



Capital Grants Review Committee, November 19, 2009

**Team members in attendance:** Todd Alsbury, Carl Hosticka, Helena Huang, Robert Liberty, Curt Zonick, Sue Marshall, Mike Faha, Jeri Williams  
 Heather Kent, Mary Rose Navarro, Kathleen Brennan-Hunter, Kristin Blyler

**Team member excused:**

Topic	Discussion	Follow-Up Needed	Responsible	Due Date
<b>Announcements</b>	Oversight Committee meeting will be held Dec. 8 <sup>th</sup> at 7:30 AM. Performance measures are still being drafted, but the hope is to have a draft for the Oversight committee meeting.	Review Committee members are encouraged to attend the Oversight committee meeting on Dec 8th.	Brennan-Hunter Kent Navarro	Prior to Dec. 8
<b>Announcements</b>	The new criteria will be applied to this review and be reflected upon after the meeting.  The group agreed that the use of "Habitats of Concern" verbiage should be clarified as to if it is referencing habitats that were specifically mapped as opposed to listed species. Mary Rose suggested using the website tool and also referencing the Oregon Conservation Strategy	Continued review of strategy	All  Navarro	Post review cycle

Topic	Discussion	Follow-Up Needed	Responsible	Due Date
<p><b>Baltimore Woods</b></p> <p><b>Requester : Three Rivers Land Conservancy</b></p>	<p>The committee agreed that site visit would help determine significance of properties.</p> <p>The committee requested equity data on the area.</p> <p><b>Noted Strengths</b>            Scenic , provides nice view of river            Bringing the land into public ownership would allow work on invasive problem            Timing is good for purchasing properties if there is a commitment to develop greenway            Migratory bird corridor            Class A habitat - If development occurred Oaks would be allowed to be taken down</p> <p><b>Noted Weaknesses</b>            Connectivity is not fully demonstrated by application            Struggles with match</p>	<p>Data collection on neighborhood income level including school lunch programs.</p> <p><b>Questions for site visit</b>            Can the ROW be vacated, if so can this be used as match?            What is cities commitment to corridor?            What are the plans for preserving other sites in regards to connectivity?            Could BES commit money up front for invasive removal to be used as match?            Is \$400/acre considered reasonable?</p>	<p>Navarro</p> <p>Committee</p>	<p>Dec 7</p> <p>Dec 7</p>
<p><b>Summer Creek</b></p> <p><b>Requester: City of Portland</b></p>	<p>It was noted that the area did not fit regional goal even though it was in a target area.</p> <p>The committee agreed the property would be a great asset to the city</p> <p>It was noted that the appraisal provided was an update as of Aug. 2009. OWEB will be completing an appraisal review and will share it with the grant committee</p>	<p>Data collection on neighborhood income level including school lunch programs.</p> <p><b>Questions for site visit</b>            What is the plan for funding match including the future of the bond? Is there a backup plan?            Is there a way to do incremental acquisition?            Can they add any assurance that restoration will be done?            What is the future of the ball field?            What is the cities vision of the site in the future?</p>	<p>Navarro</p> <p>Committee</p>	<p>Dec 11</p> <p>Dec 11</p>

Topic	Discussion	Follow-Up Needed	Responsible	Due Date
	<p>It was noted that Geoff Roach of Trust for Public Land stated that they would go back to the school district to see if there was any interest.</p> <p>The committee was informed that according to Bob at TPL the city is going forward May or next Nov. with a bond measure.</p> <p>The committee members stated that there would be value in adding restoration to scope of work despite the complications it may present to grant administration.</p> <p>The committee expressed concern over plans of the ball field</p> <p>The committee requested more data on equity including school lunch program</p>	<p>Are there any terms of the agreement that may impact the site after close of escrow?</p>		
<p><b>Stella Olsen Park &amp; Cedar Creek</b></p> <p><b>Requester: City of Sherwood</b></p>	<p>It was noted that the application did not provide a good sense of context</p> <p>The committee had concerns with the trail. It was noted that the trail would go through the floodplain and could be seasonally flooded. Additionally from an ecological standpoint it ran the risk of impacting natural resources.</p> <p>It was noted that the path leading to Cedar Creek is included but not the trail connecting it to Stella Olsen Park</p> <p>SEPA is on lease</p>	<p>The Cedar Creek feasibility study should be more examined in regards to floodplain</p> <p><b>Questions for site visit :</b></p> <p>What is the restoration plan for Cedar Creek?</p> <p>What is the existing condition of Cedar Creek Trail and is there already a connection to Stella Olsen?</p> <p>Are there any tools in City Code regarding restoring floodplain?</p> <p>What are the plans for restoration of the site and is there information about the need for restoration in the Cedar Creek Trail Feasibility Study.?</p>	<p>Staff</p> <p>Committee</p>	<p>Dec 11</p> <p>Dec 11</p>

