "RAIL - TRAIL" OPPORTUNITIES

Discussion Draft

10-15-96

Over the Next Three to Five Years

Metro Takes the Lead

Open Spaces Bond Funded Projects

- Purchase Land / Obtain Trail Easement: OMSI to Springwater Corridor
- Purchase Missing Link on Springwater between S.E. 17th and McLoughlin Blvd. (potential project)
- Burlington Northern (United Jct. to Bowers Jct.) with Potential Extension from Bowers Jct. South to Hwy. 26
- Dodge Park to Roslyn Park (old trolley line in Sandy River Target Area) (potential project)
- Newell Creek Canyon Target Area (former rail corridor exists in this area)

Coordination with Tri-Met on "Trails and Light Rail"

- Complementary Improvements to Eastside and Westside MAX Lines and Stations
- Coordination with South - North Planning. Identify potential trail corridors parallel to the line and access to future stations.

Federal Funding: ISTE A Enhancements and CMAQ

- Support Future Rounds of ISTE A Enhancement and CMAQ funds for Rail - Trail Projects
- Support Reauthorization of ISTE A Enhancement and CMAQ funds by Congress in 1997

Federal Rail Banking Law

- Support existing law permitting Rails to Trails conversions
- Oppose any efforts to eliminate the law

STUDY FINDINGS: RAIL - TRAIL OPPORTUNITIES

Discussion Draft

10-15-96

Over the Next Three to Five Years

Local or State Agencies Take the Lead -- Recommendations

City of Portland and Port of Portland

St. Johns Bridge to Swan Island to Steel Bridge (along eastside of the Willamette River)

City of Portland

Willamette River Shoreline Corridor - Marquam Bridge to Lake Oswego

City of Gresham

Springwater - Lindeman Jct. to S.E. Division St.

Springwater - connection north to Marine Dr. via railroad and powerline corridors

Clackamas County

Purchase Missing Link on Springwater Corridor at Boring (1/4 mile)
(last segment in private ownership from S.E. McLoughlin to Estacada)

North Clackamas Parks, City of Milwaukie, Metro

Purchase former PTC Line from Milwaukie to Gladstone

State of Oregon Parks

Springwater - Develop Boring to Estacada Trail Segment

Oregon Parks, U.S. Forest Service, Metro, City of Estacada

Springwater - Estacada to Mt. Hood National Forest

City of West Linn

Old Willamette Line

Cities of Hillsboro, Cornelius and Forest Grove

Complementary Trails to Westside LRT

Potential Rail with Trail Corridor between the Cities

City of McMinnville and Yamhill County or Oregon Parks

McMinnville to Seghers (near Haag Lake)

Memorandum

DATE: October 10, 1996
TO: Rosemary Furfey, Metro
FROM: RPGAC
RE: Title 3 model ordinance
CC: Ron Klein

During our meeting on 9/17, RPGAC reviewed Title 3 (8/23/96) and the Model ordinance (9/13/96). Several issues arose and are outlined below. We are hoping you can cover these questions during your presentation at our October 15 meeting. Thank you for your consideration.

General Comments

- Protection for floodplains and stream corridors in Title 3 in some cases does not seem adequate. Title 3 represents a "cook book" approach to regulation such as requiring a standard 50-foot stream buffer everywhere in the region. This may not address a wide variability in field conditions.
- The model ordinance should protect seasonal or intermittent streams and their recharge areas. Intermittent streams will affect in-stream flows, water quality and quantity in perennial streams.
- If a jurisdiction chooses not to use the model ordinance but their protection standards appear to meet the requirements in Title 3, Wouldn't this result in two levels of protection? Will the model ordinance be more stringent than the requirements in Title 3.
- The model ordinance should consider subsurface waters. Concern was raised about well spacing, potential drying out of wells and its impact on recharge of groundwater aquifers. The State Water Board Ground Water spacing ordinance should be reviewed for incorporation into these model ordinances.

Specific Comments

- Section 3 no. 1- This provision does not address the cumulative impacts of several fills over time within a watershed. For example, one 100 acres of fill can be demonstrated by an engineering study to cause no rise in flood elevation. It is the cumulative effect of many fills that will eventually cause flooding downstream.

