

BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE  
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING IN ) RESOLUTION NO. 92-1679  
CONCEPT THE CITY OF PORTLAND'S )  
MASTER PLAN FOR THE SPRINGWATER ) Introduced by Rena Cusma,  
CORRIDOR ) Executive Officer

WHEREAS, The City of Portland has been planning for the 40-Mile Loop, of which the Springwater Corridor is an integral 16.5 mile segment, around its boundaries since 1903; and

WHEREAS, The City of Portland's "Park Futures: A Master Plan for Portland's Park System" recommends the development of a trails system that will encircle the city and interconnect parks, open space, natural areas, bike paths, recreational facilities, and other public attractions; and

WHEREAS, The 40-Mile Loop and Springwater Corridor segment of the loop are trail priorities in the city's "Park Futures" and Metro's Greenspaces Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, The City of Portland is working cooperatively with Metro, City of Gresham, City of Milwaukie, Multnomah County, Clackamas County, North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, Oregon Department of Transportation, Friends of Springwater Corridor, 40-Mile Loop Land Trust, neighborhood groups, adjacent property owners, residents of the corridor, and citizens in the corridor to plan for and implement the master plan for the Springwater Corridor; and

WHEREAS, Metro is represented on the Springwater Corridor Agency Steering Committee which developed the master plan; and

WHEREAS, City of Portland parks planners are represented on Metro's Greenspaces technical advisory committee, and Metro's regional trails working group; and

WHEREAS, The Springwater Corridor project has been coordinated with Metro's Greenspaces Master Plan and its regional trails and greenways component; and

WHEREAS, The Springwater Corridor is listed and mapped in the Greenspaces Master Plan as a priority trails project; and

WHEREAS, The goals and objectives of the Springwater Corridor Master Plan are consistent and complementary with those of the Greenspaces Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, Metro has awarded a Greenspaces Restoration/Enhancement Grant to the City of Portland to restore a degraded natural area in the corridor at Leach Botanical Gardens along Johnson Creek; and

WHEREAS, The Metro Council and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) have made a recommendation to the Oregon Transportation Commission that it allocate \$3,000,000 in federal highway enhancement funds Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) to the Springwater Corridor; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

1. That the Council of the Metropolitan Service District endorses in concept the City of Portland's Master Plan for the Springwater Corridor which is detailed in Exhibit A hereto.

2. That the Metro Greenspaces staff continue to work cooperatively with the city of Portland staff and other agencies, neighborhood groups, property owners, and citizens in implementing the goals and objectives of the Springwater Corridor Master Plan.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District  
this 22nd day of October, 1992.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jim Gardner, Presiding Officer

## STAFF REPORT

### FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING IN CONCEPT THE CITY OF PORTLAND'S MASTER PLAN FOR THE SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR

Date: October 13, 1992

Presented By: Mel Huie, Planning Dept.

#### FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The Springwater Corridor, an abandoned railroad line, owned by the city of Portland will be developed into a trail for walking, biking and horseback riding. It also has importance as a wildlife corridor. For the most part, it is separated from streets and neighborhood residential areas. It stretches 16.5 miles from S.E. McLoughlin Blvd. to Boring. The corridor occupies 190.8 acres of land. The corridor forms the southern perimeter of the 40-Mile Loop (which is now about 140 miles). The corridor lies within the Urban Growth Boundary for most of its length, with the exception of a small pocket near Jenne Road, and then leaves the boundary at Hogan Road. U.S. Census figures show that 88,797 people live in the twenty census tracts within the corridor. These people live in 41,889 housing units.

The Springwater Corridor acts as a hub for many recreational sites and facilities within a half-mile to a one mile distance from it. Located within one-half mile distance of the corridor are 38 parks and facilities. Johnson Creek runs along a great length of the corridor. The goals for the Johnson Creek riparian zone include improving water quality, restoring its habitat as a fishery, minimizing flooding, preserving natural areas, and providing recreational opportunities.

The concept and planning for the 40-Mile Loop dates back to 1903. The Olmsted Brothers' Master Plan for the city of Portland Parks Board envisioned an interconnected system of parks and natural areas of which the 40-Mile Loop would be the main trail. Passenger train, and freight lines have used the Springwater Corridor since the turn of the century. The Springwater Division Line, an interurban electric railway, carried passengers and freight from Portland to Estacada from 1903 to 1958. Limited freight service was maintained until 1990. The city of Portland received the deed to the corridor's right-of-way in February 1990. The Oregon Department of Transportation purchased the ROW for \$1.5 million from the railroad company and conveyed the deed to the city of Portland.

"Park Futures: A Master Plan for the Portland's Park System" recommends the development of a trails system that will encircle the city and interconnect parks, open space, natural areas, bike paths, recreational facilities and other public attractions. The 40-Mile Loop and its Springwater Corridor segment are trail priorities.

The cost for development of the corridor is estimated at \$6,703,744. Costs include construction costs, trail head site acquisition and development, trestle repairs, pathway construction, equestrian trail development, signage, plants, street crossings, lighting, and construction of restrooms at trail heads. Management and operation of the corridor will be carried out primarily by the cities of Portland and Gresham. If Metro provides funding for the project via future revenues from the Greenspaces Bond Measure (if it is passed), it will work with these two cities in developing the various management plans

for natural areas in the corridor, and trail development standards.

Planning for the corridor has been extensive and include many local governments, Metro, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, Friends of the Springwater Corridor, 40-Mile Loop Land Trust, neighborhood groups, adjacent property owners, and citizens. Public meetings, workshops and media events have been conducted. Two public surveys were conducted in 1991. An actual door to door survey of all residences within 500 feet of the corridor was conducted to gain public input into the master plan. Metro Greenspaces staff have been involved in the planning process and sit on the Springwater Corridor Agency Steering Committee.

The Springwater Corridor project has been coordinated with Metro's Greenspaces Master Plan and its regional trails and greenways component. City planners are represented on the Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee. The Springwater Corridor is listed and mapped in the Greenspaces Master Plan as a priority project. The corridor is an integral part of the regional trails system. Metro has awarded a Greenspaces Restoration/Enhancement Grant (\$11,500) in the corridor to improve a degraded natural area at Leach Botanical Gardens and to improve water quality in Johnson Creek. The Metro Council, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) have recommended that the Oregon Transportation Commission allocate federal highway enhancement funds (Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act -ISTEA funding of \$3,000,000) for the development of the corridor.

#### EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends approval of Resolution No. 92-1679.

TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 92-1679, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING IN CONCEPT THE CITY OF PORTLAND'S MASTER PLAN FOR THE SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR

-----  
Date: October 15, 1992

Presented by: Councilor Buchanan

Committee Recommendation: At the October 13 meeting, the Transportation and Planning Committee voted unanimously to recommend Council adoption of Resolution No. 92-1679. Voting in favor: Councilors Devlin, McLain, Buchanan, Moore, and Washington.

Committee Issues/Discussion: Mel Huie, Senior Regional Planner, presented the staff report with the assistance of Mary Anne Cassin, the Springwater Corridor Project Manager for the City of Portland. Mr. Huie explained that the Springwater Corridor Project has been well coordinated with the Metropolitan Greenspaces Program, of which the Springwater Corridor is a major trail segment. In the past, Metro has supported funding for the Springwater Corridor through the Highway Enhancement Fund and through the Greenspaces Restoration Grants.

Ms. Cassin explained that the Master Plan being considered is the product of two years' worth of work on the part of all local jurisdictions (e.g. Metro, City of Portland, two counties, Cities of Gresham and Milwaukie) and the Forest Service and State Parks Division. The process has been very noncontroversial, with all parties strongly in favor. Over 77% of those recently polled agreed with the development of the site as a recreation corridor. Nearly 90% of those polled said they would use the site for recreation if it were developed.

The Springwater Corridor Project has been on the City of Portland's agenda for a long time. The project completes the southeast section of the 40 Mile Loop. It also ties into a large section of the original rail corridor, making it possible to travel from downtown Portland to the Mount Hood National Forest. The section extending beyond the City's ownership, to Boring, is owned by Oregon State Parks.

Most of the corridor itself is 100 feet wide. Because it was developed as a rail corridor, there is an existing rail bed that is extremely flat and easy to work with, with a maximum grade of two percent. This will make it easier to make the Corridor "accessible". The main, twelve foot wide, multi-purpose path will separate the soft shoulder and a separate equestrian trail. The original idea was to bring the equestrian trail only to Powell Butte or 122nd Avenue, but there is strong support to complete the trail all the way into the City; this is now within the proposal. The Corridor will also have Trail Heads and an Interpretive Center

at certain locations within the Urban Growth Boundary. In the more rural areas, the improvements will be less visible.

Funding for the project appears very positive. Enhancement funds may be available from the Oregon Department of Transportation. \$3.7 million has been requested. JPACT gave the project a "number one" priority. Receipt of this funding would complete the property acquisition for the project and provide for hard trails from McLoughlin Boulevard through Gresham. The Trail Heads and some of the street intersections may take longer.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

### *Bureau of Parks and Recreation*

Charles Jordan, Director  
Ron Maynard, Operations Manager  
Rich Gunderson, Recreation Manager  
Margie Harris, Financial Officer  
Fontaine Hagedorn, Resource Development Manager

### *Commissioner of Public Affairs*

Mike Lindberg

### *Project Staff*

John Sewell, Parks Planning Supervisor  
Mary Anne Cassin, Project Manager  
George Hudson, Project Manager  
Ed Keudell, Student Intern  
Kathleen Stokes, Student Intern  
Linda Dobson, Asst. to Commissioner Lindberg  
Christy Sutton, Graphics Consultant

### *Citizens Steering Committee*

Walt Amacher, Oregon Road Runners Club  
Carol Anderson, Oregon Road Runners Club  
Linda Bauer, SE Uplift & Johnson Creek Coordinating Committee  
Sheila Cox, Access Oregon  
Mark Hahn, Bicycle Transit Alliance  
Richard Hall, Portland Urban Mountain Pedallers  
Carol Hoeger, Oregon Equestrian Trails  
Steve Johnson, Friends of Johnson Creek & neighboring property owner  
Ray Koistinen, Foster Area Business Association  
Shoshanna Marler, Shared Outdoor Adventure Recreation  
Barbara Walker, 40 Mile Loop Land Trust  
Donna Wolf, Volkssporters

### *Agency Steering Committee*

David Ausherman, METRO  
Pete Bond, Oregon State Parks  
Steve Bricker, Portland Parks Trails Manager  
Evelyn Brown, Portland Bureau of Traffic Management  
Julee Conway, City of Gresham Parks & Recreation Division  
Roger Brown, North Clackamas Park & Recreation District  
Jim Davidson, Mt. Hood National Forest  
Diana Jensen, Clackamas County Parks  
Ed Pickering, Multnomah County  
Don Robertson, City of Milwaukie  
Jim Sjulín, Portland Parks Natural Resources Foreman  
Jeff Smith, Portland Bike Program  
Jim Soli, Bureau of Environmental Services  
Jack Stiverson, U.S. Forest Service

The Springwater Corridor Master Plan could not have been developed without the active participation of Portland's citizens. The Friends of Springwater Corridor have been an enthusiastic and helpful support group.

*Information on the Springwater Corridor can be obtained from:*

*Portland Parks & Recreation  
1120 SW Fifth Ave., Room 1302  
Portland, OR 97204 (503)796-5193*

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

## VISION STATEMENT

*The Springwater Corridor preserves natural surroundings in an area where few natural spaces remain. It creates a refuge from urban bustle and the dangers of automotive traffic by linking city neighborhoods and rural communities with trails designed for walking, bicycling and horseback riding. Meeting community needs for beauty, recreation and safety drive planning and upkeep of the Corridor, and are essential to making it an inviting natural refuge and recreation asset.*

*The Corridor gives direct access to trails along the Willamette River and to a variety of parks in southeast Portland, Boring and Gresham, as well as to a wilderness trails in the Mount Hood National Forest. Ultimately, it will connect to the Pacific Crest Trail.*

*The Springwater Corridor is more than a recreation resource: crossing Johnson Creek nearly a dozen times, it preserves an environment in which wildlife native to Johnson Creek, the last free-flowing stream in urban Portland, can thrive after years of neglect. Residents and visitors can better appreciate the heritage of nearby communities by enjoying historical markers along the Corridor telling stories of the railroad, European settlers, and indigenous people who once depended on the land and Johnson Creek as a waterway and source of life.*

*The Springwater Corridor invites residents and visitors of all ages to meet, play, contemplate nature and learn more about the city we live in.*

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

Vision Statement

### Chapter 1: Introduction

- A. Purpose of document
- B. The 40 Mile Loop & the Springwater Corridor
- C. Governing jurisdictions
- D. Existing plan documents

### Chapter 2: Location & Setting

- A. Geographic summary
- B. Historic summary
- C. Socio-economic summary

### Chapter 3: Citizen Involvement

- A. Advisory committees
- B. Public process
- C. Continuing public involvement

### Chapter 4: The Plan

- A. Goals
- B. Plan illustrative
- C. Description of major plan features
  - Design theme
  - Trails: multi-use, equestrian
  - Trailheads and facilities
  - Interpretive center and theme
  - Signage
  - Johnson Creek access
  - Fish and wildlife
  - Vegetation

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

Bridges

Intersections: major, minor, private drives

Site furniture

Public outreach

## D. Implementation

Development priorities

Funding strategies

Relationship to other jurisdictions

Cost estimate

## Chapter 5: Management

### A. Property management

Crossings

Acquisition, trades, purchase, tax delinquent

Encroachments

Utilities / shared usage

Rules and enforcement

### B. Property maintenance

Purpose / public perception

Vegetation

Trails

Litter

Signage

Trestles

Fencing

Trailheads

Public involvement

Maintenance / Operations implications

## Chapter 6: Evaluation

A. User satisfaction

B. Modifications

C. Environmental impacts / construction & post-construction

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

## Appendices

- A. Gresham's Springwater Corridor Master Plan
- B. Listing of Adjacent Parks
- C. Adjacent Property Owner Survey Results
- D. Public Meeting Summary, October 1991
- E. Public Meeting Summary, June 1992
- F. Master Plan Adoption Dates
- G. Engineer's Report on Wooden Trestles
- H. Portland Plant List

## List of Figures and Tables

- Figure 1. Location map of the Corridor
- Figure 2. Map of the Corridor
- Figure 3. Wetland locations
- Figure 4. Trail section diagrams
- Figure 5. Trailhead diagram
- Figure 6. Map of interpretive areas
- Figure 7. Signage type diagram

- Table 1. Demographic...

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

The Springwater Corridor extends from SE McLoughlin Boulevard to the community of Boring; it was developed in 1903 for rail service. The corridor was also known as the Portland Traction Company line, the Cazadero line, and the Bellrose line. It was acquired by the City of Portland Park Bureau in February, 1990 as part of the 40 Mile Loop. The corridor is part of a much longer rail system that extended beyond McLoughlin and Boring: on the west side of McLoughlin it paralleled the Willamette River into downtown Portland (this section is currently an operating short line freight operation known as the East Portland Traction Company) and on the south side of Boring it continued to Estacada (this section was abandoned 60 years ago and is currently held by the State of Oregon).

[location map of the Corridor]

Master planning for the Corridor began in 1991. The project was accomplished through the Park Bureau's Planning Section, with the active involvement of citizens, other agencies, Commissioner Lindberg's office, the Johnson Creek Corridor Committee, and the Operations Division of the Park Bureau.

#### A. Purposes of the document

This document is intended to:

- Guide the design and development of the Springwater Corridor into a premier recreation corridor;
- Establish policies that relate to managing property within the Corridor and maintaining its condition;
- Record the history of the Corridor to date;

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

- Document the plan process and establish a mechanism to review the plan and its implementation;

## B. The 40 Mile Loop & the Springwater Corridor

The 40 Mile Loop is a concept which dates back to 1903, when a group of Portland boosters hired the renowned landscape architectural firm of the Olmsted Brothers to develop a master plan for parks and boulevards in the city. The resulting Olmsted Plan formalized the city's early commitment to the development of parks and open spaces into a meaningful park system.

