

**D&C Standards Update
Nov. 7, 2006
Meeting Notes**

Terry Keyes began the meeting, which was attended by 15 stakeholders and 11 District staff. The topic was the update of Chapter 3: Sensitive Areas and Vegetated Corridors. Terry explained the chapter has been reorganized and Appendix C has been incorporated. Some graphics may be in an appendix or the Standard Details section may be expanded to include illustrations to clarify the text.

Summary

Staff reviewed the highlights of the updated chapter, as outlined below.

3.00 & 3.01 – No changes

3.02 – SPL & Permits Required

3.02.2 Site Assessment Required

Threshold and submittal process for Site Assessment

Clarification of Simplified & Standard Site Assessment from Appendix C

3.03 – Vegetated Corridors

No changes except: Table 3-1, isolated vs. non-isolated for wetlands under ½ acre

3.05 Allowed Activities in Vegetated Corridor

3.05.3 Stream enhancement projects

3.05.4 Utility infrastructure

Added utility corridor width

Allow minor encroachment w/o mitigation

3.05.7 Path width increased

Tualatin River flexibility

Low Impact Development techniques

3.06 – Gen. Req. Dev. Activities

Added 'Alternatives' requirement to Tier 1, 2, and 3.

3.08 – VC Mitigation Standards

Replacement Mitigation Ratio Table 3-2

Flexibility of mitigation increased by no longer requiring VC mitigation to be tied to DSL

Payment to Provide expanded for small impacts

Enhancement of existing VC new option

3.09 – Land Division

Redevelopment definition in Chapter 1 of current standards will be modified

3.11 – Sensitive Area Impacts Permitted by DSL and COE

New section created to increase flexibility

VC mitigation is based on post-development configurations

Partial fill wetlands

Total fill wetlands

3.12 – Linear Development Projects

New Section with new requirements

3.13 – Site Assessment Req.

New Section for submittal requirements

Added 'Final Conditions Site Plan Figure'

Continuing Work

- Lot Line Adjustments w/o Physical Development in Section 3.02 and Section 3.09.2
- References
- Further refining sections 3.08.3 (Payment to Provide, 3.11 (Sensitive Area impacts...), and 3.12 (Linear Development Projects)
- Other areas?

Questions and requests for clarification of language included:

Definitions of right of way and road

Clarify whether easements in 20' corridor are permanent

Illustrations of real life applications of the Tualatin River buffers

Numbering is incorrect in some places

Minor Encroachment should be Corridor Averaging

Mitigation for linear projects adjacent?

Mitigation within the right of way

Mitigation within one mile of the site

Mitigation in same subbasin

Mitigation outside District boundary

Linear mitigation is not tied to 3.11

Enhancement is not the same as mitigation

Redevelopment addresses buffers and stormwater

30 consecutive days (to determine a dry stream channel)

Suggestions included:

Require low impact development on all trails

Mitigation must be on or contiguous to the development site

More illustrations in the Standards

No net reduction in size of wetland

No net reduction in area of buffer

Next steps

Staff requested comments and suggestion from the stakeholders, and emphasized the importance of including data to support recommendations. Nora Curtis asked stakeholders to help the District develop practical, fair language to deter partial fill in wetlands because COE and DSL regulations do not fit seamlessly with District authority, thus leaving an area that is critical but difficult to define and regulate.

Jim Labbe of Portland Audubon Society offered to provide data about isolated wetlands. He also suggested the group convene another forum to address the issues that are not part of the Design and Construction Standards update, such as buffer widths, DSL regulations, and trails. He offered to participate in such a forum.