- Section 3 no. 5- The “anchoring” concept for structures in the floodplain is only one option. It may be appropriate to allow for emerging technologies like “floating” that may be helpful in fostering sound natural resource management measures.
- Section 7. Please explain the inclusion of the variance language in the model ordinance. In many cases it would be less expensive to acquire properties in the floodplain than to allow floodplain encroachment and then later deal with the impacts of flooding.

Section 3 no 3

We should discourage development in the Water Quality and Flood Management Area. Allowing finish floor elevations one foot above the design flood will still decrease flood storage capacity. Most developments built with this restriction will have a cumulative impact of increased flooding .

Section 3 no 2

Exception rule

Please explain the exemption to the balanced cut and fill and how all the property owners downstream could mitigate for an increase in flooding problems.

Section 4 Water Quality

C

1. Would you specify language that gives more strength to the ordinance that requires seeding and planting operations. For e.g., an area must be reseeded within 15 days of soil disturbance. Add -Removal of non native vegetation is required
2. Clear the site in phases when grading a site for development -soil disturbance and grading should be done in phases so the total amount of site disturbance is reduced at any one time.
6. What is meant by pretreatment of water?

Section 6.

B. Common Open Space- Most owners do not take initiative to improve conditions or maintain areas of common open space.

Section 11 Water Quality and Floodplain Management Model Code-

Some general comments:

unmapped wetlands, vernal pools and headwaters should be included in the list of sensitive water areas along with streams and rivers.

Metro Water Quality and Floodplain Management Model Ordinance

October 1996

I. Introduction: Implementation for Local Governments

The purpose of this model ordinance is to describe the specific provisions that will achieve the performance standards for Title 3: Water Quality and Flood Management Conservation in a city or county as described in the *Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan*.

Insert Language: Insert narrative on the importance of floodplain and stream corridor protection, why it is necessary, what it does and does not apply to, and the limitations of this ordinance language for protecting riparian resources.

Adoption by Local Jurisdictions: In order to comply with Title 3 in the *Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan*, local jurisdictions must do one of the following:

1. Cities and counties adopt this model ordinance; or
2. Cities and counties adopt portions of this model code, which together with their existing code, are presented as findings to Metro to show compliance with Title 3. Cities and counties may choose not to adopt this code and present alternative code as findings to Metro.

II. Water Quality and Floodplain Management Model Code

The (City Council or Board of Commissions) of (jurisdiction) hereby find that:

Section 1. Intent

- A. To implement Oregon Statewide LCDC Goals 6 and 7 by protecting streams and rivers, wetlands, areas with floodprone soils adjacent to streams, floodplains and sensitive water areas within the Water Quality and Flood Management Area in (name of jurisdiction) by avoiding, limiting or mitigating the impact on these areas from development activities.
- B. To adopt the Metro Water Quality and Flood Management Area Map which delineates the Water Quality and Flood Management Area.

DRAFT

171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213

Section 4. Water Quality

A. Purpose: The purpose of these standards is to protect and allow for enhancement of water quality associated with beneficial uses as defined by the Oregon Water Resources Department and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality.

B. Development Standards within Metro Boundary : Development on any size parcel within the (name of jurisdiction) boundary is subject to the following standards:

1. Erosion and Sediment Control

The local jurisdiction shall adopt and implement either (a) or (b), and (c):

a. Requirements of the erosion and sediment control sections of Oregon DEQ National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. 1200C; or

b. Requirements outlined in the "Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control Plans Technical Guidance Handbook" (City of Portland and Unified Sewerage Agency, 1994); and

c. Requirements of the DEQ NPDES Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System permits where applicable.

C. Development Standards within the Water Quality and Floodplain Management Overlay Zone: Development on any size parcel within the Water Quality and Floodplain Management Overlay Zone is subject to all requirements in Section 4(B), plus the following standards:

1. Maintain or re-establish vegetated cover to the maximum extent practicable and minimize removal of native vegetation. Removal of non-native and nuisance vegetation is permitted and encouraged, but it must be replaced by native vegetation as listed on Metro's *Native Plant List*. The vegetated cover required pursuant to this provision shall not allow the use of plants identified on Metro's *Prohibited Plants for Stream Corridors and Wetlands*.