During the last 90 years, the Olmsted Plan has served both as a continuing inspiration and as the source of the park legacy we enjoy today. Laurelhurst, Mt. Tabor, and Sellwood Parks, to name a few, were part of the Olmsted Plan. A key organizing element of that plan was the notion that the links between parks were just as important as the parks themselves in the life of the city. One of the primary linkages was a trail ringing the boundaries of the city. At that time, this was a distance of approximately 40 miles, hence the name, 40 Mile Loop. Today the 40 Mile Loop is more than 140 miles long.

Development of the Loop stalled for many years. Bits and pieces were added, but the concept was never fully embraced. It wasn't until the late 1970's that the idea surfaced in force. At that time, the State Parks Division of the Oregon Department of Transportation convened a group of interested citizens, organizations, and local governments to see if the Loop could begin to meet existing and emerging recreation needs in the urban area.

Out of that assembly came the 40 Mile Loop Land Trust, a private, non-profit group organized specifically to guide the project toward completion and to function as a land trust for the purposes of assembling necessary land and/or easements. Its first action was to develop a master plan for the Loop. The product of that effort was a system that wrapped around the urbanized portions of Multnomah County, taking advantage of scenic corridors and waterways.

By 1985, the Land Trust had laid the groundwork for the passage of a resolution by two of the major jurisdictions involved in the Loop, Portland and Multnomah County, calling for the implementation of the master plan by 1995. Even though the Loop is 100 miles longer than originally designed, the region has actually made substantial progress toward its development, with the Marine Drive Trail, the Wildwood Trail, Marquam Nature Park, and the Willamette Greenway being the most complete sections of the Loop.

With the addition of the property along the Springwater Corridor, the last major gap in the Loop was closed. The 16.5 mile-long Springwater Corridor will connect the southeast quadrant of the metropolitan area, paralleling Johnson Creek and extending the Loop from the Sellwood area through Gresham to Troutdale and Boring.

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

[map]

For many years, this part of the Loop has been the most challenging to complete. Until recently, the railroad was still operating. Johnson Creek was designated by Portland's Comprehensive Plan as the location for the 40 Mile Loop, but it is almost entirely privately owned and developed with residential uses close to the creek.

The Springwater Line is ideal for providing a southeast connection. For the most part, it is well-separated from both road right-of-way and neighboring residential areas. The route it travels is a scenic one, encompassing wetlands and buttes, agricultural fields and pastures, residential and industrial neighborhoods. It runs close to Johnson Creek, one of the last free flowing creeks in the urban area, crossing it ten times in the course of its flow to the Willamette River. The parks and open spaces it passes next or near to include Oaks Bottom, Oaks Amusement Park, Sellwood Riverfront Park, Johnson Creek Park, Tideman Johnson Park, Beggar's Tick Marsh, the I-205 bike path, Leach Botanical Garden, Bundy Park, Powell Butte Park, and Gresham Main City Park.

The smooth, even grade required for the passage of trains will be ideally suited to hiking and biking long distances. In addition, the grade will be easy for the elderly, disabled, and stroller-pushing users. The right-of-way can accommodate a variety of uses, since it varies in width from 60' to 200'; most of it is 100' wide.

In addition, ownership of the 10.8 mile-long section south of Boring to Estacada is currently held by the State. This section of the Springwater Line was abandoned 60 years ago and acquired by the Oregon Department of Transportation 20 years ago. The Springwater Corridor not only serves the needs of the 40 Mile Loop, but also offers the real possibility of a trail connection from the Pacific Crest Trail through the Mt. Hood National Forest, directly to downtown Portland. The section south of Boring is discussed for context purposes but is beyond the scope of this document.

## C. Governing Jurisdictions

The City of Portland owns the Springwater Corridor, even sections that lie outside of city limits. This arrangement was devised because of conditions applied during property acquisition; the rail line is protected from reversionary property interests because of an "interim trails use" clause applied during the rail abandonment process. This process was facilitated by having a single agency be the receiving party.

Many other jurisdictions, however, have played an active role in securing the property and will sponsor implementation of the plan. This section will describe the relationship between the jurisdictions and the role they play in managing the property.

## SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

The State of Oregon through its Parks and Recreation Department expects to use the Springwater Corridor as a model for an urban rail-trail conversion. The model includes the planning, design and development process for other possible rail-trail conversions in urban and suburban settings in Oregon.

In addition, as the Boring to Estacada section of the Springwater Corridor is under state ownership, the state will play a lead role in the development of that section. This will not occur until the Springwater Corridor is fully developed into Boring, and adjacent property owners south of Boring view recreational development of the Corridor as a positive change.

The U.S. Forest Service - Pacific Northwest Region has a goal of actively cooperating and working with Portland and other local communities to develop links between urban trails and transportation systems and National Forest trails and transportation systems. The Mt. Hood National Forest plans to develop a physical link between the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail and the Springwater Corridor trail via a planned trail along the Clackamas River. Planning and design for this linkage trail have started, with construction of the trail scheduled to begin in 1995. An eight mile section of the linkage trail is already in place between Fish Creek, a tributary of the Clackamas River, and Indian Henry Campground. Another five mile section is also in place between Rainbow and Riverside Campground along the Upper Clackamas River above Ripplebrook.

Tying the Clackamas River Forest Service trail with the State-owned Springwater right-of-way at Estacada will require an easement across land managed by Portland General Electric. The Mt. Hood Forest has begun negotiations with PGE, and started design work on this section.

The Mt. Hood National Forest is a mosaic of recreation opportunities scattered over one million acres of forest land draped over the north Oregon Cascade Mountains. Mt. Hood, at 11,235', is the dominant feature of the Forest. There are 1300 miles of trails in the Mt. Hood National Forest. These range from paved and "boardwalk" trails accessible to all users to primitive trails in the 187,000 acres of wilderness suitable to only the most hearty. The Mt. Hood National Forest is also working with the Chinook Trail Association to provide trail ties between the Forest and the Portland metropolitan area and other communities along the Columbia River within the Columbia Gorge Scenic Area.

The Gifford Pinchot Forest is also working with the Chinook Trail Association to provide trail ties between the Forest and the Vancouver urban area and other communities along the Columbia River within the Scenic Area. It is planned to tie the Washington segments of the Chinook Trail system to the Oregon segments, thus providing a link to the Portland metropolitan area.

The City of Gresham manages 4.5 miles of the corridor that passes within Gresham city limits. Gresham was the first jurisdiction to gather funds for implementation through

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

passage of a 1988 Parks Acquisition and Development bond measure. Portland and Gresham have signed an intergovernmental agreement that specifies roles and responsibilities for maintenance and management of the Gresham section. Improvements within Gresham city limits were designed after an extensive master plan process that involved hundreds of citizens. Gresham's Master Plan is included as Appendix A.

The City of Milwaukie has expressed interest in assisting the development of the Springwater Corridor, both inside and outside Milwaukie City limits, as a regional recreation facility. Very little of the Springwater Corridor is actually inside Milwaukie's City limits.

North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District has completed draft plans for neighborhood parks within the district. A portion of the Springwater Corridor runs through the district in the Southgate/Town Center neighborhood. The neighborhood's Parks Advisory Board supported development of that portion of the Corridor in its area.

Clackamas County Planning and Economic Development Division supports planning for development of the Springwater Corridor. Plans for funding, development, operations and maintenance will be developed in coordination with affected county divisions and other jurisdictions.

## Multnomah County

METRO is involved through the Metropolitan Greenspaces Program. In cooperation with local governments, they are engaged in planning a system of trails of regional significance throughout the Metropolitan Region. Using the 40 Mile Loop as a model, the regional system provides a series of continuous trails which encircle the urbanized area of the region. One of the major objectives of the Greenspaces Regional Trail System is to incorporate natural features in the landscape, define alignments along natural corridors, and to take advantage of interpretive and educational opportunities as part of the recreational experience.

The Metropolitan Greenspaces Master Plan identifies the Springwater as one of the premier trails in the region, and one which is high on the priority list for capital improvements. It meets all of the criteria for regional significance and is consistent with all policies defined in the Greenspaces Master Plan. Metro staff is currently in the process of defining first steps in implementation of regional trails and greenways. While the final decision on the priorities will be made by the Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee, cooperation with the City of Portland and Clackamas County on improvement of the urban and rural sections of the Springwater is clearly among the top priorities in the region.

The Trails and Corridors Working Group also determined that there is a need to establish trail standards for various types of uses. Trail standards will assure consistency in

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

development throughout the region and maintain similar construction and management techniques. The urban portion of the Springwater will certainly set the standard for high capacity multi-use recreational trails, and the rural portion could become a model for low impact multiple-use trails developed in a natural area setting.

## D. Existing plan documents

State of Oregon through its Parks and Recreation Department has designated the 40 Mile Loop as an Oregon Recreation Trail. The designation is codified in Oregon Administrative Rule 736-09-010(1). Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 390.950 to 390.990 authorize the department to declare regionally and statewide significant recreation trails as Oregon Recreation Trails. The Department has declared the 40 Mile Loop to be a regionally significant recreation trail.

While the designation brings no protective or financial commitment status by the state, the 40 Mile Loop is in the Oregon Recreation Trails System Plan. Therefore, it would receive priority consideration if and when state trail grants are forthcoming.

The City of Portland includes several policies in its Comprehensive Plan that relate to the 40 Mile Loop, including:

- Policy 6.9, Alternative Urban Travel: Provide support for alternative forms of urban travel such as bicycling and walking.
- Policy 11.15, Pedestrian Improvements: Provide for safe pedestrian movement along all new or reconstructed streets, and encourage provision of additional pedestrian pathways where needed for safe, direct access to schools, parks and other community facilities.
- Policy 11.48, New Parkland: Increase the supply of parkland, giving priority to: areas where serious geographical and service level deficiencies exist, land acquisition necessary to complete the 40 Mile Loop system...

In addition, the Bureau of Parks & Recreation has an adopted parks master plan, titled *Parks Futures*, which includes the following policies that relate to the 40 Mile Loop:

- Policy 1.10: Coordinate and integrate the City's parks and trail system with plans for bikeways, street improvements, and mass transit.
- Policy 8.6: Develop and maintain a citywide trail system that links parks, open spaces, the Willamette Greenway, bikeways, the 40 Mile Loop, other trails, and public attractions.

## SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

In addition, Resolution No. 33937 was adopted by the City of Portland and Multnomah County with the intention to implement the 40 Mile Loop Master Plan by 1995.

The City of Milwaukie includes several policies on its Comprehensive Plan that relate to the 40 Mile Loop including:

- The City will participate with the appropriate agencies in implementing the proposed 40 Mile Loop system, a State Recreational Trail.

Under Milwaukie's Comprehensive Plan's Transportation Element, the Springwater Corridor is specifically referred to under this objective:

- To develop a pedestrian/bikeway system which connects local activity centers such as parks, schools and activity centers.

The following policy supports that objective:

- The City will support the proposed 40 Mile Loop as a means to meet regional needs for pedestrian paths and bikeways.

Under the Recreational Needs Element, the following policy is included:

- The Parks and Recreation Master Plan should address the idea of connecting the riverfront area to the proposed 40 Mile Loop trail system with a southern arm extending to North Clackamas Park.

### Multnomah County

Clackamas County contains policies in its Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 9, Open Space, Parks and Historic Sites, that relate to trails. Under Parks and Recreation, subsection 5.2, *Development Needs*, is stated:

1. An urban trail system for both walking and bicycling, especially in conjunction with the development of neighborhood and community parks. Use should be made of open space linkages along creek and river banks, ridgelines, and existing right-of-ways. Open space dedication at the time of development will be used as a means of completing this trail system (see map IX-1). [Should we include this map as a Figure or as an Appendix? or leave out the reference to it?]

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

## CHAPTER 2

### LOCATION AND SETTING

A summary of the geography, history, and cultural setting of the Springwater Corridor follows.

#### A. Geographic summary

The Springwater Corridor is in the southeast quadrant of the metropolitan area. The Cazadero line was built at the turn of the century in order to get labor and material to the construction site of the Cazadero dam on the Clackamas River south of Estacada. Because the Corridor was established as a rail corridor, the alignment follows the route which would allow the least change in grade, paralleling Johnson Creek. For the most part, it follows the southern edge of the broad flat plain that makes up southeast Portland, skirting the northern edge of the Boring Lava formations (Mt. Scott, Gresham Butte) and then turns south at Gresham toward Boring. The maximum grade of the Corridor is 2%, in some cases achieving its flat grade with the help of deep cuts and high fills, especially at the western end in the Johnson Creek Canyon area.

#### Geology

"The geological story of the Portland basin is mostly one of deposition and erosion, followed by volcanism, subsidence, folding and faulting in that order of decreasing importance (Trimble, 1963). The last devastating events were repeated cataclysmic floods at the end of the Ice Age only 15,000 years ago."<sup>1</sup> A closely spaced cluster of 12 volcanoes near the town of Boring occurred 6 million years ago. They are now known as the Boring lava formations. During the Ice Age over 1-1/2 million years ago, terraces were formed along the Clackamas and Willamette Rivers by a fluctuating sea level. These are the "steps" that one climbs while driving east across the Portland basin. These terraces were covered by gravels and sands washed down the river from ice fronts far to the northeast. In the Portland-Vancouver Basin, these terraces are found at elevations of

---

<sup>1</sup> "Countdown to the Present", the geologic story of the Portland Basin by John Elliot Allen, an unpublished paper

## SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

about 300, 200, and 100 feet. Trimble (1973) named the gravels in them (from highest and oldest to lowest and youngest) the Springwater, Gresham and Estacada Formations. During the last advance of the ice, a series of 40 - 100 floods originating in Montana inundated 16,000 square miles of the Pacific Northwest. Each of these floods is estimated to have been ten times the flow of all the rivers in the world, and 60 times that of the Amazon River. The surfaces of the older and higher terraces in the Portland Basin are almost completely covered by "Lacustrine (lake) Deposits" from 50 to 150 feet thick. These are coarse to fine gravels, sands, silts and clays deposited in numerous lakes as the currents of each flood abated and the waters drained out. Scouring from the floods formed the depressions or sinks within the Johnson Creek watershed known as "Holgate Lake."

### Johnson Creek

Because the Corridor parallels Johnson Creek, the geography of the creek and its attendant floodplain are an important element of the Corridor. Of paramount importance are remaining wetlands:

"Wetlands are lands transitional between terrestrial and aquatic systems that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at frequency and duration sufficient to support vegetation adapted to saturated soil conditions. Wetlands provide important functional values that include stormwater retention and flood control, bank stabilization and erosion control, sediment retention, groundwater recharge, fish and wildlife habitat, and contaminant removal, among others. Many wetlands within the Johnson Creek watershed have been filled, drained or degraded as a result of urbanization, flood control efforts and agricultural development. Most remaining wetlands occur within the upper watershed and are associated with the smaller tributaries and drainageways. Significant wetlands occur at Beggar's Tick Marsh, near the fish ladder at 42nd Avenue, and between Hogan Road and 184th Avenue in Gresham. Forested wetlands, typically dominated by ash, alder, willow, and cottonwood, and emergent wetlands, typically dominated by reed canary grass, are common in the watershed. Shrub-scrub wetlands, dominated by willows, are uncommon throughout the Portland area; thus sites such as Beggar's Tick Marsh are important from a diversity standpoint." <sup>2</sup>

Degradation of water quality has resulted from several factors including toxic spills, high nutrient run-off from agriculture, feed lots, lawns and septic systems, high water temperatures in summer and high sediment concentration. The water quality aspects of

---

<sup>2</sup> from the "Johnson Creek Resources Management Plan Background Report", the Natural Resources, Fish and Wildlife chapter, p. 3-9, written by BEAK Consultants, Draft Report dated May 1992

## SPRING WATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

the Creek itself and its propensity to flood on a regular basis have been the subject of much concern and numerous studies. Most notably, a recent effort to develop and recommend implementation of a basin-wide Resources Management Plan that takes advantage of opportunities and solves problems in the Johnson Creek watershed is underway by the Johnson Creek Coordinating Committee (JCCC). At this time, Johnson Creek is listed as "water quality limited" by the DEQ because of consistently high fecal-coliform levels which violate Clean Water Act standards for recreational contact. Violations are also suspected for metals, cyanide, pesticides and PCBs in sediment or in-stream. The goals of the JCCC include improving water quality, restoring its habitat as a fishery, minimizing flooding, preserving natural areas, and providing recreational opportunities.

