

# NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE MINUTES

September 5, 2001

Metro Council Chamber

Members present: Councilor Carl Hosticka, Chair, Councilor Bill Atherton, and Councilor Susan McLain

Also present: Presiding Officer David Bragdon

**Chair Hosticka** called the meeting to order at 1: 40 p.m.

## 1. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

**Councilor Atherton** asked that the spelling of Mr. Houck's name be corrected from Houk to Houck. The minutes of the July 18, 2001 meeting were moved by Councilor Atherton, and approved by Chair Hosticka and Councilor McLain with that revision.

## 2. Resolution No. 01-3101, For the Purpose of Approving the Blue Lake Regional Park Economic Feasibility Study and Facility Design Concept

**Chair Hosticka** said that since so many people had come to testify on the Blue Lake Park Plan he wanted to move that up on the agenda. He explained to the audience that the usual procedure was to have staff introduce the resolution and make some comments about the substance of the resolution and then take public testimony.

**Mr. Charlie Ciecko** said that this agenda item addressed the possible adoption of a preferred development concept for Blue Lake Regional Park. He discussed the history of the plan and how it came to be under discussion at the meeting. The plan addressed all the guiding goals and issues that the council had designed to reduce the subsidy to operate the park, to enhance the recreational opportunities and the natural resource values of the park, and to improve operational efficiencies. He summarized the plan, which was passed out and forms a part of the record. He said that Metro had conducted a statistically valid public opinion survey, 25 interviews with key stakeholders, convened a 20-person expert business panel, held 2 ice-cream social open houses, provided one briefing to the Fairview City Council, provided a tour, and had had good media coverage. His final note was that council approval of the preferred concept would not clear the way for construction on the site, it only would allow staff to take the next step of evaluating and investigating the concept.

**Chair Hosticka** reiterated that the resolution said that the council would adopt the study and the concept, but not commit to taking specific action pending approval, financials, and so on, to actually implement the concept. **Mr. Ciecko** agreed and said that Jane Hart would talk about the components of the concept.

**Ms. Jane Hart** talked about the proposed park improvements. They were divided into two categories, general park upgrades, and recreational facilities and services. She used some graphics to explain the changes to the preferred concept. The upgrades consisted of a new entry booth and gate house, improved directional signage throughout the park, replacing the central restroom, upgrading other restrooms, upgrading picnic shelters, replacing the cook stations along the waterfront, converting the manual irrigation to automatic, expanding the park trail system around the perimeter, and upgrading utilities. For the recreational facilities services, the plan proposed bus transit service, and a bus stop, another large capacity picnic shelter, the water play area, a youth destination center, a golf learning center, an environmental education shelter, a blue lake store, a lake center plaza, and a new and expanded lake house.

**Councilor Atherton** asked about the golf course. **Ms. Hart** replied that the plan showed an 18 hole golf course, but no decision had been made. **Mr. Ciecko** said that the concept was in a very preliminary stage. The options to consider were a par 3/18 or a full length 9. **Councilor Atherton** asked about the economic viability and environmental impact of the golf course, and if the 9 vs. 18 size of the course had a large effect on that. **Mr. Ciecko** said that the par 3/18 might provide the most economical return. He said that as far as environmental impacts go he did not see much difference between the sizes.

**Councilor Bragdon** wanted clarification on the youth destination center. **Ms. Hart** said that it was very conceptual at that point. The public supported ideas such as a rock climbing gym, or a skateboard park. The program would definitely need to be partnered with someone in the private sector to see if it could be marketed and profitable.

**Councilor McLain** said that the Council had had the opportunity to look at the full concept and get comfortable with it. She said she would be looking at it to make sure that all the right things were done with the space. She wanted to know that if they voted yes on the preferred concept was there a certainty that if something was added, dropped, or changed, would it then come back for review? **Mr. Ciecko** said that he felt there would be considerable continued involvement by the Council before the plan was implemented.

**Chair Hosticka** asked what other parts of the concept would generate revenue, besides the golf learning center. **Mr. Ciecko** responded that The Lake House, picnic shelters, the Youth Destination Center (in partnership with the private sector), and the Lake Front Pavilion all had potential revenue income possibilities. **Ms. Heather Kent** added that the preferred concept described using a general concessionaire to help with reservations, catering and other types of rentals of the park facilities. Those were activities managed by park staff and operations efficiencies would be achieved by turning that over to someone else and keeping a portion of the revenues.