2. Planting must provide for 90 percent established vegetation cover within three years. Planting selection shall be appropriate to the local area and the natural long-term availability of water at the site.

Memorandum

DATE: October 10, 1996
TO: Rosemary Furfey, Metro
FROM: RPGAC
RE: Title 3 model ordinance
CC: Ron Klein

During our meeting on 9/17, RPGAC reviewed Title 3 (8/23/96) and the Model ordinance (9/13/96). Several issues arose and are outlined below. We are hoping you can cover these questions during your presentation at our October 15 meeting. Thank you for your consideration.

General Comments

- Protection for floodplains and stream corridors in Title 3 in some cases does not seem adequate. Title 3 represents a "cook book" approach to regulation such as requiring a standard 50-foot stream buffer everywhere in the region. This may not address a wide variability in field conditions.
- The model ordinance should protect seasonal or intermittent streams and their recharge areas. Intermittent streams will affect in-stream flows, water quality and quantity in perennial streams.
- If a jurisdiction chooses not to use the model ordinance but their protection standards appear to meet the requirements in Title 3, Wouldn't this result in two levels of protection? Will the model ordinance be more stringent than the requirements in Title 3.
- The model ordinance should consider subsurface waters. Concern was raised about well spacing, potential drying out of wells and its impact on recharge of groundwater aquifers. The State Water Board Ground Water spacing ordinance should be reviewed for incorporation into these model ordinances.

Specific Comments

- Section 3 no. 1- This provision does not address the cumulative impacts of several fills over time within a watershed. For example, one 100 acres of fill can be demonstrated by an engineering study to cause no rise in flood elevation. It is the cumulative effect of many fills that will eventually cause flooding downstream.

- Section 3 no. 5- The “anchoring” concept for structures in the floodplain is only one option. It may be appropriate to allow for emerging technologies like “floating” that may be helpful in fostering sound natural resource management measures.
- Section 7. Please explain the inclusion of the variance language in the model ordinance. In many cases it would be less expensive to acquire properties in the floodplain than to allow floodplain encroachment and then later deal with the impacts of flooding.

Section 3 no 3

We should discourage development in the Water Quality and Flood Management Area. Allowing finish floor elevations one foot above the design flood will still decrease flood storage capacity. Most developments built with this restriction will have a cumulative impact of increased flooding .

Section 3 no 2

Exception rule

Please explain the exemption to the balanced cut and fill and how all the property owners downstream could mitigate for an increase in flooding problems.

Section 4 Water Quality

C

1. Would you specify language that gives more strength to the ordinance that requires seeding and planting operations. For e.g., an area must be reseeded within 15 days of soil disturbance. Add -Removal of non native vegetation is required
2. Clear the site in phases when grading a site for development -soil disturbance and grading should be done in phases so the total amount of site disturbance is reduced at any one time.
6. What is meant by pretreatment of water?

Section 6.

B. Common Open Space- Most owners do not take initiative to improve conditions or maintain areas of common open space.

Section 11 Water Quality and Floodplain Management Model Code-

Some general comments:

unmapped wetlands, vernal pools and headwaters should be included in the list of sensitive water areas along with streams and rivers.



METRO

Date: October 4, 1996

To: Please distribute to the staff person in your agency/organization listed below:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Fax Number</u>	
Bob Baumgartner, DEQ	229-6957	Roger Sutherland 968-1105
Kendra Smith	240-9849	Jim Jacks, Tualatin 692-5421
Gail Killam, OEC	222-1405	Steve Kenworthy 823-6995
Mike Houck, Audubon	292-1021	
John Jackson, Lori Faha, USA	640-3525	
Chris Bowles, USA	681-7087	
Jennifer Thompson, USFWS	231-6195	
Tom Sandwick	650-4519	
Sally Edmunds and Tom McGuire	Portland Planning Bureau	823-5630
Pat Lee and Jennifer Budhabaddi,	Parks and Greenspaces	

From: *RF* Rosemary Furfey, Growth Management Services Department

Subject: WRPAC Sub-Committee Meetings for Title 3 Model Ordinance

As agreed at the Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC) meeting, a sub-committee has been formed to develop draft language for the Title 3 Model Ordinance. I am attaching the draft version of the model ordinance for flood mitigation and water quality we discussed today. The next meeting for the sub-committee will be on:

Friday October 11, 1996 at 9 a.m. Room 370 A, at Metro Headquarters

Please contact me at 797-1726 if you have questions regarding the upcoming meeting or content of the attached draft language.

