GREENSPACES TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING NOTICE

Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
Dec. 12, 2001
1 to 3 p.m.
Metro Regional Center
Room 501

AGENDA

(For more information, contact Jennifer Budhabhatti at 503-797-1876 or budhabhattij@metro.dst.or.us.)

Introductions and Announcements
1 to 1:15

What does it mean to be in the Regional Greenspaces System?
(review of third discussion draft)
1:15 to 2
Heather Nelson Kent and Jennifer Budhabhatti

Portland's Salmon Safe Certification Program
2 to 2:15
Deb Lev, City of Portland

Prioritizing Best Management Practices
2:15 to 3
Jennifer Budhabhatti and subcommittee

To:	**The Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee**
From:	**Jennifer Budhabhatti, Senior Planner, Regional Parks and Greenspaces Department**
Date:	**September 25, 2001**
Topic:	**Best Management Practices (BMPs)**

Jennifer Thompson (US Fish and Wildlife), Deb Lev (City of Portland), Lisa Hamerlynck (City of Lake Oswego), Dave Knutt (Clean Water Services)) met to discuss the need to develop Best Management Practices for park and natural area managers.

After reviewing the goal, objectives and end products of BMPs (See attachment), the group discussed a list of BMPs that apply to Parks and Natural Area Management. The group then discussed BMPs that are currently being used or are in the process of being developed for park providers in the Metro region. Lastly the group identified high priorities of BMPs that are not currently being addressed in the region.

The group discussed the following programs:

- Deb Lev summarized the City of Portland Parks "Salmon Safe" program. In 2000, Salmon-Safe was approached by the Portland Parks program to develop a program that would culminate in an approval of a salmon–safe parks and greenspaces certification program. The focus of their work is to make sure that the park's operations are compatible with best management practices for avoiding harm to urban stream ecosystems, and, where appropriate, enhancing or restoring the health of aquatic ecosystems. The results of this work will be available June 2002. The GTAC could examine the results to determine if any of the BMPs gathered might be used by other jurisdictions and if the certification process is applicable to other jurisdictions.

- Dave Knutt from Clean Water Services discussed an 8-month project that includes review of all storm water operations and maintenance activities that have the potential to adversely affect endangered fish and aquatic species, for 11 cities under their jurisdiction. This may result in change in their BMP practices to enhance the survival of endangered species. This review process will be one piece of a larger project, the Healthy Streams

Plan, in which Clean Water Services seeks to address endangered species listing and ensure that they are in legal compliance with the act.

- The Nature Conservancy (TNC) is currently organizing a workshop for Spring 2002 that will bring together those working to address invasive non-native species issues for the region's most common noxious weeds. TNC intends to compile and distribute guidance (including BMPs) for addressing these species (8 species) as a product of the workshop, pending adequate funding sponsors needed).

- The Audubon Society of Portland is currently developing a "Living with Wildlife" program and regional task force to work on issues related to wildlife-human conflicts. In addition, the Humane Society has developed guidance and a book, "Wild Neighbors," to promote BMPs and recommendations for dealing with conflicts that arise with various species.

- An environmentally- friendly golf course certification exists that includes BMPs (details need to be researched).

A major gap in BMP development was trail planning and construction and habitat requirements for wildlife amongst others. Exotic species removal was also discussed, but it was decided that a collaborative process with Nature Conservancy might be the best strategy.

The following gaps in BMPs were noted:

- **Citing of trails and recreational structures**
- **Trail planning and design guidance, including drainage issues**
- **Conservation Biology Principles for Master Planning Guidelines for parks and natural areas**
- **Exotic vegetation management and control (Coordinate with Nature Conservancy and determine gaps in program)**
- **Exotic wildlife management and control**
- **Wildlife-human interface**
- **Vegetation management, maintenance and general restoration**
- **Tree removal (i.e., snag removal, downed wood removal or relocation, pruning, removing or relocating "hazardous" in stream wood)**
- **Natural area management in wildfire zones**

Best Management Practices (BMPs)

GOAL: To research and recommend BMPs to maintain, enhance or create fish and wildlife habitat for parks and natural areas managers throughout the region.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To identify current gaps and gather information on BMPS for managing fish and wildlife habitat in the region for parks and natural resource managers through out the region.
2. To identify, "showcase" and or research BMPs that avoids and minimizes impact of recreational uses (trails, boat ramps) on fish and wildlife habitat in the region.
3. To identify and "showcase" successful BMPs that are used to enhance and create fish and wildlife habitat in the region.

