
Coordinated by:

**Smith & Bybee Lakes Wildlife Area
Management Committee**
Patt Opdyke, Chair

Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232
(503) 797-1515

Smith & Bybee Lakes Management Committee Meeting

Tuesday, February 22, 2005

5:30 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.

Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Ave., Room 270
Portland, Oregon 97232

AGENDA

Welcome, introductions	(Opdyke)	5:30 - 5:35 pm
Review/Approve Jan. meeting notes	(Opdyke)	5:35 – 5:40 pm
NRMP review and discussion - Goals and objectives	(Opdyke, Stewart)	5:40 – 6:20 pm
Updates	(All)	6:20 – 6:30 pm

Summary Meeting Notes
Smith & Bybee Lakes Management Committee
February 22, 2005

In attendance:

Troy Clark, Vice Chair *	Portland Audubon Society
Pam Arden	40-Mile Loop Land Trust
Larry Devroy *	Port of Portland
Brenda Hanke *	St. Johns Neighborhood Assn
Nancy Hendrickson *	Portland Bureau of Environmental Services
Jim Morgan *	Metro
Jim Sjulín *	Portland Bureau of Parks
Dale Svart *	Friends of Smith & Bybee Lakes
Bill Egan	Oregon Bass & Panfish Club
Dan Kromer	Metro Parks – Willamette District Manager
Elaine Stewart	Metro Parks – Natural Resource Scientist
Pat Sullivan	Metro RP&G

* denotes voting SBLMC member

In Patt Opdyke's absence, Vice Chair Troy Clark presided over the meeting.

Consideration of January 25, 2005 meeting notes

Under "Additional comments" on page 4 of the notes, Bill Egan's comment was clarified to read that he "suggested the Metro staff recommend to the Oregon State Marine Board that motorized craft, limited to electric power only, be allowed in the North Slough from the junction with the Columbia Slough." A motion was made, seconded and approved by unanimous vote that the January 25, 2005 meeting notes be accepted as revised.

Natural Resources Management Plan for Smith & Bybee Lakes review and discussion

Goals and objectives, pages 9 and 10

The review process began with the question being asked of the committee if the Goal Statement and the Objectives, as stated in the Management Plan, still give the best direction for managing the wildlife area. Troy Clark explained that this work is in preparation for any potential change or update of the management plan. It is merely laying groundwork at this point. The committee has to begin considering whether or not the NRMP needs to be updated as the review progresses. If so, it will start pulling together the pieces that it thinks are obsolete or out-of-date.

A discussion followed as to the best approach for committee members to review the material on an individual basis in the interim between the February and March meetings. One suggestion was to flag areas of concern, but not to take the time to devise a recommended language revision. The concerns may involve a simple language change, bringing it up to date or changing it because objectives described have already been accomplished.

Another suggestion considered was rather than having a "group edit" by the entire committee, perhaps have one committee member, a staff member or a small group go through the document to do the editing and then allow the committee to respond to those changes.

However, Jim Morgan added, the Goal Statement and Objectives portion of the plan is probably the one part that is succinct and important enough that the full group can focus on what the important objectives are, and if they need to change. Troy suggested going through the objectives as they're written and consider whether they're pertinent, whether they've been accomplished and whether they should continue to exist as they are written.

Maps of the management area included in the NRMP were surveyed. It was noted, particularly for members new to the committee, that the management area includes the south bank of the Columbia Slough and the north bank of the Columbia Slough to the Kelley Point Bridge.

Another suggestion was that as the NRMP is being reviewed, the management area boundaries might also be re-examined. If there are areas that perhaps should be inside the management area that currently are not, that could be an issue to flag. Areas that may fall into such a category include:

- Wapato Wetlands – very important to get under some kind of management plan
- the fill removal area - the Port removed fill around Leadbetter Peninsula, taking it back down to native soil. Should this be flagged as area that could potentially be in the management area?

Also there may be areas that are included within the boundaries of the NRMP that owners may want to have reconsidered:

- Bill Briggs, of Merit Oil, has expressed an interest in removing from the management area a Port/Burlington Northern mitigation site on the north of Old Marine Drive.

The Goal Statement was read. There was recognition that the Management Area could not be returned to its original natural condition, it could only be managed for functional values that would mimic, as much as possible, the original conditions. The following points were noted:

- Recreational uses clearly take a “back seat” to environmental protection.
- There will be less intensive use of Bybee Lake on the west.
- Smith Lake to the east will be more accessible and used more heavily.

Comments:

Bill Egan stated that the Oregon Bass & Panfish Club considers the fishing better in Bybee Lake and that it is the only area that contains enough water to hold the fish. Probably 50% of the people that fish there, in his opinion, go into the dam area to do so.

Bill added that he can arrange for stocking catfish and other non-native panfish in some of the ponds for the public to be able to fish from, but he's not going to put the effort into doing so if the areas are going to be subsequently closed off or shut down to fishing. He currently stocks three or four bodies of water in the Portland Metro area every year.

Jim Sjulín asked if there is still a reason to specify any relative difference in terms of access between Smith Lake and Bybee Lake. The goal statement says that Bybee Lake is less accessible and given what is known now about resources at both lakes, is that still worth stating as a goal?

Jim Morgan would like to see no preference given in the mission statement; that's something that needs to be decided as more is learned about the use of the system.

Troy would like to suggest language that creates a balance point between recreation and environment/habitat protection and that there would be a reference to preserving some habitat areas and not have the whole wildlife area accessible.

There was some agreement among committee members that the second and third from the last sentences of the goal statement "Smith Lake and adjacent uplands . . ." and "Bybee Lake will be less accessible" be deleted from the statement.

Brenda Hanke expressed concern for the last sentence of the goal statement and the reference to "environmental preserve" thinking of that phrase in terms of "absolutely no human contact at all." This was thought to be an exaggerated definition.

From Jim Sjulín's historical perspective, he will be happy to give his insight into the general intent of the original goal statement and objectives of 15 years ago to help move the process along as much as possible. He offered to answer anyone's questions in the interim period before the March meeting.

HOMEWORK for the next meeting:

Committee members were asked to review the objectives in the management plan (pages 9 and 10), and come prepared with any changes they feel should be made. Perhaps more importantly, they were asked to consider whether there are any additional objectives that should be included in the NRMP or is the existing list complete?

Next meeting

It was decided to move the March meeting to the 29th rather than the 22nd as scheduled to avoid conflict with some schools' Spring Break.

Updates

Dan Kromer did a walk-through with the contractor last Thursday on the new Smith & Bybee facilities. The only segment not yet approved is the shelter, having some issues still to be worked out.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 pm.