DRAFT

Draft No. 3 (October 4, 1996)

Metro Water Quality and Floodplain Management Model Ordinance

October 1996

I. Introduction: Implementation for Local Governments

The purpose of this model ordinance is to describe the specific provisions that will achieve or exceed the performance standards for Title 3: Water Quality and Flood Management Conservation in a city or county as described in the *Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan*.

Insert Language: Insert narrative on the importance of floodplain and stream corridor protection, why it is necessary, what it does and does not apply to, and the limitations of this ordinance language for protecting riparian resources.

Adoption by Local Jurisdictions: In order to comply with Title 3 in the *Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan*, local jurisdictions must do one of the following:

- 1. Cities and counties adopt this model ordinance; or
- 2. Cities and counties adopt portions of this model code, which together with their existing code, are presented as findings to Metro to show compliance with Title 3. Cities and counties may choose not to adopt this code and present their existing code as findings to Metro.

II. Water Quality and Floodplain Management Model Code

The (City Council or Board of Commissions) of (jurisdiction) hereby find that:

Section 1. Intent

- A. To implement Goals 6 and 7 by protecting streams and rivers, wetlands, areas with floodprone soils adjacent to streams, floodplains and sensitive water areas within the Water Quality and Flood Management Area in (name of jurisdiction) by limiting or mitigating the impact on these areas from development activities.
- B. To adopt the Metro Water Quality and Flood Management Area Map which delineates the Water Quality and Flood Management Area.

46 **Section 2. Area of Application**
47

- 48 A. This section hereby establishes the Water Quality and Floodplain Management
49 Overlay Zone. The standards in this section are in addition to the standards for
50 the underlying zone.
51
- 52 B. The overlay zone applies to the areas delineated on the Water Quality and
53 Flood Management Map as the Water Quality and Floodplain Management
54 Overlay Zone as adopted in zoning code. The precise boundary of the Water
55 Quality and Floodplain Management Overlay Zone is defined based on
56 any of the following:
57
- 58 1. a. mapped U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) perennial streams
 - 59 b. a stream draining an area of 100 acres or more
 - 60 c. any stream carrying year-round flow regardless of drainage area
 - 61 d. springs which have year-round flow regardless of drainage area
 - 62
 - 63 2. existing or created wetlands
 - 64
 - 65 3. 50 feet from top of waterway bank with less than 25% slope
 - 66
 - 67 4. 200 feet from top of waterway bank with more than 25% slope
 - 68
 - 69 5. FEMA 100-year floodplain
 - 70
 - 71 6. 1996 flood of record, if greater than FEMA 100-year floodplain
 - 72
- 73 C. The overlay zone defined on the Water Quality and Floodplain Management
74 Map is advisory only and has no regulatory effect. A precise measurement of
75 the site will be the final determination of the overlay zone based on site
76 measurements.
77
78
79

80 **Section 3. Flood Mitigation**
81

- 82 A. Purpose: The purpose of these standards is to protect against flooding, and
83 prevent or reduce risk to human life and properties, by allowing for the
84 storage and conveyance of stream flows through these natural systems.
85
- 86 B. Development Standards: Development within the Water Quality and Flood
87 Management Overlay Zone must comply with the following standards:
88
89
90

91 Section 3. Flood Mitigation Continued

92
93 1. Any fill and non-habitable structures within the mapped area must be balanced
94 by an equal amount of removal so that there is no net decrease of the flood storage
95 area; unless the project is demonstrated, by a certified or registered engineering-
96 geologist or engineer, that there is no rise in flood elevation impact or that it will
97 have a net beneficial effect on flood mitigation. The flood elevation is defined as
98 the 100 year flood elevation on the FEMA map or the 25 year flood elevation
99 for areas not on the FEMA map. The design engineer must perform an analysis of
100 the drainage system downstream of the development to a point in the drainage
101 system where the proposed development site constitutes 10 percent or less of the
102 total tributary drainage volume, but in no event less than 1/4 mile.