In addition to the wetland aspects of the creek and its floodplain, its importance as a wildlife corridor must be kept in mind. The presence of water and the variety of habitat to be found along the creek link islands of open space that are like giant green beads along a 16-mile long watery necklace.

### Wildlife

Wildlife within urbanized areas of the lower watershed are typified by those species capable of coexisting with high levels of human disturbance and exploiting small habitat patches or suburban landscapes. Many of these species are often nonnative and are considered less desirable by society (e.g., European starling, Norway rat). In the more rural portions of the upper watershed, the more urbanized wildlife community undergoes transition to include species which require a more "natural" habitat setting with less human interference. Even wildlife resources of the upper watershed are strongly influenced by past and continuing land-use practices, such as forest management and agricultural practices....Common wildlife species include, for example, the American crow, American robin, European starling, song sparrow, Bewick's wren, housefinch, cedar waxwing, violet-green swallow, belted kingfisher, great blue heron, mallard, wood duck, bushtit, black-capped chickadee, raccoon, opossum, nutria, and mole species in the lower reaches. Less developed areas probably support a much greater diversity of wildlife species characteristic of farm and forest land, including black-tailed deer, coyote, deer mouse, voles, bats, western flycatcher, black-headed grosbeak, orange-crowned warbler, and woodpecker. The distribution of species which are rarer in occurrence or more secretive in habits are less understood. This group often includes those wildlife populations which are declining at unacceptable rates and are at risk.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 3-10 - 3-11

## SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

Aquatic wildlife within Johnson Creek has equally suffered. Once host to salmon and steelhead runs, fish runs have all but disappeared from Johnson Creek. The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife stocks Johnson Creek each spring at SE 45th with rainbow trout. The exclusive purpose of the release is for the children's fishing program.

Channelization of the creek in the mid 1930's eliminated bends and deep pools in the creek along with much of the edge riparian vegetation resulting in a loss of prime fish habitat areas. Increased development along Johnson Creek has resulted in increased non-permeable surfaces causing extremes in water flow. All of these factors have contributed to the loss of most aquatic wildlife.

### Vegetation

Vegetation along the Springwater Corridor has undergone widespread historical alteration since initial European settlement in the mid 1800s. "Extensive old growth coniferous forests were harvested for timber, settlers cleared fertile lowlands and prairies for agriculture, and small residential communities grew to form large urban complexes. Today the Corridor encompasses a mosaic of vegetation types as it moves through a rural setting near Boring through the urbanized lands of the Portland metropolitan area. Remnants of the historical vegetation communities are uncommon, especially within the boundaries of the Corridor, replaced by a diverse assemblage of upland forests, riparian and wetland habitats, agricultural lands and urban/suburban landscapes."<sup>4</sup> When the Corridor was owned by the railroad, maintenance included an annual spraying of a non-selective herbicide to control vegetation. By far, the predominant plant species is Himalayan blackberry, an invasive non-native. Also present within the Corridor are snowberry, elderberry, indian plum, hawthorn, and red osier dogwood. Groundcover is typically weedy and overwhelmed by non-native invasives. Because of PGE's requirements to maintain clearance under their overhead wires, no full size trees can be found within the Corridor boundaries.

### Scenic qualities

The Corridor passes through a variety of land uses and offers many scenic vistas. Some of the views capture rural panoramas, other offer a glimpse into the heart of urban neighborhoods. Even the ones that show an insider's view of industrial operations have cultural and community interest.

One of the most scenic views along the Corridor is visible heading east near Powell Butte. The alignment of the Corridor is centered on Mount Hood; the surrounding landscape is an especially scenic pastoral vista.

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 3-6

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

Some of the views of wetlands and open spaces along the Corridor are also noteworthy. The raised railbed affords an elevated viewpoint from which one can enjoy the natural qualities inherent in Tideman Johnson Nature Park and Beggar's Tick Marsh; the trestles offer a bird's eye view of Johnson Creek.

The community of Boring is a charming small town. It boasts several buildings of historical architectural merit.

The proposed extension of the Corridor on the west side of SE McLoughlin Boulevard has great scenic potential. It passes Johnson Creek Park and a brick trolley barn before it turns north and follows the Willamette River shore. Wonderful views of Sellwood Riverfront Park, Oaks Amusement Park and Oaks Bottom are unparalleled.

Within Portland City limits, the Corridor is being analyzed for areas of scenic value deemed worthy of protection under the *Scenic Resources Protection Plan*, as part of the Scenic Addendum Project. This project will result in a staff report and recommendation to the Planning Commission in February 1993. It is too early in the process to report on specific scenic protection measures. However, the Scenic Review Committee has expressed interest in considering the entire corridor within City limits as a scenic corridor and recognizing the sequential views of Mt. Hood between SE 130th and SE 158th Avenues. Powell Butte to the north provides a recreational destination and environmental protection to a major section of the corridor. Further west, Tideman Johnson Nature Park and Beggar's Tick Marsh are destinations.

## B. Historic summary

### Johnson Creek

The presence of Johnson Creek roughly paralleling the Springwater Corridor has had the most significant impact on the local area. The creek's riparian edge and associated wetlands provided habitat to numerous game species. The creek was once host to abundant native fish populations, providing a readily available food source for Native Americans and early European settlers. Initially, the Johnson Creek basin was rich with timber. The creek provided a source of power and a transportation system for logging operations. Once cleared, the land was ideal for agricultural use.

Subject to seasonal flooding, the creek was responsible for the depositing fine silts along the valley floor, creating ideal soils for agriculture. The creek provided a readily available source of water for irrigation.

Logging activity and corresponding increased development through 1910-1920's increased the amount of run-off to the creek. Periodic flooding became a problem. This was compounded by the loss of many of the wetland areas (by filling) which had served as

# SPRING WATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

natural reservoir areas for excess run-off. Local residents report that flooding was so severe that Holgate Boulevard was often under water.

In 1934, the Works Progress Administration (WPA), undertook a major effort to control flooding of the creek. The creek was channelized using cut basalt stone from the local area. Part of this work included the fish ladder and waterfall close to 45th and Harney. Though the channelization had a hand crafted rustic quality about it, its flood control function lasted only about ten years. Ongoing maintenance of the channel had not been considered in the channel design. Silt lined the channel way, trapping additional debris. Water currents undercut the stone work and the channel gave way in some sections.

Unfortunately, the channelization work had also required the removal of all riparian vegetation along this the creek edge. This resulted in dramatic changes in water temperature and a severe decline in fish population. Industrial and agricultural development compounded the problems. Pollutants such as fertilizers, DDT and heavy metals have been found throughout the creek. Human contact with the water is now considered hazardous. The creek has been classified as "water quality limited" by the Department of Environmental Quality and must have a water quality management plan in place by 1993. Efforts are now underway to address the flooding and water quality issues on Johnson Creek.

## Native Americans

Details of Native Americans in the Springwater Corridor area are sketchy at best. Local residents have reported finding Native American artifacts south of the corridor at the base of Mt. Scott and there have been some reports of findings along Johnson Creek in the Tideman Johnson Nature Park area. Wapato root, a popular Indian food, is found naturally in wetland areas such as Oaks Bottom. Salmon, an important part of local native diet and culture, were once abundant in Johnson Creek. The presence of these two food sources is supporting evidence that the Springwater Corridor was host to Native Americans.

## Early European Settlement

The abundant timber and game, fertile ground and the Willamette River attracted the first European settlers to the area. The Willamette provided settlers with a readily available food source, irrigation, transport, fresh water and power. About the mid 1800's, when prime waterfront real estate on the Willamette began to get scarce, settlement began to move to smaller tributaries such as Johnson Creek. The Donation Land Claim Act of 1850, offering one half square mile to single persons and one square mile to married couples, brought an increase in competition for waterfront land to the area. Settlement along Johnson Creek started at mouth of the Willamette River and headed east and south towards Boring.

The present site of the Waverly Golf course, just north of the mouth of Johnson Creek at the Willamette River, was the location of the first settlement in the Johnson Creek basin.

## SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

In 1847, a man named Wilson cleared five acres and built a cabin at this location. Shortly thereafter, annoyed with "Indian problems," Wilson sold his land to Henderson Luelling and his family. Luelling came to Oregon with the specific intent of starting a fruit orchard and carried with him approximately 350 trees. Some of the accomplishments of the Luelling family included development of the Black Republican and Bing cherry varieties, the latter of which was named after the Luelling's Chinese foreman, Ah Sit Bing. Henderson Luelling, working with his brother-in-law, William Meek, also constructed a dam on Johnson Creek at the present crossing of Highway 224 and started a sawmill.

Several other settlers followed suit in the lumber business. Much of the harvested timber headed south to satisfy the needs of the miners in the California Gold rush. The first sawmill with a planer was built by George Wills in 1849 near the confluence of Johnson Creek and Crystal Springs. The planer had a 60 horse power motor powered by Johnson Creek and turned out the first milled lumber in the Northwest. Also notable, in 1869, Wills deeded a 60 foot wide right-of-way to the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company, the first of what would become a long history of rail occupation in the basin. In return Wills was promised a track that would serve his mill. This right-of-way provided a rail connection from Portland to Canby.

Perry Lent settled in Oregon in 1852, in the vicinity of 92nd Avenue and the Springwater Corridor. In 1883, Lent established a sawmill on Johnson Creek close to 100th and Foster.

The Johnson family, whom the creek was named after in their honor, settled at the current Publisher's Paper site in 1847. After trying their hand at the California gold rush, William Johnson built a sawmill in the vicinity of Deardorff Road. Jacob Johnson, William's son, later staked a claim at about 134th, also established a sawmill on Johnson Creek, taking advantage of the abundant fir and cedar.

Further east along the corridor, land claims and homesteads were set up by familiar names such as Philip Foster in 1847, John and Elizabeth Linneman in 1852, Jackson and James Powell also in 1852, and Willard H. Boring in the late 19th century.

### Springwater Division Line

In 1871 Ben Holladay operated a horse car service on the streets of Portland. The Portland Street Railway Company, as it was called, was the only available transportation service at the time. In 1891, Albina and East Portland consolidated with Portland. The population reached 88,200. Bridges linked the east side of town to the west side and housing spread away from the river's edge. Ben Holladay's rail company was acquired by the Consolidated Street Car Company in 1895 and expanded to 40 miles of track boasting electric cars. The company had plans of expanding service south to Oregon City and ultimately to Eugene. Though the company succeeded in establishing a line to Gladstone, economic conditions as well as two major accidents lead to the acquisition of

## **SPRING WATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN**

the company by the Portland City and Oregon City Railway company owned by Fred Morris.

A major management objective of this new railway was to expand service from Portland to Gresham via a route that headed south along the Willamette River, turning east at Sellwood, paralleling Johnson Creek and tying into Gresham. C.F. Tiffany was named superintendent of the new Portland City and Oregon Railway and a man named Stuart from California was hired as dispatcher. After numerous head-on collisions, strained labor relationships that lead to a worker's strike, management of the line was replaced. Throughout these difficulties and on the verge of bankruptcy, Morris remained focused on the idea of expanding service east to Gresham. On June 5, 1902, Morris, joined by several other investors, formed the Oregon Water Power and Railway Corporation. The added objective to this corporation was to not only expand service east to Gresham, but also include expansion along the Clackamas River for the purpose of constructing hydroelectric dams and transmission lines feeding electricity into Portland. The corporation took out a \$5 million mortgage to pay for the expansion.

Late that summer, construction began on the line to Gresham and a site on the Clackamas River was purchased for the dam. In fall, the route along the river to Sellwood was acquired. The first trains to Gresham began running in January of 1903. Construction of the line continued towards Boring and to Cazadero, the site of the hydroelectric dam. On September 28, 1903, the line was complete and took 900 passengers to the Cazadero dam site.

The 36 mile line was noted for the high engineering standards of its sweeping curves and its solid construction. The line had 54 stops and included major stations at Golf Junction, Stanley, Lents Junction, Gresham, Boring Junction, Eagle Creek, Estacada and Cazadero. In 1905, plans were laid to extend the Cazadero Line along the Clackamas River and over the mountains to eastern Oregon. To encourage week-end use, the rail corporation developed destination parks along the line such as Barton Park on the banks of the Clackamas River as well as Oaks Amusement Park on the banks of the Willamette River in Sellwood. These parks became major attractions drawing thousands of passengers each weekend.

By 1906, two companies bought out the profitable Oregon Water and Power Railway. A merger united this joint venture and the line was now owned by Portland General Electric and the Portland Railway Light and Power Company. It was under this ownership that the line reached its peak. By 1910, the company had 6 electric plants and 161 miles of rails, carrying 16,000,000 passengers. Additional power plants were underway at Faraday and Oak Grove Dam. The cars were all painted an elegant combination of maroon body, cream trim and black top. In addition to passengers, the rail hauled farm produce into markets in Portland. It was at this time that the line acquired the name "Springwater Line," possibly because of the numerous natural springs along the route.

## SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

After World War I, passenger service declined due to the popularity of the automobile. The depression of 1930 led to a further decline in the ridership of the line. Though several attempts were made to revive business, all failed. In 1932, the line from Boring to Cazadero was terminated. The State of Oregon purchased the right-of-way. In 1949, service was further cut and service was provided only to the Bellrose station. In 1958, all interurban passenger service was suspended. Southern Pacific and Union Pacific acquired the line in 1962 to operate the line as a freight service. This was abandoned in 1989, at which time it was acquired by the Oregon Department of Transportation who in turn transferred ownership to the City of Portland.

### Communities

As is typical of the development of transportation routes, several communities sprang up along the Springwater Line. Many of these communities carry the names of their founders. Heading west to east, these include Sellwood, Waverly Heights, Eastmoreland, Woodstock, Errol Heights, Lents, Powellhurst-Gilbert and Pleasant Valley. Towns that developed along the line include Milwaukie, Gresham, Boring, Eagle Creek, Estacada and Cazadero. During the peak of the rail line era, the Springwater Line was the life blood to these communities.

#### • Sellwood

Located on the banks of the Willamette River, the town of Sellwood gets its name from Reverend John Sellwood, who purchased land from the Eddy family in 1866. Sellwood had hopes of starting a religious community in the area, but ended up selling to T.A. Wood, who platted the town of Sellwood in 1882. In 1887, the town was incorporated and had a population of about 800. A ferry boat ran across the Willamette River at the base of Umatilla Street. This area was popular amongst Portlanders. A horse race track was operated at the present site of Sellwood Park and the area had one of the finest sandy beaches along the banks of the Willamette. Oaks Park was built in 1905 by the Oregon Water Power and Railway Company. Oaks Park was built to attract week end ridership and to promote the virtues of electricity. The park remains in operation today and retains much of its original character.

#### • Waverly Heights

Known locally for its fine golf course, Waverly Heights sits on the former Luelling family homestead. Purchased in 1890 by a group of Portland's social and business leaders, the intent for the site was to build an exclusive community amongst a pastoral, golf course setting. The original community included only 16 lots overlooking the clubhouse. The vision was a success and many of the original mansions are still in existence today. The site was also home to the Portland Polo club.