Topic	Discussion	Follow-Up Needed	Responsible	Due Date
	<p>It was noted that most of the total appraised value of the site is in the developable portion that staff does not consider eligible for the grant program. * 40,000 for the rest of acres</p> <p>It was noted that there was no requested funding for plant materials.</p> <p>The committee requested more details if the plans were to use pervious pavers or asphalt</p>	<p>How can Integrating Habitats inform the senior housing development?</p> <p>Who did Olsen Woods?</p> <p>Is it possible to contact SEPA directly?</p> <p>Clarification on pervious pavers and asphalt in budget</p>		
<p><b>Hall Creek</b></p> <p><b>Requester: City of Beaverton</b></p>	<p>The committee stated that it would rather have the \$12,000 in staff time show as match</p> <p>It was noted that property owners would be granting easements but they would also be gaining the benefit.</p> <p>The committee agreed that project appeared to be dealing with drainage problems on private property and noted that should be more of a contribution from private land owners. This contributions could range from direct funding, adding permeable paving, or depaving other portions of the site</p> <p>The committee stated that it would like to see depaving involved in the project.</p> <p>The committee noted the issue of safety and vegetation. It was stated that there is a need for diversity beyond low growing vegetation for habitat and to</p>	<p><b>Questions for site visit:</b></p> <p>Is the location in the City of Beaverton? What is there interest in the project and what are the broader benefits?</p> <p>Should Washington County be involved?</p> <p>Why isn't this covered by SWM funds?</p> <p>Does TRK have a depaving project going on and how could they help the project?</p> <p>Was depaving Carr Subaru or Assistance League explored?</p> <p>Who will be in charge of design and how will decisions regarding design be made?</p> <p>What else can private property owners bring to the table or contribute?</p> <p>How can the issue of only low vegetation be addressed? Discussion of the tradeoffs between safety and vegetation.</p> <p>Discuss engineering approach and habitat benefits</p>	<p>Committee</p>	<p>Dec 10</p>

Topic	Discussion	Follow-Up Needed	Responsible	Due Date
	<p>shade stream. It was also noted that maintenance costs may increase if changes to this were made.</p> <p>The committee stated that they felt more habitat benefits are needed in the project.</p> <p>Todd informed the committee that the project had the potential to decrease the negative impact the large quantity of pollutants flushed into creeks from the first big rain but the site would have to be bigger to provide the infiltration needed.</p> <p><b>Noted Strengths :</b>            Demonstration project is needed            Beaverton core is very paved.</p>			
<p><b>Crystal Springs</b>   <b>Requester: City of Portland</b></p>	<p>The Committee noted that the area probably represents the best opportunity for restoration in an urban area, the watershed is fairly intact from Reed Canyon and some fish passage barriers are proposed to be completed.</p> <p>It was noted that the project had been turned down by OWEB in the past. The committee stated it would like them to resubmit.</p> <p>The question of whether the access element is adding or subtracting to the</p>	<p>The committee requested checking demolitions costs with Metro Staff.</p> <p>The committee requested having figures in mind in the future to better understand reasoning when projects were reviewed.</p> <p><b>Questions for site visit</b>            The committee would like more details regarding access and viewing. Why was access provided and what safety precautions will be in place to ensure the health of the fish?             Will OWEB be approached again? What was there response when the project was previously submitted?</p>	<p>Navarro</p> <p>Navarro</p> <p>Committee</p>	<p>ASAP</p> <p>Dec 7</p>

Topic	Discussion	Follow-Up Needed	Responsible	Due Date
	<p>project was raised.</p> <p><b>Noted strengths:</b>  Monitoring plan  Basin wide approach  Significant species of concern  Compelling chum  Gray to Green commitment</p> <p>It is noted that Mary Rose Navarro and Kathleen Brennan Hunter both live in this area.</p>	<p>The committee would like more detail regarding the budget of streambed substrate and its function in the future?</p>		
<p><b>Trillium Creek</b></p> <p><b>Requestor: City of West Linn</b></p>	<p>It was noted that they will apply to OWEB in April</p> <p>Concern was raised over the status Calaruga Drive culvert.</p> <p>Concern was raised over the geomorphic approach – will it be bank stabilization that doesn't allow for natural movement. It was stated that the approach may not be the best thing for habitat. The committee would like to see a fish biologist working on the project.</p> <p>It was noted that the benefits to fish may be overstated</p> <p>The committee would like more information on the context - overall plans for the sub basin</p> <p>It was suggested that the project include more root wads and anchored</p>	<p><b>Questions for site visit</b></p> <p>Will a fish biologist be included in the project?</p> <p>What are the City's plans for the sub basin?</p> <p>Will additional work occur upstream and downstream?</p> <p>What is the status of the Calaroga Drive culvert?</p> <p>What is the status of the Mary S. Young Volunteers and do they have the capacity to contribute that much volunteer time?</p> <p>What is the City's management plan with State Parks?</p>	<p>Committee</p>	<p>Dec. 11</p>