103
104 2. Any excavation dug below the winter "low-water" elevation shall not count
105 toward compensating for fill since these areas would be full of water in the winter
106 and not available to hold stormwater following a rain. Winter "low water"
107 elevation is defined as the water surface elevation during the winter when it has not
108 rained for at least three days, and the flows resulting from storms have receded.
109 This elevation may be determined from records, studies or field observation. Any
110 fill placed above the 100 year or 25 year floodplain will not count towards the fill
111 volume.

112
113 3. Minimum finished floor elevations must be at least one foot above the design
114 flood height, including the roads to access habitable structures, or other
115 applicable flood hazard standard for new habitable structures in the Water Quality
116 and Flood Management Area.

117
118 4. Large areas may not be excavated in order to gain a small amount of fill in a
119 floodplain. Excavation areas shall not exceed the fill areas by more than 50
120 percent of the square footage, unless approved by (name of jurisdiction).

121
122 5. Any non-habitable structure in the floodplain must be anchored according to
123 FEMA standards.

124
125 6. Short-term parking can be located at an elevation no more than one foot below
126 the ten-year floodplain. Long-term parking can be located at an elevation no less
127 than one foot below the 100-year flood plain.

128
129 7. Culverts, stream crossings and transportation projects shall be designed as
130 balanced cut and fill or designed not to raise the floodplain. All culverts installed in
131 fish bearing streams shall meet ODFW standards for fish passage. All culvert
132 crossings, where practicable or feasible, should be made within 30 degrees of
133 perpendicular to the stream.

134
135

DRAFT

136 **C. Exceptions:**

- 137
- 138 1. Any trees and vegetation planted in the 100-year or 25-year floodplain are
- 139 exempt from the balanced cut and fill requirement.
- 140
- 141 2. Structures and other facilities designed to reduce flood impacts and improve
- 142 water quality downstream . An exemption to the balanced cut and fill requirement
- 143 will be granted when the detention is specifically engineered to mitigate
- 144 downstream flooding.
- 145
- 146

147 **Section 4. Water Quality**

148

149 **A. Purpose:** The purpose of these standards is to protect and allow for

150 enhancement of water quality associated with beneficial uses as defined by the

151 Oregon Water Resources Department and the Oregon Department of

152 Environmental Quality.

153

154 **B. Development Standards within Metro Boundary :** Development on any size

155 parcel within the Metro boundary is subject to the following standards:

156

157 1. Erosion and Sediment Control

158

159 a. Requirements of the erosion and sediment control sections of Oregon

160 DEQ National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit

161 No. 1200C; or

162

163 b. Requirements outlined in the "Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control

164 Plans Technical Guidance Handbook" (City of Portland and Unified

165 Sewerage Agency, 1994); and

166

167 c. Requirements of the DEQ NPDES Municipal Separate Storm Sewer

168 System permits where applicable.

169

170 **C. Development Standards with the Water Quality and Floodplain Management**

171 **Overlay Zone:** Development on any size parcel within the Water Quality and

172 Floodplain Management Overlay Zone is subject to all requirements in Section

173 4(B), plus the following standards:

174

175 1. Maintain or re-establish vegetated cover to the maximum extent practicable and

176 minimize removal of native vegetation. Removal of non-native and nuisance

177 vegetation is permitted and encouraged, but it must be replaced by native

178 vegetation.

179

180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224

2. Stabilize exposed soil in the landscaped area at the earliest practicable date to maintain 90 percent vegetation cover within three years, including replacement of removed trees and shrubs. The vegetated cover required pursuant to this provision shall not allow the use of plants identified on Metro's *Prohibited Plants for Stream Corridors and Wetlands*.

3. Prohibited Uses: New uses of uncontained areas of hazardous materials as defined by DEQ are prohibited in the Water Quality and Flood Management Overlay Zone.

4. Require the planting of appropriate native plant communities as listed on Metro's *Native Plant List*.

5. Soil disturbing activities are prohibited, except as exempted in Section 4(D), as defined in the ODFW construction standards. The construction site must be stabilized and work cease during the time period defined in the ODFW construction standards.

