Smith and Bybee Wetlands Natural Area Management Committee



Dave Helzer, Chair

600 NE Grand Ave. Portland, OR 97232-2736

Smith and Bybee Wetlands Management Committee Meeting

5:30 p.m. - 7:30 p.m., Tuesday, April 26th, 2011 Metro Regional Center, 600 N E Grand Ave., Room 270 Portland, Oregon 97232

AGENDA

Welcome and introductions	(Dave Helzer)	5:30 – 5:35 pm
Approve March meeting summary	(Dave Helzer)	5:35 – 5:40 pm
Continue Comprehensive Natural Resources Plan – Recreation and Monitoring	(Janet Bebb)	5:40 – 7:20 pm
General Updates		7:20 – 7:30 pm
Adjourn		7:30 pm



Smith and Bybee Wetlands Management Committee April 26, 2011

In Attendance:

Dave Helzer *	BES, Chair
Troy Clark *	Audubon, Vice Chair
Larry Devroy *	Port of Portland
Patt Opdyke*	N. Portland Neighborhoods
Dale Svart*	Friends of Smith & Bybee Lakes
Pam Arden*	40 Mile Loop Trust
Sara Henderson*	St. Johns Neighborhood Association
Eric Tonsager*	Oregon Bass and Panfish Club
Dan Moeller	Metro Sustainability Center
Paul Vandenberg	Metro Parks & Environmental Services
Phyllis Cole	Metro Parks & Environmental Services
Janet Bebb	Metro Sustainability Center
Jonathan Soll	Metro Sustainability Center
Francie Royce	North Portland Greenway Trail
Elaine Stewart	Metro Sustainability Center
Jane VanDyke	Columbia Slough Watershed Council

* Denotes voting SBWMC member

The meeting was called to order at 5:40 p.m., and introductions were made. Francie Royce of the North Portland Greenway Trail group invited the Committee to attend a preview of the North Portland Trail Greenway alignment on May 12th at the Daimler Trucks North America Corp. Conference Center (4555 N Channel Avenue, Swan Island, from 6:30 – 8:00 p.m. Staff from the City of Portland and North Portland Neighborhood Services will be on hand to present the project scope of work and timeline. There will also be an update on Going to the River and Waud Bluff Trails.

Approve March Summary Notes

There was a motion by Patt Opdyke to accept the March 22, 2011 meeting summary notes and the motion was seconded by Sara Henderson. The motion passed without amendment.

Continue Comprehensive Natural Resources Plan – Recreation and Monitoring

Janet Bebb began the discussion, which will cover two of the final topics before the draft resources plan is complete: Monitoring and Recreation. The final topic, invasive species management, will be covered at the May meeting.

Monitoring

Elaine Stewarts's Monitoring Proposal Draft (attached) was passed out to attendees, and the document was gone through, line item by line item.

Edge effect – Troy asked how the edge was defined. Elaine said a hard edge, where plants move to completely different types. An example is the edge between forest and grassland. Gentler transitions such as riparian forest to shrub habitat do not have as much edge effect.

Metro | Meeting Summary

Dave asked about target metrics. Elaine reminded the committee that David Evans and Associates presented a table of conservation targets and their associated KEAs (key ecological attributes) and indicators at a committee meeting in late 2010. Each target's current condition relative to its desired future condition is based on scientific judgment.

Retention of plant diversity and reducing breaks in the canopy are of primary importance in the riparian forest conservation target.

Dave asked about measurement criteria of mud flats. Elaine replied that they won't be directly measured but they are simple to track as they are exposed during drawdown each summer.

Salmon passage over fish ladder is monitored closely by Metro Natural Resources Technician Rick Scrivens.

Troy asked if the prairie at Ramsey could be included. Elaine mentioned that it had been under discussion at a previous committee meeting but could not recall details. Larry said it was a mix, and more of a meadow, and Troy added that it is the largest stretch of prairie around. Janet said that it is included in the Legend.

Dave verified the boundaries of Ramsey, City of Portland and Port holdings. Elaine commented that conservation targets overlap multiple ownerships at the natural area and asked if the Committee should look at this further; would the City and Port want to monitor in the same way? Larry D. said he would take this back to the Port. It was asked if this issue could be managed by an IGA. Dave said it was an interesting question for BES, and that coordination of management and monitoring to the extent possible is highly advisable since the City can't hold Metro responsible if the City is not doing its part.

The Streaked Horned Lark was discussed. Elaine suggested using the established protocol used by The Nature Conservancy and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, as they have been monitoring larks for years and this will enable comparisons.

Western painted turtles: a tickler system for visual surveys was suggested. Troy said he'd seen a lot of turtles at Ramsey. Larry pointed out that the presence of the railroad causes great disturbance to the turtles.

Pam Arden asked about the physical process of monitoring. Elaine explained that many of the monitoring activities are quantitative (formal measurements follow a protocol and are recorded on data sheets), while others are informal field notes taken on walk through monitoring visits.