#### • Eastmoreland

Eastmoreland was platted in 1909 by Ladd Estate Company, formed by William Ladd. Ladd had previously developed Westmoreland, and chose the name after a Multnomah County judge, Julius Caesar Westmoreland. The neighborhood was built in close

## SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

proximity to the recently completed Reed College. This became a selling point for the Ladd Estate Company as potential home buyers were shown photographs of uppercrust neighborhoods surrounding a college modelled on East coast Ivy League schools.

To the south of Eastmoreland and directly on the Springwater Corridor, is the former site of a bustling industrial area, where sawmills turned out 10,000 board feet of lumber per day.

Further east along the corridor lies Tideman Johnson Nature Park. The park is named after the Johnson family, (no relation to William Johnson, the Creek's namesake) whose original land claim included the park land. The site is unique because it represents one of the few areas along Johnson Creek that is within a gorge. The Johnson's encouraged public use of their property for recreation purposes. They sponsored 4th of July picnics and fireworks open to all who desired to attend. The site remains was donated to the City of Portland in 1942 and remains in a natural state today as a refuge for wildlife.

### • Woodstock

The Woodstock neighborhood was platted in 1889 and was named after a Sir Walter Scott novel. Originally, all of the streets in the Woodstock area carried the names of characters in the novel. Woodstock is within the eastern end of the gorge area. Of particular note in this area is the fish ladder and waterfall at 45th and Harney, constructed by the Works Progress Administration in 1934.

### • Brentwood-Darlington (Errol Heights)

Brentwood-Darlington, formerly known as Errol Heights, was originally named after a sailing ship, Errol, that carried Joseph A. Strowbridge to America from England. Strowbridge settled on property between 45th and 82nd Avenue. His heirs later subdivided his land and formed the Strowbridge Estate Company. The company was responsible for establishing Errol Station on the Springwater Line. A plat was filed in 1910 and the neighborhood promoted itself as a suburban, bedroom community, where the low cost of land was a chief draw. Many of the residents from the neighborhood worked with the WPA throughout the 1930's.

### • Lents

The town of Lents is named after the Lents family who originally settled the area around 92nd Avenue. The town was officially platted in 1892 and was serviced by steam trains and later electric trolleys along the Springwater Line. The town has been through severe changes as business suffered from development along 82nd Avenue and the construction of I-205.

Points of interest along the corridor in Lents include William Johnson's original settlement location at 100th and Foster, Indian Rock at the base of Mt. Scott, Lents Junction and the PGE substation at 102nd and Woodstock.

## SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

### • David Douglas Area (Powellhurst-Gilbert and Pleasant Valley)

Settlers came to the David Douglas area because of the rich soils deposited by regular flooding of Johnson Creek. This particular area of the Johnson Creek basin is notably narrower than most of the basin, making it especially susceptible to flooding. The Springwater Line served the farmers in this area with stations at Arnaud (112th), Kirpatrick (117th), Gilbert (122nd), Ramapo (128th), Bellrose (136th), Wilson (141st), and Sycamore (Jenne Road). Gilbert station had loading dock facilities to handle produce for transport to Portland.

Points of interest along the corridor in the David Douglas area include Beggar's Tick Marsh at 111th and Harold; and Powell Butte Nature Park at Powell and 168th, a 500 acre nature area situated on one of the Boring Lava domes. Also just south of the corridor along SE 122nd lies Leach Botanical Garden. The garden has an excellent collection of native plants and is located on the banks of Johnson Creek.

### • Milwaukie

Founded in 1847, the town of Milwaukie lies at the western end of the Springwater Corridor. The Leuelling settlement and the mouth of Johnson Creek both are within the City of Milwaukie. During the late 1800's, Milwaukie rivaled with Portland as the key shipping port on the Willamette River. Industries such as sawmills, ship building and gristmills sprung up in the area.

In the 1930's, the Springwater Line was a daily part of most Milwaukie residents. The line served passengers and hauled industrial goods into Portland. The Wichita Feed Store on Johnson Creek Boulevard began business during this time. It served as a hub to the community selling agricultural products and hardware. The building remains in the original family ownership and the interior has changed little since it was opened.

Bell Station, located off Johnson Creek Boulevard at 67th, was built in 1902 and is on the Clackamas County Inventory of Historic Resources. The name is misleading as the building has never been a rail station but rather a store. It currently houses a deli and grocery business.

### • Gresham

Early settlers came to the Gresham area because of abundant timber and fertile soils. The close proximity to Portland created a strong market for these goods. Crops were brought into Portland via Powell Boulevard, a former Indian trail, later named after the Powell family that first settled the area. With the railway completion in 1903 running through the center of Gresham, transportation became much easier and Gresham's population grew. The main rail station was located at the current Main City Park. A secondary station was located at Linneman Junction and named after the Linneman family who settled the area in 1852. The station building still remains and plans are now underway by the City of Gresham to move the structure to its original location and convert it to a rail museum.

## SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

Cedarville Park, also known as Club Paesano, is immediately adjacent to Linneman Station and the Springwater Corridor. The privately-owned park was named after the abundant cedar trees in the area. The park was established in 1910 and is still popular today as a week end picnic spot.

Gresham began sponsoring annual fairs in 1906 and was chosen as the site for the Multnomah County Fair in 1926. These attracted visitors to the area many of whom came back to settle in Gresham.

Between 1970-1980, the population in Gresham tripled as it became a "bedroom" community to Portland. Additional growth was spurred on by the completion of light rail in 1986.

Also of notable interest along the Springwater Corridor are three pioneer cemeteries dating back to the 1860's; Ambleside community at Hogan Road which is a planned summer resort community dating back to 1904; and Columbia Brick Works, a brick factory established in 1906 and still in operation.

### • Boring

The town of Boring is at the eastern end of the the Springwater Corridor. It was named after Willard H. Boring, the first pioneer in the area. Because of the hilly terrain, farming was difficult and land claims were few. Livestock, lumber and grains were the main products of the area. Boring began to develop a town center with the arrival of the Springwater Line in 1903. Boring Junction was built as the official station for the town. A store with apartments quickly followed, then a post office and drug store were built in 1910. Many of these building are still in active use and have been placed on the Clackamas County Historic Inventory. The station building still stands but is in need of repair.

### Recommendations

The Springwater Corridor can be viewed as a series of overlays through time with each layer enriching the cultural heritage of the corridor. The corridor passes through diverse landscapes ranging from industrial neighborhoods to pastoral farm land to natural wildlife areas. Each of these landscapes tells a story of a significant way of life and period of time. Interpretive opportunities should be utilized to reveal the story behind these places. The trail users should have an opportunity to learn about who traveled along this route before them.

Interpretative stations should be developed for the following features:

A. The story of Johnson Creek should be told. This should cover the changes of the creek including native fish species, flooding, man's use of the creek, water quality and current efforts to improve Johnson Creek.

## **SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN**

B. The history of Tideman Johnson Nature Park should be interpreted. The contribution of the Tideman Johnson family to the area along with the natural amenities of the gorge area should be included.

C. The William Johnson Family Settlement at the Publisher's Paper site, including the naming of Johnson Creek and the numerous ways the land has been used, should be interpreted.

D. Natural areas such as Beggars Tick Marsh, wetland enhancement projects along the creek and Powell Butte should be interpreted. These areas represent current thinking on the value of natural areas.

F. Boring Junction and the surrounding historic buildings should be developed into a historic theme park. The "missing link" at this location should be acquired. Interpretation should include the buildings, the rail line, and the "First to Walk," Friends of Springwater Corridor event. The remaining station building should be renovated and integrated into the theme park.

G. The Springwater Line, its development and significant role it played to the region should be interpreted. The story of the power transmission lines should be included.

H. The historic Bell Station, representing a rail station like building should be acknowledged.

I. The story of the Native Americans, their relationship with Johnson Creek should be interpreted.

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

## C. Socio-economic summary

The purpose of this section of the master plan is to provide an overview of the land use and population surrounding the Springwater Corridor including its relation to other recreation sites and facilities. Another purpose of this section is to identify the potential users of the corridor, the possible uses, and the major factors creating the need for the corridor. Zoning designations, population and housing units, population and housing growth, existing recreation, and recreation deficiencies will be used as a basis for this analysis.

### Adjacent Land use:

The 16.5 miles of the Springwater Corridor, in total, occupies 190.8 acres of land. It begins in an urban setting within the City of Milwaukie and ends in a rural area of the town of Boring. The corridor lies within the Urban Growth Boundary for most of its length, with the exception of a small pocket near Jenne Road, and then leaves the boundary near Hogan Road. Along its course the trail passes through several types of land use areas. The majority of surrounding land, (36%), is zoned for residential use and is spread out along the entire length of the corridor.

Industrial zoning is the second largest amount of land use, (14.3%), adjacent to the corridor. Most of the industrial land use occurs between the western end of the corridor in the City of Milwaukie east to Foster Road near 120th Avenue. The remainder of industrial land use occurs in the town of Boring.

Manufacturing land use, (7.5%), and commercial land use, (1%), are also dispersed within the industrial areas. Manufacturing land use exists in two areas: between Luther Road and Flavel Street; and between the I-205 Freeway and 111th Avenue. Almost all the commercial land use is concentrated near 82nd Avenue in the form of strip development.

East of Powell Butte Nature Park much of the trail passes through a rural area with the exception of the City of Gresham. Most of the land is designated as agricultural, transitional timber, and farm land use zones. This type of land use constitutes approximately 10% of the land use surrounding the corridor.

Along the trail are several natural resource and open spaces that total 685.3 acres. These natural resource and open space areas occupy 3.2% of the land use adjacent to the corridor. A large portion of this acreage is located within the 569-acre Powell Butte Nature Park and Tideman Johnson Creek Nature Park. Another (100.2 acres), is divided between five areas within the City of Gresham. The remainder located in Beggar's Tick Marsh under the jurisdiction of Multnomah County. Almost the entire length of the Springwater Corridor lies within the Johnson Creek Watershed.

The remaining 28% of land use exists within the City of Gresham. It consists of residential, commercial, and open space zoning designations.

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN


In the near vicinity of the corridor, (within one-half mile), are 1023.4 acres of parks and recreational facilities. These recreational areas range from as small as a 2.4 acres undeveloped park site to as large as the 569-acre Powell Butte Nature Park.

There are 38.8 acres of undeveloped park sites included in the 1023.4 acres of recreational sites. These sites remain undeveloped because they are either awaiting funding, still in the proposal stage, lack accessibility, or are difficult to develop for recreational use.

## Demographics: (Data taken from 1989 METRO Regional Forecast)

The Springwater Corridor passes through four cities or towns and two counties, Multnomah and Clackamas. The two are divided into sub-areas which are subdivided into census tracts. The corridor passes through six sub-areas and a total of twenty census tracts. All the census tracts, with the exception of #233 in sub-area #19, lie within the urban growth boundary. A common boundary for the sub-areas and census tracts is the Multnomah/Clackamas County line and the Willamette River for sub-areas #2 and #6. Figure 1 lists the settings, types of land use, populations of census tracts adjacent to the corridor within the sub-areas *See map on following page for reference to the corridor, census tracts, and sub-areas.*

| <u>Sub-area</u> | <u>Census Tract</u> | <u>Setting</u> | <u>Land Use</u> | <u>Population</u> |
|-----------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 2               | 2                   | Urban          | Industrial      | 13,249            |
|                 | 3.02                |                | Residential     | 4.4% of           |
|                 | 6.01                |                | Commercial      | sub-area          |
|                 | 6.02                |                | Manufacturing   |                   |
|                 | 86                  |                |                 |                   |
|                 | 88                  |                |                 |                   |
| 4               | 85                  | Suburban       | Residential     | 21,327            |
|                 | 89                  |                | Manufacturing   | 28.1% of          |
|                 | 90                  |                |                 | sub-area          |
|                 | 91                  |                |                 |                   |
| 5               | 98.02               | Urban          | Residential     | 30,577            |
|                 | 99                  | Suburban       | Commercial      | 35.2% of          |
|                 | 100                 | Rural          | Natural/Open    | sub-area          |
|                 | 104.04              |                |                 |                   |
| 6               | 208                 | Urban          | Industrial      | 16,564            |
|                 | 209                 |                | Residential     | 26% of            |
|                 | 210                 |                | Commercial      | sub-area          |
|                 | 216.01              |                | Manufacturing   |                   |
| 7               | 222.01              | Suburban       | Residential     | 2,317             |
|                 |                     |                | Commercial      | 11.8% of          |
|                 |                     |                |                 | sub-area          |
| 19              | 233                 | Rural          | Residential     | 4,583             |
|                 |                     |                | Agricultural    | 6% of             |
|                 |                     |                | Timber Trans.   | sub-area          |
|                 |                     |                | Industrial      |                   |




Sub-areas / Census Tracts

-  Census Tracts Adjacent to Trail
-  Sub-area Boundaries
-  Springwater Corridor Trail

Multnomah and Clackamas county line serves as a common boundary between Sub-areas.

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN



## CENSUS TRACT POPULATION ADJACENT TO CORRIDOR BASED ON SUB-AREA


The fourteen census tracts in sub-areas #2, #4, and #5 are in Multnomah County and have a population of 65,333 people. This is 14% of the total population for the three sub-areas. The six census tracts in sub-areas #6, #7, and #19 are in Clackamas County with a combined population of 23,464 people. This is 14.8% of the total population for the three sub-areas. In all, the total population of the twenty census tracts is 88,797 people that live along the Springwater Corridor.

The population adjacent to the corridor occupies 41,889 housing units. These units are divided into single-family and multi-family dwellings. The average percentage of housing units along the corridor is 73% single-family and 27% multi-family dwellings.

### Population Growth & Housing: (Data from 1989 METRO Regional Forecast)

Population along the Springwater Corridor is projected to experience changes involving growth and decline by the year 2010. Some of the changes are expected to be as diverse as a decline of 10% to an increase by as much as 150% or more in some areas.

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN



## CENSUS TRACT POPULATION-ANTICIPATED CHANGE

The total growth by the year 2010 is projected to reach 122,860 people, an increase of 72.2%. Census tracts in sub-areas closest to the urban center are projected to show the least growth while census tracts in sub-areas furthest from the urban center are projected to show the greatest amount of growth. Most of the population increases are projected to occur east of the I-205 freeway. A large increase is expected to be in the area of Gresham from the Multnomah county line north to Burnside Road and between Foster Road to 282nd Avenue. This increase is projected at 22% to 140% depending on census tracts. The area around Happy Valley is projected for the largest increase in population at 152%. The area around Boring, which is outside the Urban Growth Boundary, is projected for only a moderate amount of growth, (17%), as is the area around Powell Butte Nature Park.

Changes in population along the corridor is likely to result in changes in housing units as well. The types of units, single-family or multi-family units, will depend upon land use

## SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

zoning along the corridor. Multi-family units are projected to grow in urban areas, while single-family units are projected to grow in more rural areas. Areas in between, mainly suburban, are projected to have an increase in both single and multi-family units. The greatest increase in single-family units is expected to occur east of I-205 out to Gresham between the Multnomah/Clackamas county line and the Springwater Corridor.

The projection for multi-family units shows growth in several different areas along the trail, but the largest growth is expected to be around Gresham and west of Happy Valley along I-205.


A study by the National Park Service Rivers & Trails Conservation Program, dated 1992, showed that the development of three trails in different areas around the country have had a positive effect economically. While the list is numerous, the obvious areas of effect are in consumable goods, such as food and beverages, and others. A couple of areas that may show economic growth are near Johnson Creek Boulevard and Harney Street, Bell Avenue, 82nd Avenue, 136th Avenue, within the City of Gresham, and within the town of Boring. These areas are where the corridor passes close by and offer users the convenience of obtaining goods without having to travel any distance from the corridor.

