

AIR, LAND, WATER, WILDLIFE AND HAZARDS SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING  
ROOM 126, MULTNOMAH BUILDING  
501 SE HAWTHORNE BLVD, PORTLAND OR  
JULY 22, 2015 3:00-5:00 PM

## **MEETING SUMMARY**

### **I. Welcome, Introductions and Announcements**

In attendance:

Subcommittee members

Marcy Houle  
Stephanie Nystrom

Project Team

Rich Faith  
Rithy Khut  
Kevin Cook  
Matt Hastie  
Cathy Corliss

Absent

Catherine Dishion and Jerry Grossnickle

There was three community members in attendance: George Sowder, Paula Sauvageau, Carol Chesarek

Rich Faith welcomed everyone to the first meeting of this subcommittee and briefly explained the items that will on tonight's agenda, which is primarily to provide an understanding of various policy issues and to obtain feedback from the subcommittee so that staff can begin drafting policy language.

### **II. Riparian Corridor Policy Issues**

Rithy Khut summarized the main points in his memorandum on this topic, which is one of many resources that is covered by Statewide Planning Goal 5. The summary included a look at the maps included in the packet (Figures 1A and 1B) and information about the process to inventory and protect Goal 5 riparian corridor resources and the difference between the standard approach and the safe harbor approach. The standard inventory falls on the local government to conduct and requires an Economic, Social, Environmental and Energy (ESEE) analysis to be performed when applying a protection program. A safe harbor inventory uses data or information already collected by other agencies and does not require an ESEE analysis if the protection program applies prescribed standards and criteria.

The following are some major points from the discussion of this topic:

- Another way of interpreting or phrasing the third key policy question in the memo under riparian corridors is: Should the SEC-s and SEC-wr overlay zones be consolidated into one overlay. If yes, this would trigger the need to do an ESEE analysis because the two overlays have different standards for protection of the resource.
- A similar question can be asked about the policies about protecting riparian corridors from the rural area plans in that it might make sense to apply them consistently throughout the county rather than in only one rural area.
- Regarding the first key policy question in the memo, more simply the question is really asking if the two fish-bearing streams not currently part of the inventory should be added to it, and if they are, which approach should be taken for their protection – standard or safe harbor?
- Are headwaters captured in the inventory? Are they being protected through our SEC zones? Policies about riparian corridor protection should address watersheds.
- Subcommittee members agreed that the two streams should be added to the inventory and that as new data becomes available the county should update its inventory maps to include other eligible streams. It is not known how often the State updates its inventory. There should be a policy about the County periodically reviewing new information to keep its inventory up to date.
- Subcommittee members agreed that the SEC-s overlay should be applied to Newberry Creek flowing out the West Hills. If an ESEE analysis needs done, then do it.
- On the East side, the Bull Run River probably doesn't need an SEC overlay because it is within a protected watershed largely owned by the City of Portland or the Forest Service. Nothing is going to happen there anyway.
- To a question whether streams running through the Angell Brothers mining site can be protected through safe harbor provisions, the answer was that those streams would have to be designated as significant, which does trigger an ESEE analysis.

### **III. Wetlands Policy Issues**

Rithy summarized the information on this topic in his memorandum and referred to the wetland map included in the packet (Figure 2). Virtually all of the wetlands on the Statewide Wetland Inventory (SWI) that are not now protected by the County's SEC-w overlay are found on Sauvie Island.

The following are major comments regarding this policy issue:

- Can the SEC-w overlay be applied to all the SWI identified wetlands on Sauvie Island not now covered by the overlay? The answer is yes but it would first require an ESEE analysis of those wetlands.
- Subcommittee members agreed with the two key policy questions about wetland protection posed in the memorandum.

- There was agreement that there should be a policy about protecting wetlands by removal of invasive species. After further discussion it was decided that this policy may fit better under the topic of habitat.
- The existing West Hills RAP policy about protecting water quality by control of runoff from West Hills Area streams should be expanded to address runoff from other sources such as roads and impervious areas.
- Policy 3.8 from the proposed Sauvie Island/Multnomah Channel RAP should be generalized for application countywide.

#### **IV. Wildlife Habitat Policy Issues**

Rithy provided a brief background on this topic and referred to the wildlife habitat maps in the meeting packet (Figures 3A and 3B). Cathy Corliss stated that she was not sure those maps are the most current. They appeared to be an earlier version of wildlife habitat maps produced by our subconsultant specializing in resource protection. She also thought that painted turtles had been taken off the list ODFW maps of important habitat.

Major comments on this subject were:

- Subcommittee members agreed that the SEC-h overlay should be applied to those wildlife habitat areas shown on the maps that are not currently protected. If that triggers the need for an ESEE analysis, then it should be done.
- Regarding the critical habitat areas shown in the East County area, a question was raised about whether all of this habitat is within the boundaries of the National Forest. It was not clear if this is the case, but if it is, the subcommittee did not feel the SEC-h overlay needed to be applied here. Staff should look at the restriction of the CFU zone(s) that applies to this habitat to make sure there is adequate protection provided through the underlying CFU zoning before concluding that the overlay is unnecessary.
- A concern was expressed that painted turtles may still be listed as a sensitive species even if the habitat map does not include them. Staff needs to verify their status.
- Existing plan policies pertaining to wildlife will be revised and brought back for review just as has been done with existing policies on other topics.
- There ought to be a policy encouraging the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) to administer the Wildlife Habitat tax deferral program.
- There should be a policy about setting a cap on house sizes in habitat areas.
- There should be a policy specific to high value habitat such as oak woodlands.

#### **V. Natural Hazards Policy Topics**

Matt Hastie gave an overview of this policy topic noting that there are a number of natural hazards that could be examined from a policy perspective, but in the case of the comp plan and what is most relevant to Multnomah County, the three major hazard issues are Steep Slope and Landslides, Floodplains and Channel Migration, and

Wildfire. Matt briefly went over each of three hazard topics as discussed in his summary report included in the meeting packet.

Matt informed the subcommittee that the County's Hazard Mitigation Plan is in the process of being updated and is on a similar track as the comprehensive plan. That process is being handled by a team in the County's Office of Emergency Management. It will be incorporated in some way into the County Comprehensive Plan. Matt proposed that a staff person working on the Hazard Mitigation Plan could be invited to a future meeting of this subcommittee to brief them on that planning effort.

Matt pointed out the difference in County policy and implementing regulations about what percentage slopes are regulated for hazard – 20% versus 25%. He noted the key policy question to address this discrepancy. A subcommittee member asked whether we can just go with 20% as the threshold for Hillside development regulations. After further discussion about this and other hazard topics, Matt said it would be possible for him to draft preliminary policy language on landslides and wildfires for the next subcommittee meeting, but he did not feel he had enough information and feedback to do that for flooding and channel migration.

**VI. Public Comment**

No comments

**VII. Meeting Wrap up**

Rich reminded everyone that the next subcommittee meeting will not be until September 2, the same day as the next CAC meeting. The committee will finish its review of flooding issues and will also be reviewing the subject of historic preservation. Draft policies related to the topics discussed this evening will also be presented at the next meeting.

**VIII. Adjourn**

**The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:05 pm.**