

City of Gresham

Environmental Overlay Project

Stakeholder Meetings: Summary

Introduction

Stakeholder meetings were held on October 4, 2016. The purpose of these meetings was to outline the scope of the project and have an informal discussion about the concerns and key stakeholder groups. Two meetings were held, one for the development community and one for neighborhood association members and environmental groups, each consisting of a staff presentation followed by discussion.

Staff and consultants provided a PowerPoint presentation (available on the City's website) that included project goals, schedule, and an introduction to the topics of overlay zone consolidation, updating regulations with new environmental data, density transfer, forthcoming FEMA floodplain regulations, and next steps in the project.

Development Group:

Attendees:

- Dale Hult
- Ray Moore
- Carey Sheldon
- Jim Leeper
- Jesse Brand
- Ray Moore

Comments and themes from the group:

- Thank you for getting this process started.
- Property owners cannot interpret the regulations that apply to their property. The HCA zone is somewhat easier to understand.
- Overall we agree with the stewardship concept.
- Would like to see regulations based on a field-identifiable feature, rather than a line on a map. Floodplain can be identified by elevation.
- Some properties are mostly or entirely covered with ESRA - this is overreach.

- Buffer is 200' on one property, and 100' on a neighboring property. What is the reason?
- You're on the right track with this project - we would still like to see significantly less area protected in places it doesn't make sense. One participant expressed the opinion that if the project wasn't going to result in smaller natural resource areas, it was of limited benefit.
- There may be an opportunity for a pilot/example project - it will come in for land use approvals before this process is complete.

Neighborhood Groups / Environmental Groups

Attendees:

- Daniel Newberg, Johnson Creek Watershed Council
- Carl Clinton, SW Neighborhood
- Carl Rulla, Coalition of Neighborhood Associations
- Karen Bohrstedt, GPVNA
- John Bildsoe, Friends of Grand Butte Wetlands, neighborhood associations
- Kevin Peterson, homeowner

Comments and themes from the group:

- Interest in density transfer - concern that the rate of ESRA density transfer is lower than the HCA, but the desire is to have a greater amount of protection than the HCA.
- It seems like the process would benefit from ground-truthing these designations. Aerial data identified a quarry as an environmental zone.
- Mitigation requirements under HCA requires "seedling trees." Consider requiring larger trees.
- Concern about what's on the map vs. what's on the ground - streams move, data can be outdated.
- Maybe requirements to mail notices are the right time to ask if there are corrections to maps. Or during map amendments.
- Discussion of the pros/cons associated with converting the ESRAs from base zones to overlay zones.

- Are Intermittent streams included? (we are using identified Goal 5 resources)
- Role of neighborhood associations in identifying natural resources in project areas - very important to the City.
- Over time the City should build better data by requiring original data from applicants as they complete surveys of their property.
- General support for ESRA as an overlay zone. The cases where a non-obvious decision about which base zone should apply may be few.



Meeting summary prepared by Angelo Planning Group, 10/31/2016