### Population Served:

Based on *Parks Futures*, a comprehensive plan for the city's parks and recreational facilities, a telephone survey showed that two factors influence the usage of parks and recreation sites: age and education. Younger people, (40 years and under), and people with higher education, (4 years or less of college), seem to use nearby recreation sites and parks at least once a month. Also families with children are more likely to visit parks and recreation sites than those without. Income was found to have little influence on visitation to nearby parks. Additional data was obtained from a survey conducted by Portland State University of the population living adjacent to the corridor. Results showed that 66% were under 45 years of age, 51% had 4 years or less of college, and that 42% had at least one child under 16 years of age.

According to *Park Futures*, 61% of the population in sub-area #2 and 45% of sub-area #4 would visit a nearby park or recreation site at least once a month. For the population of the census tracts in sub-area #2 the number of people would be 8,191 some of the time or at least once a month. For the population of the census tracts in sub-area #4 the number of people would be 9,597 some of the time or at least once a month. Because sub-area #6 closely resembles sub-area #2 demographically, the number of people that would visit a site some of the time or at least once a month would be 10,104 people. The census tract, #222.01, in sub-area #7 is similar to the census tracts in sub-area #6. The number of people that would visit a park or recreation site some time or at least once a month would be 1045 people.

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN



**NUMBER OF ANTICIPATED PARK VISITORS PER SUB-AREA**  
(Projections based on visits of at least once a month)

The *State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP)* defines the desired size of parks and recreation sites. The plan matches the size of the site with the size of the service area and the population of the service area. In accordance with the *SCORP* many of the neighborhoods and recreation sites in the metropolitan region are deficient. The Springwater Corridor when developed will help to meet the goals of the plan. The corridor will be categorized as a linear park and will help increase the ability of the region to meet the *SCORP* goals.

Development of the corridor will offer the following types of recreation and activities: a place for organized walking, hiking, and running groups; casual hiking, jogging, and walking; bicyclists (both on and off-road types), commuters, and equestrians. The corridor offers a wide variety of uses and access to other recreational sites. It will also act as a destination in itself where people will be able to go and unwind or relax, be close to nature, be by themselves, or just pass the time.

The Springwater Corridor is not limited to usage by nearby and local residents only. Citizens from other areas around the metropolitan region will be able to access the corridor. The *Parks Futures* telephone survey of residents region wide showed that many of the activities that people regularly participated in will be provided by the corridor. The most popular were: walking for recreation, picnicking, day hiking, bicycling, and jogging. Some other benefits offered by the Springwater Corridor are:

- Recreational users will be offered scenic views and access to areas with scenic views, such as those on Powell Butte Nature Park.
- Environmental education classes will offer a diversity of landscapes from urban to rural habitats in addition to the many open spaces, green spaces, and nature parks

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

accessible from the corridor.

- Bird watching is another activity that can be enjoyed from the trail and natural areas.
- Hard surfacing along most of the trail will allow disabled citizens to enjoy many of the benefits that the trail offers.
- All users will benefit from a safe recreational environment of the 16.5 miles of trail without having to contend with motor vehicles, with the exception of intersections.
- Bicycle commuters will be offered a safer and more direct link to employment and shopping centers.
- Equestrians will be able to enjoy a recreational area extending from an area around 128th Avenue to Boring.
- Bicyclists will be able to connect into the 16-mile I-205 bike path that extend from Vancouver, Wash. to Gladstone, Ore. raising the total of off-street bike paths to over 33 miles.
- Residents in "park deficient" neighborhoods will be able to access other parks and recreational facilities more safely and easily.

Comparative user survey results from the I-205 bike path, the Burke-Gilman trail in Seattle, as well as counts from *The Impact of Rails-Trails* by the National Park Service are used below to anticipate usage and user groups on the Springwater Corridor. Survey results from *Park Futures* telephone survey is also used to obtain general estimates of user groups. The surveyed percentages for user groups were formulated with the population of adjacent census tracts to estimate how many people would visit a nearby park or recreation site and also to estimate how many people in each user group would be. The counts from the surveyed trails and the estimates from the *Parks Futures* are averaged together to project the number users in each group and total number of users.

| <u>Trail Name</u>              | <u>Daily</u> | <u>Monthly</u> | <u>Annually</u> | <u>Percentage of Users</u> |
|--------------------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| <i>Dyersville, Iowa: Rural</i> |              |                |                 |                            |
| <i>Heritage Trail</i>          | 375          | 11,249         | 134,986         |                            |
| Bicycling                      | 244          | 7,312          | 87,741          | 65%                        |
| Walking                        | 112          | 3,375          | 40,496          | 30%                        |
| Jogging                        | 11           | 337            | 4,050           | 4%                         |
| Equestrian                     | 4            | 112            | 1,350           | 1%                         |

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

| <u>Trail Name</u>                         | <u>Daily</u> | <u>Monthly</u> | <u>Annually</u> | <u>Percentage of Users</u> |
|---|--------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| <i>Tallahassee, Fla.: Rural</i>           |              |                |                 |                            |
| <i>St. Marks Trail</i>                    | 477          | 14,315         | 171,774         |                            |
| Bicycling                                 | 386          | 11,595         | 139,137         | 81%                        |
| Walking                                   | 43           | 1,288          | 15,460          | 9%                         |
| Jogging                                   | 19           | 573            | 6,871           | 4%                         |
| Equestrian                                | 19           | 573            | 6,871           | 4%                         |
| <i>Contra Costa County, Calif.: Urban</i> |              |                |                 |                            |
| <i>Lafayette/Moraga Trail</i>             | 1,136        | 34,079         | 408,950         |                            |
| Bicycling                                 | 239          | 7,157          | 85,880          | 21%                        |
| Walking                                   | 738          | 22,151         | 265,818         | 65%                        |
| Jogging                                   | 148          | 4,430          | 53,164          | 13%                        |
| Equestrian                                | -            | -              | -               | -                          |
| <i>Portland, Ore.: Urban</i>              |              |                |                 |                            |
| <i>I-205 Bike Trail</i>                   | 218          | 6,545          | 78,540          |                            |
| Bicycling                                 | 144          | 4,330          | 51,960          | 66%                        |
| Walking                                   | 74           | 2,215          | 26,580          | 34%                        |
| Jogging                                   | -            | -              | -               | -                          |
| <i>Seattle, Wa.: Urban</i>                |              |                |                 |                            |
| <i>Burke-Gilman Trail</i>                 | 1,558        | 46,740         | 560,880         |                            |
| Bicycling                                 | 1,262        | 37,859         | 454,313         | 81%                        |
| Walking                                   | 125          | 3,739          | 44,870          | 8%                         |
| Jogging                                   | 156          | 4,674          | 56,088          | 10%                        |
| Other                                     | 16           | 467            | 5,609           | 1%                         |
| <i>Park Futures Plan</i>                  |              |                |                 |                            |
| Bicycling                                 | 710          | 21,305         | 255,658         | 20%                        |
| Walking                                   | 2,378        | 71,338         | 856,056         | 67%                        |
| Jogging                                   | 501          | 15,018         | 180,216         | 14%                        |
| <b>Portland, Ore.: Varied</b>             |              |                |                 |                            |
| <b>Springwater Corr.</b>                  | <b>1,219</b> | <b>36,575</b>  | <b>438,903</b>  |                            |
| Bicycling                                 | 683          | 20,482         | 245,786         | 56%                        |
| Walking                                   | 439          | 13,167         | 158,005         | 36%                        |
| Jogging                                   | 110          | 3,292          | 39,501          | 9%                         |
| Equestrian                                | 37           | 1,097          | 13,167          | 3%                         |

Relation to Population Centers:

Beginning on the west end, the corridor is bordered by the City of Milwaukie in Clackamas County to the south and by the City of Portland in Multnomah County to the north. The corridor begins in a major metropolitan area with other municipal cities nearby, such as Gladstone, Oregon City, West Linn, and Lake Oswego to the south and southwest. Also further east and south of the corridor is the unincorporated city of Happy Valley near the I-205 freeway.

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

Further east the corridor passes through the City of Gresham, (the states 4th largest city), with nearby municipals to the north of Troutdale, Wood Village, and Fairview. Finally, the corridor ends in the town of Boring at the trail's southern most point. In all the Springwater Corridor passes through and connects four cities and two counties.

Expansion of the corridor to the east and west are under consideration. The corridor on the eastern end would eventually be continued past the town of Boring to the Mt. Hood National Forest under the supervision of the State of Oregon. The expansion on the western end would continue from McLoughlin Boulevard towards the Willamette River eventually linking the corridor to downtown Portland.

Along its route there are several points to access the corridor. These access points can be reached by public transportation. There are a total of twelve bus and one light rail routes that either intersect, stop nearby, or connect at one end point of the corridor.

- Bus routes connecting in Milwaukie are numbers 31, 32, 33, and 40. These routes provide service to and from downtown Portland.
- Bus routes that intersect the trail are as follows:
  - #10 at 122nd Avenue and at 136th Avenue provides service to and from downtown.
  - #19 at Henderson Street provides service to and from downtown.
  - #71 at Bell Avenue in Milwaukie, Foster Road near I-205, and at 122nd Avenue.
  - #72 at 82nd Avenue.
  - #75 at 45th Avenue.
  - #82 at 182nd Avenue and at Eastman Parkway provides service to Gresham Transit Mall.
- Bus route #5 passing near the trail, ends at 97th Avenue and provides service to downtown.
- Bus route #9 passes near Powell Butte Nature Park along Powell Boulevard provides service to and from downtown Portland and Gresham.
- The MAX light rail system is a short distance away from the trail between 8th and Kelly Streets in Gresham and provides service between downtown Portland and Gresham.

All routes, except for #32 and #40, have accessible lifts for disabled citizens. Routes #31, #40 on Sundays, #71, and the MAX light rail have bicycle racks. An extension of the light rail system to Milwaukie is being considered later in the future. No long term goals or general schedules have been proposed as of yet.

## Relation to Recreation Sites:

The Springwater Corridor is located only a few miles away from several major recreational areas, such as the Willamette River, Oaks Amusement Park, the Clackamas River, the Sandy River, the Columbia River, and Oxbow State Park. The Portland metropolitan area is

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

wealthy in terms of recreational areas and the Springwater Corridor plays an integral part.

The Springwater Corridor acts as a hub for many recreational sites and facilities within a half-mile to a one mile distance of the corridor. Located within a half-mile distance of the corridor are 38 parks and facilities, four of which are privately owned. The public areas vary from as small as a 2.4 acre undeveloped park site to as large as the 569 acre Powell Butte Nature Park. The total combined acreage for all 38 sites and facilities is 1023.4 acres. The 38 sites consist of four community parks, nine neighborhood parks, and three recreational facilities. Included are seven natural resource/open spaces and eight undeveloped park sites. A listing of parks, their jurisdictions, size and type, and distance from the Springwater Corridor can be found in Appendix B of this master plan.

An inventory of these sites and facilities is as follows:

| <u>Recreation Facilities</u> | <u>Total Number</u> |
|------------------------------|---------------------|
| Ballfields                   | 22                  |
| Tennis Courts                | 6                   |
| Stadiums                     | 2                   |
| Parking Spaces               | 650                 |
| Restrooms                    | 12                  |
| Soccer Fields                | 1                   |
| Golf Course                  | 1                   |
| Benches                      | 78                  |
| Picnic Tables                | 131                 |
| Game Courts                  | 17                  |
| Play Equipment               | 94                  |

Community parks are typically larger than neighborhood parks, between 10 to 50 acres, they receive more frequent use. These parks offer more facilities such as ballfields, group picnic areas, restrooms, and because they attract more regional users than a neighborhood users, are equipped with off-street parking spaces.

Neighborhood parks tend to be quieter places located in and identified with the adjoining neighborhood. Visitors to these parks live within walking distance. Most neighborhood parks are located on quiet side streets away from busy arterials offering a safer play area for children. These parks are typically five acres or less in size.

Recreational facilities are specialized sites that are highly developed with parking lots, visitors' facilities, and highly manicured landscapes. These type of sites attract thousands of visitors annually and are sometimes destinations for tour groups.

Undeveloped park sites remain so because they are either awaiting funding, still in the proposal stage, lack accessibility, or are difficult to develop for recreational use.

## **SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN**

Natural resource/open space parks have been acquired or preserved primarily as a resource for wildlife habitat and environmental education. Numbers of visitors to these parks are usually less than those at more developed park sites. Man-made improvements, if any, are limited to trails, interpretive facilities, and restrooms.

There are currently 20.99 miles of both on and off-street bike routes and paths. Included in this total is the I-205 bike path that runs from Vancouver to Gladstone. Of the 20.99 miles, one-third are off-street bike paths, most of which are located within the Powell Butte Nature Park. Some of these paths share usage as hiking and equestrian trails.

Over half of the bike routes and paths, 13.63 miles, are on-street routes. These routes are located on streets with designated lanes for bicycles. Approximately 80% of these routes are located within the city limits of Gresham.

Existing trails and pedestrian paths near the Springwater Corridor total 8.73 miles. The majority of these trails are located within the Powell Butte Nature Park. The remaining amount are divided among Butler Creek, Lents, Gresham Main City, and Westmoreland parks.

Besides hiking and bicycle trails, there are 4.67 miles of designated trails for equestrian use, all located within Powell Butte Nature Park. Strong support by various equestrian clubs has demonstrated a demand for an equestrian trail along the entire length of the Springwater Corridor.

With the development of the Springwater Corridor the total amount of bike routes and trails will be over 37 miles, not including the entire length of the I-205 bike path. The total length of hiking trails will grow to 25.23 miles and the total length of equestrian trails would be about 13.8 miles.

### **Summary:**

The Springwater Corridor in its undeveloped condition already offers some usage to parts of the population living nearby and adjacent to it. When developed, use of the corridor will only increase, not only by current user groups, but by others as well. The corridor will serve to meet the recreational needs that may arise from future increases in population and housing growth. Development of the corridor will provide a significant alternative route for equestrian, non-motorized, and foot transportation. The corridor will eventually provide an important link for future trail development between the downtown urban center, 40-mile Loop, Mt. Hood National Forest, and the Pacific Crest Trail.

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

## CHAPTER 3

### CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

Citizen involvement has been a key element in the development of this plan. The public was involved in several different ways, as outlined below:

#### A. Advisory committees

Early in the planning process, a citizen steering committee was appointed by the Project Managers in order to guide the decision-making process. This committee included one or two representatives from all of the various user groups that would be expected to have an interest in the final result of the plan: hikers, runners, bicyclists, mountain bikers, equestrians, the 40 Mile Loop Land Trust, Friends of Johnson Creek, the Johnson Creek Corridor Committee, neighborhood activists, adjacent property and business owners, and people with disabilities.

The role of the committee was to help synthesize input from the public-at-large, review the planning process and direct its results. Many of the innovative ideas for the plan and its implementation were originated by the thoughtful people who participated on the steering committee.

In addition, an agency committee was appointed in order to merge the efforts being expended by each agency toward the common goal of development of a plan and the plan's implementation. This committee included representatives of law enforcement agencies, Oregon State Parks and the U.S. Forest Service in addition to each of the jurisdictions most directly affected: METRO, Milwaukie, Gresham, Multnomah County and Clackamas County.

#### B. Public process

The public was involved in the development of this plan in many ways. The Bureau employed the following methods of outreach:

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

## Signage:

As soon as ownership of the property was transferred to the Bureau of Parks and Recreation, temporary signage was installed throughout the Corridor at street and bridge crossings. These signs offered a place to contact for further information, outlined use limitations ("No motorized vehicles. No dumping.") and dangers inherent in the existing conditions. Dozens of citizens contacted the City as a result of these signs.

## Newsletter:

A quarterly newsletter has been issued since May 1991. The newsletters are mailed to a mailing list of approximately 3000, which includes all properties located within 500' of the Corridor, elected officials, and people who called for more information. Newsletters are used to update citizens on progress, upcoming hearings, and issues of interest. They were also used to gather input on condition of the trail.