Sara Henderson asked if the list was complete. Elaine answered that this is a draft protocol, and she asked the Committee's feedback on levels indicated for breadth and intensity of monitoring. Sara brought up invasive plant monitoring, and whether this should increase with climate change. Elaine responded it was part of the new framework to relate monitoring to conservation targets and their KEA's. There is other work that is being done on invasives in addition to this

Metro | Meeting Summary

monitoring plan (emerald ash borer traps were brought up as an example). She told the committee that she will present the invasive species part of the plan at the next meeting.

Patt shared that monies from the Fund could go towards monitoring projects. The last page shows days of staff time required to implement the plan, mostly between May and July.

Patt brought up PSU students; would they be part of this? Elaine said graduate students were involved with monitoring emergent wetlands (part of open water conservation target). Long term interest and commitment is required, which does not always make a good fit with undergraduates and high school students. There could be internship and Capstone project opportunities.

Dan Rosenburg's turtle work was mentioned by Sara Henderson; Elaine is working with him, and of course Susan Barnes is involved as well.

Open water: Troy Clark said that prior to 2000 there was no emergent willow. Elaine said that recent monitoring indicates the loss of willow is almost totally in Smith Lake, below the height of the beaver dam and currently outside Metro's ability to manage the water. Troy said prior to the 2000 drought about 300 acres of riparian habitat was lost. He wants a baseline, and understands that we'll lose some before we gain. Dave said that it starts with the new plan, although aerial photos from the DRC can be used to investigate. Elaine elaborated that there are several things to consider regarding the beaver dam and Smith Lake. Recent monitoring indicates that Columbia sedge is increasing in Smith Lake and the monitoring data need further examination before deciding whether to alter the beavers' work. It could be done with a deceiver that would give Metro control over drawdown but allow the beavers to remain. Jonathan asked if the number of acres of shrub habitat set in report is acceptable; will amount in plan get us there? If not, the discussion as to management goal should be reopened and examined to provide context for a decision about the beaver dam. Troy asked that the numbers be looked at. Elaine will bring them to the next meeting. Patt said that we need to look at tradeoffs; there are lots of bits and pieces since nature is constantly changing. Elaine said that the goals in the plan are the amount of increase we want to see over 10 years, since that is the plan duration.

Janet asked that people think about these points.

Recreation: Access by People over Next 10 years

Janet reminded the Committee that anticipation of particular actions is articulated in the agreement.

Janet stressed the importance of being in clear agreement as to which projects are undertaken. To get a sense of where the members of the Committee stand, she asked that members prioritize what they see as most important, using dots on a board she brought to the meeting.

She discussed responses to survey, to which 30 citizens responded. She handed out data on some responses.



Capital Projects

Landfill trail and bridge, biggest single change Improving portage from North Slough to Bybee – this would likely increase canoe traffic Bird blinds renovation-2nd story is possible on both Interlakes Trail extension – different degrees of improvement discussed Signage upgrade @ visitor's area, canoe launch and distances to Interlakes Seating for tired walkers Future trail extension around lakes

Programs

Environmental education General public boat trails

Programmatic points – environmental education via school and general public tours Janet passed out a listing of Smith Bybee Lakes Wildlife Area Educational Programs; the ¹/₂ naturalist who does these programs is paid out of the Fund.

James Davis shared via Janet that school programs are at capacity. BES currently supports the bus transportation for these at 250 - 400 per trip. This is not a given; if BES pulls funding would the Committee consider funding it, through the Fund or grants?

As trail at landfill is built people become more interested in classes. James says there is no staff time for this; there is more demand than he can meet. In his opinion there is enough need to keep another ½ naturalist busy. The opinion of the Committee was asked on this point.

Metro leads these trips, but a commercial group brings in boats, is 3 times a year enough? Dale Svart noted concern that commercial outfits would be profiting from Smith Bybee.

Patt asked if these programs would potentially impact the area, and thus increase other impacts that need to be mitigated/approached. Janet assured her they would.

Do we want to encourage more people to see the area from the water? Pam brought up the water trail concept that had been discussed at a previous meeting.

Eric reminded the Committee of the intention to keep Smith as more of a boating lake, and Bybee with less access and as natural as possible, keeping impact from people to a minimum.

The Watershed Council also runs groups there, with permission from Metro.

James serves ~3000 people per year. Do we want this number to stay where it is, or to increase? With greater public traffic there will be a definite impact on system; how much impact do we want?

Paul said high school and PCC students are already accessing SJLF with James, looking at the lake from the water control structure. Sometimes SJLF staff joins in to provide landfill history and perspective.

There was a suggestion that the Bybee Blind provide a more open view of the lake.

General Updates

Troy asked to bring up an issue that he has been waiting to talk about for several meetings: a purple martin nesting project. He asked for a buy in, and the Committee agreed to talk about it at a future meeting.

Carrie Butler will be accompanying Larry Devroy to the next meeting as part of the transition process.



Troy brought up the question about a management cost to the Fund that was addressed last meeting, Jonathan said that this cost did not exist.

Janet reported that a full draft will be coming out electronically.

She reported that the new document type passed, and will be available next year. Comment on invasives can be sent to Elaine or Janet prior to the meeting. Dale asked if herbicides would be part of discussion, and Dan answered that it would be. The meeting was adjourned at 7:44.

Next meeting May 24, 2011 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. Room 270, Metro Regional Center

pac Attachments