**Councilor McLain** asked about the environmental impact of this project. Asked what environmental studies had been done and what was planned for the future. **Mr. Ciecko** said that the water was of high quality and that it would continue to be protected to maintain that high quality. **Ms. Kent** said that there was a designated wetland on the property so there were a number of agencies reviewing the property along with Metro. **Mr. Ciecko** said that there were no endangered species on the property. **Ms. Kent** summarized some of the public comment that had been received prior to the meeting. She also stated that the resolution under discussion asked the Council to approve the draft concept with 5 of the 6 recommendations from the parks and greenspaces advisory committee. They requested some language in the resolution guaranteeing that park construction and use would not negatively impact the water quality. Metro felt that that issue had been adequately addressed throughout the document.

**Chair Hosticka** started the public hearing.

**Mr. Jim Raze** from the City Council Fairview, read a letter to the committee which forms a part of this record. **Chair Hosticka** asked for questions and then invited the two representatives from the City of Portland to speak.

**Mr. John Zoller**, City of Portland - Parks, said that he and his group supported the golf course. He felt that it was an environmentally beneficial concept as well as a good source of revenue. He discussed golf green maintenance and how it was much more environmentally friendly now. **Chair Hosticka** asked if there were any independent review bodies that could certify or state what the impact of a golf course would be on the aquifer. **Mr. Zoller** said that one of his organization's golf courses was certified by the Audubon Society of New York. They put the course through a rigorous list of checks before it was certified. He said that all their courses go through the same checklist, even though only the one was certified. He said they could review the course plans. He also mentioned the United States Golf

Association, and that there were a number of universities conducting tests on turf and chemical pesticides for gold greens. **Chair Hosticka** said that he had lived on a gold course and was not impressed, but that he had heard things were better. **Mr. David Peters**, City of Portland, Oregon Bureau of Water Works, read a letter to Chair Hosticka for the Committee. It is attached and forms a part of this record.

**Councilor Atherton** asked him how far the aquifer extends. Mr. Peters wasn't certain. **Councilor Atherton** asked if a geotechnical study had been done. **Mr. Peters** said yes and that the City of Portland had modeled the ground water aquifers to look at the risk assessment of that area. He said that the Blue Lake Aquifer was at risk just because it was so close to the surface. But he pointed out that that could be managed. **Councilor Atherton** asked if there had been any development in the Blue Lake Aquifer area lately, and if so had the city reviewed those? **Mr. Peters** said that not that he was aware of. **Councilor Atherton** said he thought he saw construction. **Mr. Peters** said residential. **Councilor Atherton** thought that there was also commercial construction, and he wanted to know what the impact of that was on the area. He also asked if Mr. Peters knew what the current nitrate level in the water was. **Mr. Peters** said that he thought it was 3. He said that the proposal had a contingency to look at the background information and to conduct the necessary studies. **Councilor Atherton** asked just how big would the impact be compared to some of the other activities. He also wanted to know if the current activities were being regulated also? **Mr. Peters** didn't know.

**Chair Hosticka** wanted to know what legal rights the City of Portland had regarding the well and the aquifer. **Mr. Peters** said that the state requires certain regulation, maintenance and protection of a designated area around a well.

**Councilor McLain** thanked both gentlemen for their time. She said that everything they said at the meeting really applied to stage 2. She said that the staff would be back with everything they had written in their letter and more, and that level of detail would be in place before working on the budget for the master plan. She thanked them for their partnership.

**Chair Hosticka** thanked both men and called the next person to give testimony.

**Ms. Jean Ridings**, Interlachen PUD, passed out displays for the committee. She said she was disappointed in the potential for the golf learning center. She mentioned that there were several super fund sites in that area already. She did not welcome another threat to the aquifer. She said it was a shallow aquifer with no confining layer to protect it. She objected to the removal of the sixth bullet on the resolution, which was discussed by Ms. Hart above. She objected to not being able to testify at a meeting between the City of Portland Water, the Parks, and Metro. Her handouts are attached and part of the record.