## Surveys:

Two surveys were conducted in 1991. The first was a door-to-door survey of all the residential properties located within 500' of the Corridor. Students from Portland State University designed the questionnaire, conducted the survey, and analyzed the results. A follow-up survey was mailed to commercial properties located within 500' of the Corridor. Questions were patterned very closely after the residential survey. These results were analyzed by the Bureau of Parks.

The survey revealed that neighbors are very supportive of recreational development along the Corridor. Results were quite similar between residential and commercial neighbors. When asked directly if they would like to see the corridor developed, over three-quarters (77%) said they would in both surveys.

Among residential neighbors, recreation, nature watching, and beautification were indicated by 67%, 59%, and 58% respectively of those desiring development. Those not wanting to see the corridor developed (23%) showed little agreement regarding specific reasons for opposing development. Concerns with vandalism, privacy, noise, litter, danger from others, and funding were quite minimal ranging from 10% to 16% of those opposed to development. The percentage of people who expect to use the corridor exceeds the percentage who want development, and varies by location within the corridor, from 79% between SE 39th - 82nd, to 89% between SE 82nd - I-205.

Among commercial neighbors, wildlife habitat improvements ranked highest at 68%, followed by bike trails and regular security patrols (65%) and trail connections to other parks at 61%. Again, similar to the residential results, the percentage of respondents that claim they will use the Corridor if developed (81%) exceeds the respondents wanting development. Walking was the greatest anticipated use, followed closely by biking and nature watching. Approximately 86% of the respondents anticipate that between one and 10 of their employees will use the corridor daily. Those opposed to development cited

# SPRING WATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

concern over vandalism and loss of privacy as reasons for the opposition. Litter and noise from the Corridor were also cited as concerns.

A full analysis of the surveys is included as Appendix C.

## Public Meetings:

Three rounds of public meetings were sponsored by the Bureau during the development of this plan. The first round, in October of 1991, was used to explain the project and the schedule, and develop goals and a list of concerns. Approximately 60 citizens attended these meetings. Their input on goals was synthesized and adopted by the citizen steering committee. A list of their concerns is included in Appendix D.

The second round, in May of 1992, was the forum for a presentation of the draft master plan. Approximately 40 citizens took part in three workshop sessions about the elements as presented. Conceptual plans for trailhead design and locations, trail surfacing, points of interest, and a phasing schedule were introduced. Citizen input was summarized (see Appendix E) and the plans were modified as directed by the citizen steering committee.

In the fall of 1992, this master plan was adopted by each affected jurisdiction. See Appendix F for a list of adoption dates.

## **C. Continuing public involvement**

This master plan is to be considered a starting point only. Because demographics and land uses, and how the Corridor is used will change after it is developed, there will be a need to re-visit and refine the master plan.

The biggest change anticipated at this time will come in the form of user conflict. This corridor, once developed, will undoubtedly be very popular. Not all user groups will co-exist harmoniously. User etiquette and regulations may need to be modified.

When this is considered, a similar steering committee and simplified public process should be conducted, in accordance with the goals adopted by this master plan.

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

## CHAPTER 4

### THE PLAN

#### A. Goals

The development of the Springwater Corridor Master Plan is in direct response to a set of goals established from citizens' input at the first round of public meetings. These goals are as follows:

- Preserve the linear integrity of the corridor. Acquire new lands adjacent to the corridor as available and as appropriate.
- Minimize conflicts between user groups as much as possible through design and a management plan.
- Celebrate and interpret the cultural and geographic history of the Corridor.
- Enhance and preserve the natural resources of the Corridor.
- Allow the Corridor to serve as an alternative transportation route.
- Provide a safe and inviting environment throughout the Corridor. Provide a high standard of maintenance.
- Serve the widest possible array of user groups.
- Utilize the Corridor to join the communities and recreation sites it travels through, by maximizing involvement opportunities in planning, developing and maintaining the Corridor.
- Maintain positive impacts to adjacent properties.

# SPRING WATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

- Provide for a range of recreational activities throughout the Corridor.
- Create funding options and develop a phasing plan to complete development as soon as possible.
- Develop a clear and comprehensive signage system in order to orient and educate users.
- Encourage responsible use of the Corridor with respect for adjacent properties.

Establishing these goals provides a means of addressing the wide array of community concerns received from public input and addressing those within the master plan development.

(Master Plan Diagram)

## C. Description of Major Plan Features

### Design theme

The general design theme will focus on showcasing the use of local materials, using recycled materials when possible. This Corridor will be distinctly Northwest, showing the use of local stone, plant materials, and workmanship.

### Trails

- **Multi-purpose trail:** A twelve foot wide, multi-purpose, hard surface trail with two foot wide soft shoulders will extend from the western end of the corridor east to Palmblad Road, the eastern edge of Gresham. The hard surface trail shall be designed to facilitate a wide range of uses including bicycles, wheelchairs, hiking, jogging, strollers, and walkers.
- **Equestrian trail:** An equestrian trail will be developed along the entire length of the corridor. Wherever possible the equestrian trail will be separated from the multi-purpose trail and reserved exclusively for equestrian use. This will reduce accidents between equestrians and faster moving bicyclists or other trail activities. A visible clear zone should be provided where the equestrian trail joins or intersects with the multi-purpose trail. The equestrian trail will be native soil topped with a bark peelings surface. West of 128th, special signage should be used to warn equestrian of hazardous road crossings at 122nd, Foster Road, 82nd and Johnson Creek Boulevard.

The equestrian trail should have a minimum horizontal clearance of 5'-0" and a minimum vertical clearance of 10'-0". All vegetation such as tree limbs, stumps,

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

etc. should be cleared from this area. At bridge crossings, a special rubberized matting should be used over the wood decking for improved safety of equestrians.

- Combined multi-purpose and equestrian trail: In a limited number of locations, the multi-purpose trail will need to merge with the equestrian trail. This happens at bridge crossings and steep canyon areas. In these situations, the multi-purpose trail will be reduced to a ten foot width paralleled by a six foot wide soft surface equestrian trail.
- Soft surface trail: A ten foot wide soft surface trail will extend from Palmlad Road south to Boring. This portion of the corridor passes through a rural, agricultural landscape that is in sharp contrast to the urbanized western end of the corridor. The development intent in this section is to harmonize with the surrounding rural character, minimize development impacts while providing a safe and useable corridor. Palmlad Road provides a convenient route for "skinny tired" bicycles to join with the Highway 26 bike route.

(Diagram trail sections)

## Trailheads

In order to provide public access and serve a wide diversity of users, trailheads should ideally be located approximately two and one-half miles apart along the corridor and in close proximity to public transportation. The one exception to this is the rural section between Palmlad Road and Boring, where minimum development is desirable. A total of eight trailheads are being proposed along the corridor. Four of these are within the Gresham city limits and are located at Linneman Junction, 10th Street, Main City Park and Hogan Avenue. Of these, the 10th Street trailhead will accommodate equestrians. Outside of Gresham, trailheads are proposed in the general proximity of the following street crossings: Johnson Creek Boulevard, SE 82nd Avenue, 128th Avenue and at Boring Junction. Of these trailheads, equestrian facilities will be provided at the 128th Avenue site and at Boring Junction. An existing trailhead on top of Powell Butte with equestrian facilities will provide additional access to the Springwater Corridor. Powell Butte has numerous hiking, mountain biking and equestrian trails that link directly with the Springwater Corridor. In addition, Beggar's Tick Marsh may have an opportunity for limited shared parking and a small trailhead facility.

Trailheads will include automobile parking, restrooms with maintenance/storage areas, lighting, a drinking fountain, at least two path connections to the corridor, picnic tables, garbage cans, recycle bins, bicycle parking, telephone and plantings for shade and aesthetics. Equestrian trailheads will have additional facilities including a staging area, horse watering trough, hitching posts, trailer parking, horse mounting ramps for physically challenged equestrians and horse waste composting bins. A separate equestrian trail should extend from the trailhead to the corridor to allow horses to "shake themselves out" before entering the main trail.

# SPRING WATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

Site improvements at trailheads should be designed with the physically challenged in mind. In addition to disabled parking spots, elements such as drinking fountains, curb cuts, vegetation, and interpretive signing must be carefully designed.

For security purposes, trailheads should be highly visible from the public right-of-way, located close to compatible businesses, (ideally with around-the-clock hours). Joint usage of trailheads with community policing efforts should be encouraged.

(Diagram trailhead)

One of the trailheads should be considered a "signature" trailhead. The signature trailhead will be advertised as the central entry point to the Corridor, and will be designed to be especially welcoming to new users. Ideally, this trailhead will be larger, have more picnic facilities, and be centrally located (as near to I-205 as possible).

In addition to trailheads, several neighborhood access points exist. These serve as informal access, primarily serving the immediate neighborhood and providing a limited amount of on-street parking. These typically occur where residential streets end at the corridor. The location of these areas will not be publicized. Minor improvements such as development of a connecting trail, vegetation management and minor signage will occur at these sites.

(Diagram neighborhood access points on MP.)

## Resource Interpretation

Visitor/Interpretive Centers are proposed at the Johnson Creek Boulevard and at the Boring Junction trailhead site. These centers will orient the trail user's and interpret the natural and cultural resources along the corridor.

The Boring Junction site will be the interim terminus of the corridor and will be developed as an historic theme park. As the name implies, the Boring Junction site has roots closely tied with the railroad. The site served as a rail stop from 1903 to 19--. Most of the surrounding buildings at this site have local historical significance. A historically designated church, the United Methodist Pioneer Chapel, will be moved to the site. The cultural resource interpretation opportunities will be developed at this site.

The Johnson Creek Boulevard site provides access to Johnson Creek at its western end. A waterfall and fish ladder built by the WPA are located at this site. The presence of Johnson Creek in this dense urban area is a unique resource and presents an excellent opportunity to interpret this natural resource. In addition, the ODF & W trout stocking program at this location makes the site an ideal recreation spot for fishing.

## Signage

## SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

Interpretive signage, directional and regulatory signage will form the basis of a comprehensive signage system. The design of signage should be coordinated as much as possible with the existing signage along the Gresham section. The Springwater Corridor logo should be incorporated as appropriate.

For signs to be effective, they must be clearly readable and easy to understand. Sign shape, color contrast, text and graphic choices, viewing distance and purpose of sign should all be considered in the signage design. Signs should be simple and concise. Signs should compliment the trail experience, not dominate it. Signs should be selectively used and their number should be held to a minimum along the trail. Signs should be grouped together.

- Interpretive signs will be installed at trailheads and at points of interest to raise the public's awareness to the numerous cultural and natural resources found on the corridor. These will be the largest signs used on the corridor. One panel will be devoted to Johnson Creek and the Springwater Corridor. A "You are Here" map, which includes other destinations, will be incorporated into this panel. The remainder of the sign will be devoted to the interpretation of the specific site. Sites selected for interpretation include Tideman Johnson Park, the original Johnson family settlement (near SE 100th), Beggar's Tick Marsh, Powell Butte Nature Park, rail station buildings such as Lents Junction, Bell Station and Boring Junction. Additional interpretation opportunities will include wildlife habitat, wetlands, Johnson Creek and geologic features. Interpretive signs should be placed at least four feet off of the main trail to allow groups of people a safe reading area with minimum disruption on the trail.

(Map showing interpretive areas)

- Directional signage will inform the trail users of significant trail connections to adjacent recreation sites such as Powell Butte, Johnson Creek Park and the I-205 bike route.
- Regulatory signage will be used to ensure a greater level of public safety. Potential hazard signs will be placed at road crossings and bridges. Stop signs and stop ahead signs will be used on all road crossings, except private drives. Yield signs will be used on private drives (the trail users will have the right-of-way). Caution signs will be placed on other areas of the trail where potential hazards exist. Standard shapes and colors will be used for regulatory trail signs (a red octagon to be used for "stop", a yellow triangle for "yield", etc.), but the signs will be proportionately smaller to be consistent with the scale and design speed of the trail. These signs should borrow from the standardized shapes, colors and wording from transportation signs. It is critical that regulatory signs be placed in a visually clear area with good sight distance.

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

Bridges will require special signage because all users, including equestrians, must share a single width. Trail etiquette signage will be used throughout the Corridor, but especially at bridges, using text and graphics for the clearest message.

- Mileage markers will be placed at one-half mile intervals, based upon the historic rail mile markers. These will provide the trail user's with a sense of orientation along the entire route of the corridor. These will be located at the edge of the trail and routed into a 6" X 6" post.

(Diagram signage types)

## Johnson Creek Access

The Springwater Corridor roughly parallels Johnson Creek and crosses it ten times. In most cases however, Johnson Creek is not within the corridor right-of-way. Access to the creek is limited by steep banks and wetland areas. Due to the sensitive nature of the creek edge, physical access will not be encouraged. Visual access to the creek and opportunities for environmental education will be encouraged. The one exception to limiting physical access will be at SE 45th where spring fishing will be accommodated. The ODF & W stocks the Creek with rainbow trout at this location. (Significant views need to be identified and noted on MP!!!)

## Fish and Wildlife

The corridor has an average width of one hundred feet and has been significantly altered by human intervention. Despite Johnson Creek's proximity, the Creek and its associated wetland areas have been subjected to the forces of urbanization, flood control efforts and agricultural development, compromising the corridor's functional value to wildlife. However, perhaps even more significant to wildlife than the corridor itself is the natural areas that it passes along its 16.5 mile length.

Within the urbanized southeast Portland area, the corridor links together several open space/natural areas. These include from west to east, the Willamette River, Tideman Johnson Park, Beggar's Tick Marsh and Powell Butte. Additionally, the corridor passes by numerous undeveloped sites that provide wildlife habitat. (there are several other "natural/undeveloped areas along the route that serve as important wildlife habitat need to id those too - Ed's Park, Foster Farm)

With rapid loss of remaining open space to urbanization, the corridor plays an increasingly vital role to wildlife. Forming a link between these natural areas, the corridor supplements the remaining open space and serves as a wildlife migration corridor. This link creates an opportunity for wildlife in isolated pockets of open space to strengthen their gene pool thereby increasing their bio-diversity.

## SPRING WATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

Designated wildlife observation areas will be located in ecologically rich areas such as wetlands and the creek edge. Habitat enhancement projects will be undertaken in these areas. Interpretive signage will play an important role in public education at these sites.

(Map)

Current efforts are underway by the City of Portland, Bureau of Environmental Services and the Johnson Creek Corridor Committee to improve the water quality, flood control and ecological balance of Johnson Creek. The Springwater Corridor roughly paralleling Johnson Creek along its entire length provides the recreational component to this effort. The existence of the Springwater Corridor increases the exposure of Johnson Creek to the public, thereby increasing the number of "stream-keepers."

(Need to id some projects in this area - coord. with BES)

### Vegetation

Portland General Electric (PGE) maintains two overhead power lines on the perimeter of both sides of the corridor, running its entire length. Over the years, PGE's maintenance program has been to cut down any vegetation reaching a height of 15'. This practice is necessary for safety reasons, but has resulted in a lack of any large trees along the corridor. PGE will maintain this practice indefinitely. In the long term, burying the lines underground should be pursued. Currently this option is not considered feasible by PGE.

Himalayan Blackberry is the resulting dominant vegetation type along the corridor, thriving in open, disturbed landscapes. It is resilient and presents an ongoing maintenance challenge. Its rapid growth is capable of overgrowing and closing off the corridor in a single growing season. Blackberries serve a minor role in providing wildlife habitat, but due to the maintenance burden they create, they should be removed as much as possible. Replanting with a low growing, native scrub type vegetation will attract a greater diversity of wildlife and not interfere with the overhead PGE lines. Use of native trees and shrubs of limited height will be emphasized. Lowered maintenance costs is a further benefit for the use of native plant material. Additionally, in conjunction with the JCCC's efforts to restore Johnson Creek, riparian plantings along the creek should be re-established.