Topic	Discussion	Follow-Up Needed	Responsible	Due Date
	<p>wood</p> <p>It was noted that volunteer numbers were high and perhaps too impressive</p> <p>It was noted that the project leaders are not wedded to the footpath.</p> <p>It was noted that the cost was reasonable</p>			
<p><b>Buckman Elementary</b></p> <p><b>Requestor: Portland Public Schools</b></p>	<p>The committee appreciated all the community support and letter writing.</p> <p>Concern was raised about the match being realistic to meet.</p> <p>It was noted that the area is nature deficient.</p> <p>Concern was raised regarding the realism about the time needed to establish and having long term success with plantings especially in a schoolyard</p> <p>The committee noted that the project will likely not affect the homeless issue.</p> <p>The committee noted that they may like to fund elements such as bioswale, depaving, planting and tree blvd.</p> <p>Concern was raised about maintenance and follow through.</p> <p>MRN noted that the quality of the application shows capacity of the group.</p>	<p><b>The committee requested a log of “why they had supported past projects and elements of past projects ” for future reference</b></p> <p>What are PPS’s safety requirements for playgrounds and nature based play?</p> <p>How will bids and contracting process be administered</p> <p><b>Questions for site visit</b></p> <p>Could the project be phased?</p> <p>What are the green elements the committee would like to fund?</p> <p>What is the proximity to homeless encampments?</p> <p><b>Budget questions</b></p> <p>Project Management costs –15% should only be applied to the construction costs. Therefore, it should only be \$56,360.</p> <p>How did you determine your maintenance costs?</p> <p>For the engineering line item, what’s the</p>	<p>Navarro</p> <p>Committee</p> <p>Navarro</p>	<p>Dec 7</p> <p>Dec 7</p> <p>Dec 7</p>

Topic	Discussion	Follow-Up Needed	Responsible	Due Date
	<p>It was noted that the benefits were great for students but may not necessarily transfer to the community.</p>	<p>difference between the financial and the in-kind match?</p> <p>We can't fund the "Beyond Buckman" piece or the Garden Coordinator. These expenses can't be capitalized.</p> <p>I would like more information on the Escrow account? What future costs and needs to you anticipate?</p> <p>Is this budget based on prevailing wage?</p> <p>What utilities will have to be rerouted?</p> <p>Are there existing light poles? (I'll look for these at the site visit)</p> <p>How was the budget for lawn repair determined?</p>		
<p><b>Park Avenue Station</b></p> <p><b>Requestor: TriMet</b></p>	<p>It was noted that the funding would need to be in place before they could move forward with the engineering development. Construction is not slated to begin until spring 2011. The committee stated they would like to see restoration work begin prior if possible</p> <p>It was noted that the project was one of the most cost efficient being reviewed.</p> <p>The committee stated it would like to see a more detail maintenance plan for both the parking structure and the restoration area.</p> <p>It was noted that TriMet would capitalize the trees, the committee expressed interest in what that meant to them.</p>	<p><b>Questions for site visit</b></p> <p>What is the in-kind line item for the Trolley trail?</p> <p>How certain is it that the project will begin in Spring 2011 and can the restoration (invasive removal ) phase begin earlier</p> <p>Provide more detail on Maintenance plan for both the parking structure and the restoration work. Who will do restoration? Have they researched the longevity of a living wall?</p> <p>Is the station location final</p> <p>What does capitalizing the trees mean to TriMet.</p>	<p>Committee</p>	<p>Dec 11</p>



Topic	Discussion	Follow-Up Needed	Responsible	Due Date
	<p>The committee raised the question if the location of the station was final. If it continues south what does that do to the plan?</p> <p><b>Noted Strengths:</b>            Good demonstration project for other tri-met stations.            This project came out of community interest            Costs are very reasonable            Best opportunity to use Integrating Habitats            Visibility – connection to the Trolley Trail and # of people every day.</p>			
<b>NEXT MEETING:</b>				