6. No impervious surface is allowed within the sensitive water area. Run-off from impervious surfaces within the floodplain must be pretreated. This pretreatment facility must be located at least 25 feet from top of bank; or pretreatment may be allowed 10 feet within the water quality sensitive area only if an equal amount of mitigation area is set aside.

Alternative: This is the language from USA adapted to meet Title 3 requirements:

"The vegetated corridor shall be a minimum of 50 feet wide, measured horizontally, from the defined boundaries of the sensitive area, except where approval has been granted by the Agency or the City to reduce the width of a portion of the corridor. If approval is granted by the Agency or City to reduce with width of a portion of the vegetated corridor, then the surface water in this area shall be directed to an area of the vegetated corridor that is a minimum of 50 feet wide. The maximum allowable encroachment shall be 15 feet, except as allowed in Section 3.11.4. No more than 25 percent of the length of the vegetated corridor within the development or project site can be less than 50 feet in width. In any case, the average width of the vegetated corridor shall be a minimum of 50 feet."

D: Construction Variances: The following activities qualify for variances: emergency activities and others (Task: sub-committee needs to identify other activities.)

225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269

Section 5. Protection Incentives

The following two incentives are methods by which cities and counties can allow development to occur while protecting the resource.

A. Density Transfers: The density accruing to the land within the Water Quality and Floodplain Management Overlay Zone can be transferred to other portions of the parcel outside the zone. (Note: get language from John for doubling base density.) If a jurisdiction awards a density transfer, these areas qualify as open space density bonuses. (Task: Sub-committee needs to decide how to calculate density transfers.)

B. Set-back Adjustments: Rear yard set-backs can intrude 20 feet into the Water Quality and Floodplain Management Area.

Section 6. Long-term Regional Protection

Protect the long term regional continuity and integrity of Water Quality and Floodplain Management Overlay zones using one or more of the following methods:

The following four items are methods for cities and counties to choose from to protect the long term regional continuity and integrity of the overlay zone.

A. Transfer Development Rights (TDRs): The development rights of property within the Water Quality and Floodplain Overlay Zone can be transferred to other properties which have been approved by the (jurisdiction). Metro will be the regional agency to facilitate identification of transfer and receiving areas.

B. Conservation Easements: Development within the overlay zone is restricted under the conditions of the easement.

C. Common Open Space (Task: this term needs to be defined in definition section): The overlay zone portion of the property will be designated on the platt as common open space.

D. Dedication or Donation: The overlay zone portion of the property will be dedicated or donated to the (name of jurisdiction), special district, public agency or private non-profit for preservation.

E. Fee Simple Sale: The overlay zone portion of the property will be sold to the (name of jurisdiction), special district, public agency or private non-profit for preservation.

270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297

Section 7. Variances

If a parcel cannot contain the construction of a 1200 square foot single family home, then the Water Quality and Floodplain Management Ordinance will be varied to permit construction of such a home. This will be allowed unless the lot was partitioned or divided to separate the buildable land from land prone to flooding.

Section 8. Map Errors

(Task: Sub-committee needs to identify a process to resolve map errors.)