The main design theme of the Corridor will be the riparian corridor. This feature ties together historic and on-going values of the Creek. It will be a wonderful opportunity to educate the public about the diverse and attractive plants that are native to the area. Despite the strong emphasis on native plants, the palette will not be strictly limited to natives. For example, some of the more urbanized sections of the Corridor may require a different design treatment.

Vegetation will also help to define the Corridor's boundaries and protect the privacy of our neighbors. Plants can be effective screens and are more visually appealing than a long line of fences.

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

(List of acceptable plant materials from PGE, include wetland plants)

## Bridges (Any other bridges west of McLoughlin)

There are eleven trestles along the 16.5 mile length of the corridor. Almost all of these trestles have been retro-fitted with basic safety improvements including decking and handrails. Based on an engineers report (see Appendix G) the sub-structure to these trestles are sound. Design loads for the decking have been figured on the basis of accepting loads of maintenance and emergency vehicles. Bridges numbers 5 and 6, adjacent to Tideman Johnson Park have concrete slab sub-decking and are currently surfaced with gravel. These two bridges will be hard surface treated to match the multi-purpose trail hard surface treatment. All bridges will need to accommodate equestrian usage. Recycled rubber matting will be placed on a portion of these bridge surfaces to accommodate the added wear from equestrians. Railings will extend perpendicular to the ends of the bridges since these areas have abrupt drop offs from the bridge abutments.

(Diagram bridge)

## Intersections

The Springwater Corridor is unique because it does not fall into a road right-of-way. This eliminates conflicts between trail users and automobiles as found on most roadway bike lanes. The corridor does however intersect with several roads. These intersections must be addressed in order to increase trail user safety and minimize conflicts. With the anticipated growth in the Portland metropolitan region and resulting increased automobile traffic, this situation will only become more aggravated.

All intersections pose a degree of hazard to the public and therefore reduce the quality experience of the trail user. As a general rule, the total number of crossings along the route of the corridor should be held to an absolute minimum.

Minimal improvements at all intersections shall include: vehicle control bollards, center bollard removable for maintenance and emergency vehicles, removal or thinning of vegetation to increase visibility, use of natural basalt boulders as needed to control vehicle access around the intersection, stop signs, striping and "XING" wording.

- Major Intersections: There are five major intersections along the Springwater Corridor. These are located at Johnson Creek Boulevard, 82nd Avenue, Foster Road, 122nd Avenue and Eastman Parkway (which is in Gresham). These are considered major intersections because of the high volume of traffic they receive and the resulting high degree of difficulty in crossing. Major safety improvements at this type of intersection shall include thermal plastic pedestrian cross walks, signage forewarning motorists of the approaching corridor as well as signage forewarning trail users of the approaching intersection, pedestrian activated signal crossings and where roadway width allows, pedestrian refuge median islands.

# SPRING WATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

Foster Road is particularly dangerous because of the extreme angle at which the two intersect. In ideal circumstances, the trail system should meet the roadway at a 90 degree angle if possible.

In the long term, grade change separations should be developed at these intersections.

(Diagram major intersection)

- **Minor Intersections:** There are 28 minor intersections along the Springwater Corridor. (Need to list these out, there's a lot of them include improvements). Minor intersections are defined as crossings at public roadways that due to their low traffic volume and minimal width, they present a low degree of difficulty in crossing. These intersections will be treated similar to the major intersections with the deletion of the pedestrian activated signals. Some of the more challenging intersections to cross in this category will receive flashing warning lights.

(Diagram minor intersections)

- **Private Drives:** Private drives are defined as vehicle crossings that serve a private citizen or a group of citizens, typically providing access to private property. Where these are deemed necessary, the party filing the crossing permit shall make all necessary safety improvements for the crossings. These improvements shall include but not be limited to removable bollards, stop signs (with the driveway user stopping), raised trail surface with warning striping and placement of basalt boulders as needed to control unauthorized vehicle access. Individuals are urged to contact their local transportation department for additional requirements. (See Chapter 5A, "Property Management").

(Diagram private drives)

## Site Furniture

Benches should be located along the trail at strategic locations, to capitalize on views and to provide a rest station. Ideally, some benches will be sited at cool, shady locations. Benches, trash receptacles, etc., will be made of vandal-resistant materials, emphasizing the use of metal to reflect the inter-urban train era. Trash receptacles at trailheads will allow for recycling.

## Public Outreach

Throughout the master plan development, public input opportunities have been maximized and the final master plan is a direct result of this input. Public outreach will continue upon completion of the construction phase of the corridor. It is a high priority to the Park Bureau and to governing jurisdictions that the built project fulfills the needs of the trail users. Survey boxes will be installed at trailhead locations to get updated input from trail users. Park staff will have an on site presence at the trail interpretive centers to talk

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

directly with trail users. An informational brochure will be developed and distributed to the public to raise public awareness of the corridor.

## D. Implementation

### Relationship Between Local Jurisdictions

The corridor passes through five local jurisdictions which include Clackamas County, Multnomah County, Gresham, Portland and Milwaukie. East of Boring, the Springwater Corridor is under State Parks jurisdiction and beyond Estacada the corridor is under the jurisdiction of Mt. Hood National Forest. Specific agencies from these jurisdictions that have been actively involved in the master plan development of the corridor include transportation, environmental services, police and parks and recreation.

The cities of Gresham and Portland have an inter-governmental agreement in place that defines roles and responsibilities for each city in regards to the Springwater Corridor. Agreements between Portland and the other involved jurisdictions will occur as funding possibilities become more defined.

The Metropolitan Service District has increased involvement of local jurisdictions through their quarterly Parks Forum meetings and the Greenspaces program. Systems such as natural resources and extensive trail systems are especially important to plan on a regional basis.

### Development Priorities

Safety improvements are the immediate priority for development on the corridor. Specifically, the bridges and intersections along the corridor pose serious public hazards. Only after these improvements are complete can the corridor be safe and useable by the public.

In general terms, trail development shall proceed from a west to east direction. The western end of the corridor passes through a dense urban area and has the greatest potential to serve a wide segment of the population. The one exception to this "west to east rule" is the portion of corridor within Gresham's city limits. Gresham has secured funding through a bond measure and is proceeding with development of 1.75 miles of trail during the summer of 1992.

An implementation phasing plan is as follows:

- Immediate, Summer 1992
  - Bridge decking and handrails
  - Street crossings signage
- Surfacing Experiment:
  - Install six different surfaces and a survey user box between I-205 and SE Flavel

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

- Summer 1993
  - Trail development between Powell Butte and Gresham(Diagram immediate phase)
  
- Phase I
  - Basic Safety Improvements
    - Bollards at intersections
    - Signalized crossings
  - Acquisitions
    - Missing link in Boring
    - Missing link between McLoughlin and SE 17th
    - Trailhead locations
  - Basic user improvements
    - Multi-purpose trail surfacing between McLoughlin and Powell Butte
    - Equestrian trail development between McLoughlin and Powell Butte
    - Signage between McLoughlin and Powell Butte
    - Planting between McLoughlin and Powell Butte
    - Development of centrally located "Signature Trailhead"(Diagram phase I improvements)
  
- Phase II
  - Corridor Development
    - Improvements at two trailheads
    - Equestrian trail between Boring and Powell Butte
    - Soft surface trail between Gresham and Boring
    - Signage between Gresham and Boring
    - Planting between Gresham and Boring(Diagram phase II improvements)
  
- Phase III
  - Corridor Development
    - Improvements at one trailhead
    - Connection to Willamette Greenway(Diagram phase III improvements)

## Funding Strategies

Some federal grants are available, sometimes from unlikely sources. Both Gresham and Portland have been successful in securing small Land & Water Conservation fund grants for development of the Springwater Corridor. A potentially large amount of federal money may become available for Springwater from Federal Highway funds through the Oregon Department of Transportation for newly eligible "enhancement activities" (one of which is rails-to-trails conversions). This source, known as the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) was initiated by Congress in late 1991 and is

## **SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN**

presently the most likely source of funding for development. Projects from around the state will be ranked by priority in late 1992; the Springwater Corridor was submitted to the Oregon Department of Transportation as the #1 priority of the metropolitan area by METRO's JPACT (Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation). If funding is approved, it will provide 80% or more of the requested Phase 1 improvements; the remaining 20% must be supplied by local sources.

The cities of Gresham and Portland have each been successful in passing a parks levy within the last five years. In a general way, these have provided the funds for many regional park projects, such as the Springwater Corridor and Gresham's greenway system. Unfortunately, both levies were three year serial levies that are now expired. Neither city is proposing another levy in the near future.

The North Clackamas Parks & Recreation District was formed in November, 1990, by voter approval of a permanent addition to the tax base. Funds from this tax are being used for NCPRD's park planning effort, some site acquisition, and development of a swim center and regional park. The funds will also be used for some operations and maintenance costs.

The Metropolitan Service District (Metro) is proposing a general obligation bond measure to be placed on the November, 1992 ballot. If this measure is successful, it will provide \$ 200 million for natural area acquisition and trails development throughout the region. The Springwater Corridor is recognized as a regionally significant trail system in the Greenspaces Plan. The main thrust of the measure is to secure funds for acquisition significant natural resource/open spaces; approximately 25% of the generated amount will be distributed among local jurisdictions for local unrestricted use.

Other possibilities include more entrepreneurial activities that are compatible with park development. An example of this would include underground fiber optic cables that pay rent for their use of the corridor. Also funding through donations from private foundations, friends groups, and federal block grant funds are all possibilities.

Friends groups and volunteers have already been a source for donated labor. A Youth Conservation Corps crew spent last summer assisting with maintenance operations such as brush control and litter pick-up along the Corridor. A Marine reserve unit was responsible for decking and hand-rails on several of the bridges.

Feb 1950  
 00072  
 1.5 Mile  
 RR Co

## SPRING WATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

### Cost Estimate

The following is a "ball park figure" for construction based upon the implementation phasing plan previously covered:

- Immediate Phase

| <u>Item</u>                                 | <u>Qty &amp; Unit Cost</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|---|----------------------------|--------------|
| Trail development - Powell Butte to Gresham | 63,360 SF @ \$1.75/SF      | 110,880      |
| Surface Experiment                          | 31,680 SF @ \$1.50/SF      | 47,520       |
| Trestle Repairs                             | Engineer's estimate        | 165,000      |
| Gresham 1.75 miles trail dev.               |                            |              |

### TOTAL IMMEDIATE PHASE

- Phase I

| <u>Item</u>                        | <u>Qty &amp; Unit Cost</u>    | <u>Total</u> |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| Trailhead site acquisition         | 4 @ \$130,000                 | 520,000      |
| Land acquisition (Boring)          | Allowance                     | 100,000      |
| Land acquisition (SE 17th)         | Allowance                     | 400,000      |
| Intersection control bollards      | 256 @ \$225 each              | 57,600       |
| Intersection crossing:             |                               |              |
| Striped only                       | 14 @ \$6,000 each             | 84,000       |
| Flashing light                     | 14 @ \$25,000 each            | 350,000      |
| Full signal                        | 4 @ \$60,000 each             | 240,000      |
| Hard surface trail (6 miles @ 12') | 390,000 SF @ \$1.75/SF        | 682,500      |
| Signage                            | Allowance                     | 25,000       |
| Planting (trees and shrubs)        | Allowance                     | 120,000      |
| Trailhead Parking                  | 1 @ \$50,000                  | 50,000       |
| Restroom                           | 1 @ \$110,000                 | 110,000      |
| Lighting                           | 12 @ \$2,800                  | 33,600       |
| Equestrian Trail Development       | 29,040 LF @ \$1.55/SF         | 45,012       |
| Gresham's improvements             | Allowance                     | 339,200      |
| Planning/Consultant                | Allowance (4% of const. cost) | 200,000      |

### TOTAL - PHASE I

**\$3,356,912**

- Phase II

| <u>Item</u>                        | <u>Qty &amp; Unit Cost</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| Hard surface trail (6 miles @ 12') | 390,000 SF @ \$1.75/SF     | 682,500      |
| Equestrian trail (5.5 miles)       | 29,040 LF @ \$1.55/LF      | 45,012       |
| Trailhead parking                  | 2 @ \$40,000 each          | 80,000       |

## SPRING WATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

|  |                    |             |
|--|--------------------|-------------|
| Restrooms  | 2 @ \$110,000 each | 220,000     |
| Lighting (parking areas)   | 24 @ 2,800 each    | 67,200      |
| Signage  | Allowance          | 25,000      |
| Planting   | Allowance          | 240,000     |
| Gresham's completion (Phase 3-8)   | Allowance          | \$1,060,800 |
| <i>• includes 2.75 miles of asphalt and equestrian trail, bridge undercrossing, 2 trailheads and trail furnishings</i> |                    |             |

**TOTAL - PHASE II** **\$2,420,512**

• Phase III

| <u>Item</u>                                 | <u>Qty &amp; Unit Cost</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|---|----------------------------|--------------|
| Shared use of E. Portland Traction Co:      |                            |              |
| Fencing                                     | 23,760 LF @ \$20/LF        | 475,200      |
| Hard surface trail                          | 285,120 SF @ \$2.25/SF     | 641,520      |
| Trailhead parking                           | 1 @ \$40,000               | 40,000       |
| Restrooms                                   | 1 @ \$110,000              | 110,000      |
| Lighting (parking areas)                    | 12 @ \$2,800 each          | 33,600       |
| Tideman Johnson Park To Johnson Creek Park: |                            |              |
| Street system                               | Allowance                  | 1,000        |
| Signage                                     | Allowance                  | 25,000       |

**TOTAL - PHASE III** **\$1,456,920**

**GRAND TOTAL** **\$6,703,744**

(Need adjustment factor for inflation, trailhead parking areas need definition as to number of parking spaces provided. This may increase cost. This assumes 24 per trailhead which is most likely low.)

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

## CHAPTER 5 MANAGEMENT

"A successful rail trail involves more than simple acquisition of a rail corridor and initial preparation of the roadbed and structures for one or more varieties of trail use; it also entails managing the corridor to maximize its recreational and conservation benefits for the public and to protect it from various kinds of incompatible encroachments. Because of the "stringbean" nature of the corridor, a rail trail park is especially prone to pleas and threats from potentially deleterious non-park uses. Protecting the park accordingly poses a challenge, and requires careful attention to policies and procedures relating to non-rail trail and non-park uses."<sup>5</sup>

In addition, a high standard of maintenance is a key ingredient in a successful project that cannot be over-stressed. Goal #5 states, "provide a safe and inviting environment throughout the Corridor. Provide a high standard of maintenance." The psychological effect of good maintenance can be a highly effective deterrent to vandalism and littering.

### A. Property management

A separate set of policies and procedures that outline the details of property management for the Springwater Corridor is being developed and will be adopted by City Council. Elements of the policy are summarized below:

#### Crossings

Each motorized vehicle crossing of the Corridor presents an interruption to the Corridor users and a potential hazard. For this reason, approval for new crossing agreements will be limited to those that are absolutely necessary, such as adjacent property owners with no other access to their property. Existing crossings will be formalized with new agreements, and where possible, will be consolidated with other crossings. Existing and new crossing agreements will be considered and pay a fee based on land value and impact.

---

<sup>5</sup> from "Protecting Your Rail Trail: Management Considerations and Strategies" , an unpublished report from the Rails to Trails Conservancy, January 1990.

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

New public road easements will be issued to local units of government for road purposes provided grade separation is maintained. This includes all public road crossings. The grade separation requirement may be waived by the City under extenuating circumstances.

## Acquisition

Development of the Corridor to its full potential requires acquisition of some key additional property. One important purpose is to close two "missing links", one at each end of the City-owned section: between SE McLoughlin and SE 17th to connect to the Willamette Greenway, and between D Street in Boring and the beginning of the State-owned section. The other important purpose is to provide trailhead facilities at selected locations. It is important to acquire additional property as soon as possible since real estate prices generally increase each year and potential sites are limited.

