

# Environmental Overlay Project (EOP) Update



Kathy Majidi & Jeff Lesh January 2020

#### Natural Hazard Areas

## Natural Hazards

- Flooding
  - Risk protection through Floodplain Overlay
- Landslides
  - Risk protection through Hillside Physical Constraint District

#### Natural Resource Areas

# Natural Resources

- Wetlands
- Streams
- Riparian Areas
- Upland Habitat

#### Protected through:

- Environmentally Sensitive Restoration Areas (Pleasant Valley)
- Environmentally Sensitive Resource Areas (Springwater)
- Habitat Conservation Areas ("current city" and Kelley Creek Headwaters)





#### **Initial Project Drivers**

#### • Floodplain Maps and Code

- Federally mandated timeline
- Goal: update floodplain maps and code to meet requirements

#### Natural Resource Buffers

- confusing, overly complex, and relied on outdated resource info
- Goals:
  - unify (between planning areas)
  - simplify complicated code and mapping processes
  - update (with best available data)

## **Project Direction**

Natural Hazards:

Use best available data to meet state and federal risk mitigation standards

Natural Resources:

Be consistent with prior stakeholder input: No significant change to the degree of resource protection in current code

- Pleasant Valley Community Plan, 1999-2005
- Springwater Community Plan, 2004-2007
- Metro's Title 3 process, 2002-2008

## Environmental Overlay Project Components

|                          | Floodplain  | Riparian & Upland<br>Habitat  | Hillside  |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|
| Last updated             | 1990s (Johnson, Fairview,<br>and Kelly/Burlingame)<br>2009 (in Columbia Slough)   | 2001 (ESRA-PV), 2005<br>(ESRA-SW), 2008 (HCA)   | 2003  |
| Current Update           | 2019  | 2020  | 2020  |
| Regulates development in | Floodplains   | Streams, wetlands, uplands, natural areas   | Steep slopes and landslide-<br>prone soils  |
| Drivers                  | <ul> <li>National Flood<br/>Insurance Program<br/>requirements (FEMA)</li> <li>Statewide Planning<br/>Goal 7 (Flooding)</li> <li>Public health and safety</li> <li>Preserve property</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Statewide Planning Goal 5</li> <li>Metro Title 3 and 13</li> <li>Clean Water Act</li> <li>Preserve wildlife habitat and water quality</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Statewide Planning Goal<br/>7 (Landslides)</li> <li>Public health and safety</li> <li>Preserve property</li> </ul> |



## Environmental Overlay Project Components

|                             | Floodplain  | Riparian & Upland<br>Habitat  | Hillside  |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|
| Last updated                | 1990s (Johnson, Fairview,<br>and Kelly/Burlingame)<br>2009 (in Columbia Slough)   | 2001 (ESRA-PV), 2005<br>(ESRA-SW), 2008 (HCA)   | 2003  |
| Current Update              | 2019  | 2020  | 2020  |
| Regulates<br>development in | Floodplains   | Streams, wetlands, uplands,<br>natural areas  | Steep slopes and landslide-<br>prone soils  |
| Drivers                     | <ul> <li>National Flood<br/>Insurance Program<br/>requirements (FEMA)</li> <li>Statewide Planning<br/>Goal 7 (Flooding)</li> <li>Public health and safety</li> <li>Preserve property</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Statewide Planning Goal 5</li> <li>Metro Title 3 and 13</li> <li>Clean Water Act</li> <li>Preserve wildlife habitat and water quality</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Statewide Planning Goal<br/>7 (Landslides)</li> <li>Public health and safety</li> <li>Preserve property</li> </ul> |





- Currently finalizing a draft code for public review
- Currently finalizing GIS models for public review
- Public review begins April 2020.



Natural Resource Overlay (stream, wetland, and upland habitat buffers)

We needed to address 3 primary issues:

Issue 1:

- Current buffers don't reflect best available data
  - Most improvements are LiDAR data





## Natural Resource Overlay (cont.)

Issue 2:

 Presence of computer-generated buffer geometries that didn't result in the envisioned resource protection



# Natural Resource Overlay (cont.)

Issue 3:

• Difficulty of understanding and administering three complicated, differing buffer models





# HCA Model - Inputs





#### HCA Model – Final Values





## Natural Resource Buffers Simplified



Standard buffer widths around similar resources

- No significant change in level of protection
  - Averaged the pre-existing buffers
- Use easier-to-find field indicators
  - Measure from center of the stream
- Simplified buffer doesn't generate anomalies
- Uses most current, high resolution data



### Natural Resource Buffers Unified

Discrepancies existed because of how the various buffers were adopted:

- ESRA-PV: buffers are a land use zone
- ESRA-SW: buffers are a land use zone
- HCA (current city): buffers are an overlay



# Natural Resource Buffers as an Overlay



#### Natural Resource Buffers as a Zone





#### Transitioning from Zone to Overlay



Proposed zoning with Conceptual Natural Resource Overlay

### Hillside Overlay – What is it?

Regulates development on

- steep slopes
- landslide prone soils

Consists of:

- Development code
- Overlay boundary

Overlay boundary relies on

- slope data
- landslide hazard data
- risk prioritization criteria





## Hillside Overlay – Why update?

Natural Resources Overlay (NRO) removed some steeply sloped areas which prompted a review of our Hillside code and overlay.

Limitations

- Coarse slope data
- Inaccurate landslide hazard data
- Lacking clear and objective standards for needed housing

Opportunities to improve

- Higher resolution slope data
- 2014 landslide inventory
- 2018 landslide hazard data
- 2019 State landslide land use guide





#### Hillside – Inaccurate Hazard Data

Text to Accompany

GIS Overview Map of Potential Rapidly Moving Landslide Hazards in Western Oregon

by R. Jon Hofmeister Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries

> Daniel J. Miller Earth Systems Institute

Keith A. Mills and Jason C. Hinkle Oregon Department of Forestry

Ann E. Beier Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development





Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries

Interpretive Map Series IMS-22

2002

IMS-22 data was used as our "Further Review Areas"

DOGAMI webpage now states:

"IMS-22 hazard zones are now considered to be an inaccurate depiction of this hazard."



## Hillside – New Hazard Data (2014-2018)

#### Landslide Hazard and Risk Study

Central and Western Multnomah County, Oregon





Interpretive Map 57 Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries



OREGON DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND MINERAL INDUSTRIES (





#### Hillside – Slope data comparison

10-m USGS DEM



2003 available data

1-m lidar DEM







#### Hillside – New high quality slope data



Hogan Butte and Johnson Creek



#### Hillside – Coarse Slope Data



#### CITY OF GRESHAM

#### Hillside - New Hazard Data





#### Hillside – Code



#### Code and overlay development guidance

- Integrating new hazard data
- Goal 7 compliance
- Examples from other jurisdictions

#### PREPARING FOR LANDSLIDE HAZARDS

A LAND USE GUIDE FOR OREGON COMMUNITIES

October 2019



## Coming for your review:

#### Simplified, unified Natural Resource Overlay

- Updated Map
- Updated Code

#### Hillside Overlay

- Updated Map
- Updated Code

#### **Zoning Map Update**

• Pleasant Valley and Springwater

#### Next Steps