Section 9. Definitions

Open Space Streams ODFW Construction Standards

Top of Bank Sensitive Water Area Development

short-term and long-term parking

wetlands

Goal 6 and 7

Rails - Trails Regional Study

October 15, 1996

1. Background of Study
 - Greenspaces Master Plan / Regional Trails System
 - Need for Comprehensive Planning Approach
 - Need to Create a Database and Maps
 - Coordination with Local Partners
 - Coordination with Metro Transportation and Growth Management
 - Opportunities which Need to be Acted Upon in a Timely Fashion
2. Railroad Corridors as Trails: What are "Rails to Trails" and "Rails with Trails"
3. Railroad Abandonment Process
 - Rail Lines in "Disuse" vs. "Tracks Torn Up" vs. "Officially Abandoned"
 - It Starts with the Railroad Company
 - Federal Review and Approval: Surface Transportation Board (STB)
 - Local Agency or Nonprofit Organization to Take on Financial Responsibility
 - Purchase Price Agreed Upon / Salvage Value
 - Corridor "Rail Banked" for future Rail Use (freight / passenger)
4. What Happens if a Corridor is Not Abandoned or Railbanked
 - Short-Line Railroad Operator Leases Corridor for Continued Service
 - Corridor is Lost for Public Use
 - Land Sold Off Parcel by Parcel (if fee owned by railroad company)
 - Land Reverts to Adjacent Property Owners (if easements existed)
5. Existing Rails to Trails Projects in the Metro Area
 - Springwater Corridor
 - Gladstone segment of Portland Traction Co.
 - Banks to Vernonia
6. STUDY FINDINGS: DATA BASE and MAPS
 - Railroad Ownership
 - Union Pacific / Southern Pacific
 - Burlington Northern / Santa Fe
 - Port of Tillamook Bay
 - Port of Portland
 - Tri-Met
 - Willamette River Shoreline Trolley Consortium
 - Railroad Operators
 - Main Line Operators
 - o Union Pacific and Southern Pacific
 - o Burlington Northern and Santa Fe
 - Short Line Operators
 - o Portland and Western
 - o East Portland Traction Co. (SamTrak)
 - o Peninsula Terminal
 - o Portland and Willamette
 - o Mollala Western
 - o Smurfit & Simpson Timber Co.
 - Railroad Segments Studied: 50 Segments Studied

7. STUDY FINDINGS "RAIL - TRAIL" OPPORTUNITIES

- **Metro Takes the Lead**

Open Spaces Bond Funded Projects

- OMSI to Springwater Corridor
- Burlington Northern (United Jct. to Bowers Jct.)
with Potential Extension from Bowers Jct. South to Hwy. 26
- Milwaukie to Gladstone (PTC line)
- Dodge Park to Roslyn Park (old trolley line in Sandy River Target Area)
(potential project)

Coordination with Tri-Met on "Trails and Light Rail"

- Complementary Improvements on Eastside and Westside MAX Lines
- Coordination with South - North Line

- **Local or State Agencies Take the Lead -- Recommendations**

City of Portland

St. Johns Bridge to Swan Island to Steel Bridge (east side)

City of Gresham

Springwater - Lindeman Jct. to S.E. Division St.

State of Oregon Parks

Springwater - Develop Boring to Estacada Trail Segment

Oregon Parks, U.S. Forest Service, Metro, City of Estacada

Springwater - Estacada to Mt. Hood National Forest

City of West Linn

Old Willamette Line

Cities of Forest Grove and Hillsboro

Rail Line Between the Two Cities

Coordination with Westside LRT

City of McMinnville and Yamhill County or Oregon Parks

McMinnville to Seghers (near Haag Lake)

C:\huiem\RtoTrail\RPAC.096



METRO
Regional Parks and Greenspaces
600 NE GRAND AVE. PORTLAND, OR 97232-2736 (503) 797-1850

NORTHWEST RAIL-TRAILS

OREGON

Oregon has eight trails registered with the Rails to Trails Conservancy in Washington, D.C.:

■ **BANKS-VERNONIA:** Oregon's first linear state park; work began on the trail in 1989. Six trailheads provide access. The easiest to find are two along Oregon 47 north of U.S. 26. The trail still has missing links along Pongratz Road and in Banks. The Vernonia part of the 20-mile trail is scheduled for paving this summer.

■ **SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR:** The trail extends 16.8 miles from McLoughlin Boulevard in Southeast Portland to Boring and is scheduled for \$2 million in improvement. The paved section in Gresham is heavily used.

■ **ROW RIVER:** The Bureau of Land Management is planning to spend \$2 million over the next two years for trailheads, bridge decking and paving on the 14-mile long trail east of Cottage Grove.

■ **OC&E AND WOODS:** Oregon's second rail-to-trail state park, the 110.4 miles of converted railroad is called OC&E Rails to Trails Linear State Park. The 65.4-mile OC&E line runs from Klamath Falls to Bly, with the 45-mile connecting Woods line running from Beatty north to Thompson Reservoir in the Fremont National Forest. The first four miles, from Sixth and Washburn in Klamath Falls to Oregon 39, will be paved this summer. Other improvements will include decking of five trestles and resurfacing of some sections.

■ **DESCHUTES RIVER:** Deschutes State Park at the mouth of the river has a 16-mile bike trail on the east bank along an old railroad grade.