## LAND ACQUISITION POTENTIALS

|               |                          |          |
|---------------|--------------------------|----------|
| Missing links | SE McLoughlin to SE 17th | ___ Ac.  |
|               | Boring                   | 0.25 Ac. |

|            |               |
|------------|---------------|
| Trailheads | near SE 45th  |
|            | near SE 82nd  |
|            | near SE 136th |

When necessary, the first choice for a strategy to acquire property will be to first take advantage of any tax delinquent property, or property owned by another public agency, if possible. This strategy will be used to develop a small trailhead at Beggar's Tick Marsh, which is owned by Multnomah County.

The next choice will be to have trailheads located on private property. This may be possible where an adjacent property owner requires concessions on the Springwater Corridor, such as a building encroachment or a motor vehicle crossing.

Finally, where outright purchase is necessary, the City will consider sales from willing sellers that do not displace residential uses. A donation will be requested before cash is spent for property. Selling land to the City will follow a carefully structured procedure based on independent appraisals of fair market value. This protects constitutional property rights with the right of appeal to the courts by either party. Negotiations for purchase are based on appraised values.

## Encroachments

The illegal use of public land by private landowners will not be tolerated. The City of Portland, as property owner, will act immediately to establish and mark boundaries and to resolve problems of encroachment.

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

In some cases, a pre-existing agreement with the Portland Traction Company granted land use rights over the former railroad property. Each of the old agreements will be reviewed and, if appropriate, re-negotiated with land owners. In cases where the land has historically been used for permanent structures, new agreements can be considered appropriate because the cost of moving these structures is usually high. Land exchange may be an equitable and permanent solution for all parties based on the concept of value for value.

## Utilities / shared usage

In some cases, compatible utility and shared usage agreements may be of benefit to both the Springwater Corridor and the requesting party. For example, underground fiber optic cables would not interrupt use of the Corridor while providing an annual rental fee for maintenance of the Corridor. Utilities may not be granted exclusive use of the Corridor but would be expected to share use with other compatible and even competing utilities.

## Rules and enforcement

In general, the initial set of rules proposed for the Corridor will stress courtesy and cooperation with other users rather than a restrictive set of edicts. The rules are outlined below:

- **Using a path.** Every person using a path shall travel as near to the right side of the path as is safe, excepting as may be appropriate while preparing to make or making turning movements or while overtaking and passing another user proceeding in the same direction.
- **Overtaking path users on the left.** Any path user overtaking another user proceeding in the same direction shall pass to the left of such overtaken user at a safe distance and shall not again move to the right until safely clear of overtaken users.
- **Audible signal when passing.** Every user shall give an audible warning signal before passing another user of any mode. Signal must be first produced five seconds before executing the passing maneuver. Signal may be produced by voice, bell or horn and must be clearly audible for 100 feet.
- **Regard for other path users.** Every user shall exercise due care and caution to avoid colliding with any other path user of any mode. Every user shall travel in a consistent and predictable manner.
- **Groups on path.** No group of path users, including their animal(s), shall span more than half the path, measured from the right side, so as to impede the normal and reasonable movement of other path users.

## SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

- **Entering and crossing path.** User entering or crossing a path at uncontrolled points shall yield to traffic on the path.
- **Lights on path users.** Every user shall be equipped with lights, when using a path at any time from a half hour after sunset to a half hour before sunrise and at any other time of insufficient light or unfavorable atmospheric conditions. Bicyclists shall be equipped with a light which shall emit a white light visible from a distance of 500' to the front, and a red or amber light visible from a distance of 500' to the rear. All other path users shall be equipped with a light which shall emit a white light visible from a distance of 250' to the front, and a red or amber light visible from a distance of 250' to the rear.
- **Alcohol or other drugs.** A person shall not travel or be present on a path with an alcohol concentration in his blood or breath of 0.08 or more based on the definition of blood and breath units; or under the influence of alcohol or any drug or combination of drugs to an extent that the person's ability to use the path safely is impaired to a substantial degree.
- **Debris.** No person shall throw or deposit or allow to be thrown or deposited, any glass bottle, glass, nails, tacks, wire, cans or any other substance or debris, including animal waste. Any person who drops, or permits to be dropped or thrown, any material shall immediately remove the same or cause it to be removed.

This trial set of rules is based on successful projects in other areas. At this time, it is not proposed to adopt a speed limit or a set of hours for the Corridor to be open. Trailheads, however, will be closed and locked consistent with the hours for City parks.

The most effective and most visible enforcement on the Springwater Corridor will be other trail users. In addition, a citizen's foot patrol has already been at work along the corridor, stopping motorcycle use and hoping to prevent illegal use before the Corridor is developed. The foot patrol is backed up by a group from PUMP (Portland Urban Mountain Pedallers). A patrol's primary function is to provide assistance and information, not to apprehend criminals. If a serious crime does occur, members of the patrol can get assistance from the emergency 911 network.

Patrol personnel should perform positive trail functions as much as possible--distributing maps and brochures, providing information, offering bicycle safety checks for children and performing other service-oriented activities. Security personnel should use a bicycle, foot, or horse to patrol a trail, not a motorized vehicle. Users respond more favorably to someone whose appearance is more like a "trail user" than a law enforcement officer.

In addition, the Multnomah County Mounted Posse is negotiating for a home base location on or near the Springwater Corridor. They have committed to making regular patrols of the Corridor. The sheriff's office in each county along the Corridor will be asked to aid

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

in control of trail use. The Parks Bureau Trail Manager will also be a regular presence on the Corridor. Adjacent landowners and trail users are encouraged to report violations to either the Trails Manager or the local law enforcement agencies.

The rules and regulations will be posted conspicuously at trailheads and any other necessary locations along the Corridor. Trail brochures, "safety days" (which involve volunteer user group presentations), and meetings with user groups will also help inform users of the regulations.

## B. Property maintenance

Maintenance is just as important as property acquisition and development. It includes such activities as pavement stabilization, landscape maintenance, facility upkeep, sign replacement, fencing, mowing and weed control. However, the effects of a good maintenance program are not limited to the physical and biological features of the Corridor:

- A high standard of maintenance is an effective way of helping advertise and promote the Corridor as a state recreational resource (word of mouth advertising is best);
- The psychological effect of good maintenance can be an effective deterrent to vandalism, litter, and encroachment;
- Good maintenance is necessary to preserve positive public relations between the adjacent landowners and government;
- Good maintenance can help make enforcement of the Corridor more efficient. Local clubs and interest groups will take pride in "their" trail and will be more apt to assist in the protection of the Corridor.

Thus, an effective maintenance program in the region is to achieve its goals for the Springwater Corridor.

A successful maintenance program requires continuity and a high level of citizen involvement. Regular, routine maintenance on a year-to-year basis will not only ensure trail safety, but will also prolong the life of the trail. Maintenance activities required for safe trail operation should always receive top priority. The following tasks should be part of a maintenance checklist:

### Surfacing

At this point in time, a final selection for the multi-purpose hard surface paving material has not been made. The selection will be based on the results of a user survey of a

## SPRING WATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

variety of innovative materials that are installed in the Corridor after the test samples have been in place for six months. The materials under consideration include a soil stabilizer, a concrete mix, a fly ash mix, a clay mix, and crushed stone. These materials should produce a hard surface that is accessible to a variety of users, less expensive than asphalt, and less expensive to repair (they may even be repaired by volunteer crews). The unknown factor at this time is their durability, especially under wet conditions and heavy use.

No matter what material is chosen, cracks, ruts, and water damage will have to be repaired periodically. In addition, vegetative control will be necessary on a regular basis. Some of the innovative surfaces may require an annual dragging.

Erosion control of the railbed will be necessary in several areas that have drainage problems. It may be necessary to maintain ditches and culverts to help drain these areas and prevent water from pooling in heavy rains. Checks for erosion should be made monthly during other regular maintenance activities, and especially during the winter months.

The surface will have to be kept free of debris, especially broken glass and other sharp objects, loose gravel, leaves and stray branches. Trail edges will have to be swept frequently to keep them from ravelling.

### Weed control

On-going efforts will be made to reduce the amount of Himalayan blackberries growing throughout the Corridor, but it is recognized that total control is beyond the resources of governing agencies and volunteers. An annual mowing along both sides of the center line is necessary to help check invasion. For long term weed control, native vegetation and other plants will be reestablished on the Corridor by mechanical seeding and planting to shade out undesirable weed species and improve wildlife habitat.

Wherever possible, weed control will be accomplished by mechanical methods. Innovative weed control methods such as controlled grazing (sheep controlled by a shepherd) and steaming should be explored. The application of chemical sprays will be limited to use on those plants listed as *Harmful Plants on Portland Plant List* (see Appendix H), including Poison-hemlock, Golden chain tree, Poison Oak, Garden Nightshade, and Stinging Nettle. In any case, no chemical sprays will be applied within 25' of Johnson Creek or a water feature.

### Litter

Litter along the Corridor will be removed by Parks or volunteer crews. Litter receptacles will be placed at access points and trailheads. Litter will be picked up twice a week during summer months, (just before and after a weekend) and once a week during the winter.

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

## Signage

Signage will have to be replaced along the Corridor on an as-needed basis. A monthly check on the status of signage should be performed with follow-up as necessary.

## Trestles

An engineer's report on the structural capacities of the existing wood trestles (see Appendix G) recommends an annual visual inspection of each of the trestles.

## Culverts

All of the existing culverts should be cleared of vegetation and debris once annually. The inspection should be taken place before winter rains.

## Fencing

The use of fencing for boundary control is strongly discouraged. The first preference will be to plant shrubs, trees, and use temporary fencing to establish privacy. Assuming need can be demonstrated, and funds are available, governing jurisdictions may absorb up to one-half the cost of construction of fences for residential neighbors. Parks and adjacent landowners must, however, sign an agreement which describes their duties and responsibilities for the construction of the fence. Commercial and business neighbors will be required to fund fence construction in entirety. Where the fence is needed to protect the property of the Corridor and/or users of the property, the governing jurisdictions will construct their share of the fence and require the adjacent property owners to construct their share of the fence.

## Trailheads

The specialized facilities at trailheads will require frequent inspection and maintenance. Restrooms must be cleaned on a daily basis. Site furniture and lighting should be kept in good repair. Trash receptacles should be emptied daily during high use periods.

## Public involvement

Trail user organizations, community groups, civic organizations and businesses should be invited to provide periodic maintenance work along the Corridor as a means of improving trail safety, keeping maintenance costs down and building good will with people living adjacent to the trail.

Trail users and neighbors can be encouraged to monitor and report maintenance problems and requests along the Corridor. "Improvement Request Forms" should be available at trailheads, through user organizations and at bicycle shops. Request forms should include the same maintenance items that are covered in the routine maintenance check list.

## Maintenance/Operations implications

Currently, the Springwater Corridor is being minimally maintained by Parks Bureau personnel on an "asset protection" basis, with assistance from a Youth Conservation Corps and volunteer crews. This is not an acceptable long-term arrangement. As Corridor

## SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

development is completed, a Trails Manager should be assigned to the Corridor. The primary duties of this position would be to regulate trail use, coordinate volunteers, and maintain the trail. The Trails Manager would report to a maintenance supervisor. A seasonal laborer and the necessary equipment should be assigned under this position also. The personnel assigned to the Corridor would be based at a trailhead / information center.

On-going maintenance could be partially offset if adequate utility lease agreements are arranged, or license or easement fees are available. Other possibilities include "adopt-a-trail" sections by adjacent businesses or business associations. Volunteer labor has been extensively used in the past and can be counted on for continued support, especially with items such as litter control and planting parties.

One other possibility is a "trail use fee day", where volunteers charge for use of the Corridor (on a voluntary basis) in order to establish a maintenance endowment fund.

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

## CHAPTER 6

### EVALUATION

Throughout the master plan development of the Springwater Corridor, public input has been sought in order to identify public needs and concerns and arrive at a design that best addresses these needs. The Park Bureau views this project as the beginning of a long term relationship with the adjacent communities. This effort will continue upon completion of the construction phase of the project. Though a great deal of survey data has been gathered to anticipate the type of activities the trail will receive, the real test will happen after the trail is built. It is critical to the success of the trail that after it is constructed an on going post construction evaluation process begins. This will provide important data as to the actual use versus anticipated use of the corridor and begin to reveal what works and what doesn't work.

The following is a partial list of questions that should be answered by this evaluation process:

- What are the trail user characteristics?
- What are the trail use patterns and how do they vary along different sections of the trail?
- What user conflicts are there, if any? (Between trail users groups, neighbors, vehicles, etc.)
- How has the trail impacted surrounding neighborhoods and other land uses?
- How has public use of the trail impacted Johnson Creek?
- What is the reaction to the physical nature of the trail?
- Are additional access points needed?

#### Evaluation Strategies

##### Determining Trail User Characteristics:

In order to determine existing use of the trail, a trail traffic count will need to be conducted. The following evaluation methodology is loosely based on a study, *King County, Commuting & Recreational Trail Use Analysis: Burke-Gilman Trail, Sammamish River Trail*, prepared by the International Bicycle Fund, in 1985. The trail monitoring procedure will consist of observing and counting trail users within a discrete time frame and location. Month, day of week and time of day should be recorded as well as weather conditions. The count should make record of the type (biker, walker, jogger, etc.), description (age, sex) and number of users, direction of travel and surface traveled on. These trail user counts could be done by volunteer groups such as the Friends of

# SPRINGWATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

Springwater Corridor or arrangements could be made with local college survey/sociology classes. Monitoring should take place at varying days of the week, time of day and at different locations along the trail.

## Trail Use Patterns, Conflicts and Impacts

To obtain data on specific trail use patterns, a questionnaire should be developed that has the objective of the following:

- Determine the purpose of the trip
- Determine where the user began and ended their trip
- Determine how far users tend to travel on the trail and the pattern of traffic flow
- Determine the frequency and type of accidents occurring on the trails
- Determine the socio-economic characteristics of users of the trail
- Collect comments and criticisms about the physical nature of the trail from those using them and adjacent residents

During the early phases of the master plan development, Portland State University students were very effective in conducting a door to door survey of adjacent residents. A similar means of distribution could be used for this post construction evaluation questionnaire. Direct, on-trail distribution could also be utilized.

## Public Input

To a large extent, satisfaction of both the adjacent land owners and trail user's will determine the trail success. These citizen's should have an opportunity to voice thier concerns and solicit comments to be included in the evaluation process. An annual or bi-annual meeting should be held with these user groups to gather input into the ongoing management of the trail.

## Environmental Impacts

Johnson Creek, roughly paralleling the corridor along its entire length, is an amenity to the trail but is also a sensitive ecological resource. In order to protect this resource, various aspects of the trail should be monitored.

## Trail Surfacing

The experimental trail surfacing to be constructed in the immediate construction phase, should be monitored for any hazardous leachate materials. This test section will extend from the I-205 bike route to Flavel Drive and proposes the use on several trail surfacing materials that have not been used extensively in the past. Concerns have been expressed over the potential leachate material from fly ash, a powder like bi-product from coal burning power plant that has similar properties to concrete. Each trail surfacing section should be monitored and the results of this monitoring should weigh heavily in the final trail surfacing selection.

# SPRING WATER CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

## Public Impacts

With the development of the corridor, and the arrival of trail users, the potential of public misuse of the creek may increase. The presence of water acts as a natural draw for most people. But due to the environmental sensitivity of the creek and associated wetland, access is discouraged. Loss of fragile riparian vegetation, bank erosion, contamination of creek water from excessive fecal material and introduction of exotic fish and wildlife species into the creek are a few of the potential impacts. Close, ongoing monitoring of the creek will be needed to limit these impacts.

## Modifications

Based upon the post construction evaluation data, problems with the trail will be clearly identifiable, solutions will be proposed and changes will be made as needed to improve the public experience of the corridor.