**Chair Hosticka** called Dr. Robert Johnston, Interlachen PUD, and Dr. Johnston read into the record a letter regarding Interlachen PUD Comments Upon "Blue Lake Regional Park Draft Economic Feasibility Study & Facility Design Concept." This letter is attached and forms a part of the record. **Councilor Atherton** asked if the Interlachen PUD Homeowner's Association regulate use of pesticides. Dr. Johnston said that they would make recommendations, but that there was no ordinance against use of pesticides. **Chair Hosticka** asked about the issue of number six on the minutes Ms. Riding had submitted in her packet. **Mr. Ciecko** said that there were six recommendations made by the Regional Parks and Green Spaces Parks Advisory Committee. He stressed that they were advisory, and then said that staff was recommending that five of those items be incorporated into the plan. He said that staff did not recommend that number six be incorporated because it was redundant and that the issue of environmental impact of the golf course had been addressed. Staff felt the plan provided adequate assurance of Metro's commitment to protecting the groundwater resource. **Chair Hosticka** said that the status of the situation was clear and that the committee could decide what to do about that issue. **Councilor Atherton** said that on page 36 of the plan under design parameters it said "coordinate implementation with Interlachen PUD,

Portland Water Bureau, City of Fairview, area residents and other relevant parties.” He said that they would obviously address the subsurface water quality issue.

**Chair Hosticka** said to finish the public testimony and then asked Mrs. Jane Graybill to make her presentation. **Mrs. Jane Graybill**, Special Representative for the Interlachen Water PUD, handed out a packet for the committee members which now forms a part of this record. She discussed the information in her packet. **Councilor McLain** thanked Mrs. Graybill for her hard and thorough work. She said that all the information presented would be taken into consideration during stage 2 as it was valuable. She said the committee’s job was to protect natural resources and that they were committed to doing that. She asked that the people giving testimony would understand that the information they were giving the committee was very important, but that it would be more appropriate for stage 2. She said that they could not decide about a golf course until they had reviewed studies and reports on it, which would come later. **Mr. Ciecko** made the comment that the Metro Planning Department had responded to the Interlachen Water PUD letter that Mrs. Graybill had said in her testimony had not been answered. He provided a copy of the letter for the record.

**Chair Hosticka** mentioned the time constraint on the committee, asking people to try to keep their testimony brief.

**Jean McLemore**, Interlachen Inc. Representative, said that she was part of the neighborhood committee. She and her neighbors were in favor of the plan except in regards to the addition of the golf course.

**Councilor Bragdon** asked her to clarify which committee she was on. She said she was on the committee to draft the plan for Blue Lake park.

**Mr. Trask**, U.S. Forest Service, said he was opposed to the plan proposal. He did not like the preferred alternative. He felt it was impossible to enhance a natural wetland. He was against the construction of the site, as he felt that it would damage the aquifer. He also felt that access to the site would be, and would create, a large problem. He also sited cost as being a problem. He asked that Metro not bring a city park to a country setting.

**Mr. Ron Buel**, of The Buel Group, supported the preferred concept. His discussion focused on the revenue production arena. He felt that a lodging facility at Blue Lake Park would be a great revenue source. He said that a hospitality center on Blue Lake would pull together the economics of the plan by bringing hundreds of regular paying guests to the site year-round. He talked about the benefits of a golf-learning center. He felt that the concerns regarding the Interlachen residents could be addressed through mitigation. He suggested that it was possible to capture damaging water runoff and keep it out of the Aquifers. He said that he thought the right thing could be done without damaging the water aquifer and by producing enough revenue to make it workable. **Chair Hosticka** pointed out that the language of the material included the recommendation of the advisory committee that the development would only be considered if surface and subsurface water quality was protected. **Councilor McLain** said that the process had been a thorough process and thanked the members of the public for their outstanding testimony. She said that she felt that none of the testimony presented at the meeting would affect the vote as it mostly dealt with stage 2 issues. She put a motion before the committee to pass the resolution. She read for the record “these six guidelines are recommended. 1) Replace implementation with design and development (page 36), 2) the RPAC GAC will review golf-learning center design and develop plans at a key decision point, 3) to identify the Lake House Environmental Education shelter which we’re now talking about as an education shelter and pavilion at potential locations for cultural and historic interpretation and even possibly with live performance (and that gets to the historical basis), 4) Metro will seek partners when developing interpretive themes and their implementation throughout the park, 5) replace environmental education with educational shelter, and 6) Metro guarantees a development would

only be considered if surface and subsurface water and water quality standards are met.” She felt that number six should stay in the document and that Metro would have no problem meeting that standard.