■ **WALLULA LAKE:** The U.S. Army Corp of Engineers is building a 4.8-mile trail from McNary Beach, two miles above McNary Dam, to Hat Rock State Park. The trail near Umatilla is expected to open in May 1996. Anyone wishing to volunteer for work parties is asked to contact park ranger Charlene Jensen at (503) 922-3211.

■ **SUMPTER VALLEY:** The Malheur National Forest maintains a 0.2-mile interpretive trail at Dixie Summit northeast of Prairie City that explains the history of the logging railroad in the area.

■ **MALHEUR:** A 12-mile section of trail for mountain bikes and snowmobiles follows the Old Hines logging railroad grade between Summit Prairie and Murray Camp in the Malheur National Forest south of the Strawberry Wilderness Area.

FUTURE POSSIBILITIES

■ **BURLINGTON NORTHERN:** A seven-mile section of track from the Sauvie Island Bridge to Helvetia in Washington County is being abandoned. Passage of the May 16 Metro greenspaces bond measure would provide funding for trail development.

■ **WILLAMETTE VALLEY:** Abandonment is possible of a Burlington-Northern line from Salem to Junction City. The Salem to Albany section has the potential to link Willamette River Greenway parks with city parks and to serve as a commuter route.

■ **MALHEUR VALLEY:** An abandoned rail line through Eastern Oregon will be examined for trail development potential by Pete Bond, state trails coordinator.

■ **WALLOWAS:** A railroad in northeast Oregon has high potential, according to Bond. The Idaho Northern and Pacific line between Elgin and Joseph is being considered for abandonment. Much of the route follows the Grande Ronde and Wallowa rivers.

■ **CAZZADERO:** State parks owns an abandoned line from Boring to Estacada. Although a vital link between the Springwater Corridor and the Mount Hood National Forest, local residents have not supported trail development. Expense would be high because of two creek crossings.

WASHINGTON

A national leader in converting abandoned railroads to trails, Washington has nearly 50 projects. Among them are:

■ **KLICKITAT:** The 31-mile rail corridor from Lyle on the Columbia River to Warwick on the Goldendale Plateau is under study and not open to the public. Washington State Parks has title to the corridor, but the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area is managing it. An environmental assessment is being written and is due for completion late this fall. The trail would need to be designated as a national recreational trail by the regional forester for the scenic area to continue managing the project.

■ **CHEHALIS:** State parks is expected to name this year a 56-mile abandoned rail line and convert it to a trail between Chehalis and South Bend. The line is a vital link in a state plan to run an east-west trail from the Pacific Ocean to the Idaho border.

■ **BURKE-GILMAN:** One of the oldest, most popular and most scenic rail-trails in the country, the Burke-Gilman trail connects Seattle's Lake Union with Bothell where it joins the Sammamish River Trail. Already 26 miles long, connections to downtown Seattle and Shilshole Bay are planned.

■ **JOHN WAYNE:** Extending 282 miles from North Bend to the Idaho border, the trail is owned by state parks west of the Columbia River and the Department of Natural Resources east of the Columbia. The west section is called Iron Horse State Park and is noted for a 2½-mile tunnel beneath Snoqualmie Pass. The trail has some major gaps, including lack of crossings of Interstate 90 east of Ellensburg and the Columbia River near Vantage.

■ **SCABLANDS:** Also called the Pasco-Fish Lake Trail, the parks commission is expected to bestow an official name this summer. The trail runs 132 miles from Pasco to Cheney. Although usable in short segments, the state is awaiting official title from Burlington Northern and architects are working on a master plan.

FACTS AND FIGURES

Facts and figures about the national rails-to-trails movement:

■ The United States has 681 rails-to-trails projects covering 7,866 miles in 48 states. Only Hawaii and Delaware are without projects.

■ The most heavily used rail-trail is Virginia's Washington & Old Dominion Trail with two million annual users. The longest trail will be the 321-mile Cowboy Trail when it opens across Nebraska this summer.

■ Michigan leads with 855 miles. Washington is sixth with 463 miles and Oregon is 19th with 102 open miles.

■ The Rails-to-Trails Conservancy opened in 1986. It has 65,000 members. The address is 1400 16th St. N.W., Suite 300, Washington, D.C., 20036; (202) 797-5400.

— Terry Richard