**Chair Hosticka** said to put that into a motion and that Resolution No. 01-3101 be forwarded to the full Council with the recommendation that they pass it. **Councilor Atherton** said that he felt that the resolution addressed all the issues brought up at the meeting during the public testimony except Mr. Buel’s about the shelter/lodging system. He said that the lodging had been drawn up, so it had been considered. He accepted the committee’s recommendation and supported the motion. **Chair Hosticka** asked if the motion was adopted, would they as a council review any specific implementation steps that would be taken to implement the plan. He felt that the Council could not guarantee anything about surface or subsurface water quality. He felt they could take reasonable and responsible steps to make sure that Metro’s actions do not degrade the aquifers. He wanted to be sure that if approve the concept that there would be further review about any implementation to assure the Council and the public that those conditions would be met to the extent possible. **Mr. Ciecko** said that they were happy to commit to the level of involvement that the council would have in the ultimate implementation. He said that it was clear that Council was interested in having an ongoing role in the implementation of the plan if Council did adopt the preferred concept.

**Mr. Buel** asked a question. **Chair Hosticka** summarized the question as – does the concept rule out consideration of lodging facilities? **Mr. Ciecko** said the answer was yes. He said that it had been considered and widespread reaction was negative, and that element was dropped from the preferred concept. He said the local residents felt it was inconsistent with the character of the park. **Chair Hosticka** said that the park was not a passive natural park, and although some folks wanted an amusement park, he felt that some place between these two concepts was what the resolution proposed.

**Councilor McLain** said that we had listened to the advisory committee, had heard testimony from the public, and had read letters to the Council and Committee members on the subject. She felt that the vote was for the overall concept and product. She felt that all items had been addressed except Mr. Buel’s and that could be addressed at the Council level. **Councilor Atherton** felt that Mr. Buel’s comments were important regarding the wind on the gorge, the viability of a lodging facility vs. a golf course. He felt that the bottom line was that there was a plan for the facility, but not a way to pay for the operation of it.

**Chair Hosticka** asked if there was further comment and then called for the role.

**Motion** Councilor McLain moved Resolution No. -01-3087.

**Vote:** The vote was 2 aye/ 0 nay/ 1 abstain, and the motion passed.

### 3. Goal 5 Upland Wildlife Criteria

**Chair Hosticka** asked to have a special meeting next week to discuss this issue as there was another committee waiting to use the chamber.

**4. Councilor Communication**

There was none.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Bardes  
 Council Assistant  
 :kb

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF  
 September 5, 2001

Document Number	Date	Document Description	RES/ORD
090501ne-01	9/5/01	Letter to Chair Hosticka from Rosemary Menard, Water Resources Director, City of Portland concerning Blue Lake Feasibility Study	Resolution No. 01-3101
090501nr-02	None listed	Map of Interlachen Wells, Section 2, east of Blue Lake Road submitted by Jean Ridings	Resolution No. 01-3101
090501nr-03	None listed	Article titled " Blue Lake: Unhappy Hunting Ground written by Joseph Meyers	Resolution No. 01-3101
090501nr-04	7/01-8/01	Variety of letters submitted to Parks Dept concerning Blue Lake Feasibility Study from Doug & Diane Walke, J.L. Rasmussen, Stan Saunders, Andy Cotugno, Linda Williams, Ron Buel	Resolution No. 01-3101
090501nr-05	8/24/01	Letter to Linda Williams, Interlachen PUD from Andy Cotugno concerning Blue Lake Feasibility Study	Resolution No. 01-3101
090501nr-06	8/29/01	Letter to Metro Council & Natural Resources Committee from Roger Vonderhaar, City of Fairview concerning Blue Lake Feasibility Study	Resolution No. 01-3101
090501nr-07	7/30/01	Letter to Andy Cotugno from Linda Williams concerning Interlachen PUD Comments on Blue Lake Feasibility Study	Resolution No. 01-3101
090501nr-08	8/7/01	Minutes of Metro Parks and Greenspaces Advisory Committee	Resolution No. 01-3101
090501nr-09	2/22/01	Memorandum Detailed Risk Analysis of the Columbia South Shore Wellfield Area	Resolution No. 01-3101
090501nr-10	9/7/01	Letter and attachments to Natural Resources Committee concerning Blue Lake Feasibility Committee from Jane Graybill	Resolution No. 01-3101
090501nr-11	June 2001	Blue Lake Regional Park Draft Economic Feasibility Study and Facility Design Concept, Exhibit A	Resolution No. 01-3101