END PRODUCT:

- To inventory and recommend best management practices in the region to attain above goals and objectives. .
- To develop education/outreach pamphlets based on research/reconnaissance for regional and local park supervisors, park planners, restoration groups etc

ORIGINAL LIST OF BMPs

Natural Area/Park Facilities

- *Facility placement e.g., trails*
- *Reduction of impervious surfaces*
- *Pesticides and nutrient use*
- *Mowing*
- *Landscaping and irrigation*
- *Exotics removal*
- *Hillslope slumping/landsliding*
- *Trail construction*
- *Trail maintenance and use*
- *Pesticide application*
- *Pest Control applicator certification?*
- *Golf Course maintenance*
- *Wetland enhancement*
- *Riparian enhancements*
- *Streambank improvements*
- *Installation of riparian enhancements*
- *Riparian and upland enhancements (tree planting)*
- *Boat launch facilities maintenance*
- *Stream downcutting control feature installation*

TRAILS

Audience: Park, trail planners, maintenance workers and other citizen groups interested in trails in the region

Goal: To plan, design, construct and maintain trails to provide recreational and transportation opportunities for citizens and to avoid or minimize impact on hydrology, water quality, fish and wildlife.

GUIDELINES FOR SITING NEW TRAILS

The goal in planning, constructing and maintaining a trail is to enhance the natural and human environment by preferably avoiding and or minimizing negative impacts to natural resources. If impacts cannot be avoided then all precaution will be taken to minimize them.

1. To identify the goals of the trail plan, it's connectivity to the landscape and to determine the sites for human interaction in the plan including scenic vistas etc.
2. To map the following:
    a. Biological resources such as threatened, endangered, sensitive species habitat, areas with high erosibility, wet areas such as streams, wetlands, springs, floodplains and meadows.
    b. Geologic constraints: slope, soil etc.
    c. Cultural resources.
    d. Existing uses including trails and other structures.
    e. Existing and proposed transportation connections in the landscape.
3. To recommend placement of trails in the watershed such that wet areas and sensitive areas are avoided, crossings and impact to hydrologic connectivity to wet areas are minimized, and vegetative buffers are maintained and enhanced between wet and sensitive areas and the trails.
4. To research and recommend design and construction of trail guidelines that has a minimum impact on water quality, quantity and habitat.
5. To establish a list of maintenance guidelines to address vegetation, runoff and erosion issues.
6. To research methods to monitor trail impacts to natural resource issues such as erosion and run-off.
7. To recommend methods to restore and decommission trails to address natural resource impacts such as erosion and runoff issues.
8. To recommend trail usage guidelines/use that would protect sensitive areas from trail users or minimize impact thereof.

EXAMPLES OF TRAILS THAT COMPLY WITH THE ABOVE OBJECTIVES

OBJECTIVE:

9. To list and show site examples of trails where trail planning and implementation is exemplary and show some of the characteristics mentioned above

Number	Regional Natural Area Sites	Manager	Acreage
1	Forest Park	Portland	4,360
2	Hagg Lake	Washington County	2,600
3	Smith and Bybee	Metro	1,907
4	Government Island	Metro	1,708
5	Sandy River Delta	BLM?	1,558
6	Oxbow	Metro	1,200
7	Sandy River Gorge	Metro	1,068
8	McIver State Park	State	968
9	East Buttes /Boring Lava	Metro	730
10	Gales Creek	Metro	606
11	Tryon Creek	Portland	637
12	Jackson Bottom	City of Hillsboro and USA	597
13	Powell Butte	Portland	572
14	Tualatin River National Wildlife refuge	USFWS	568
15	Clear Creek Canyon	Metro	492
16	Burlington Bottoms	BPA	445
17	Tonquin Geologic Area	Metro	436
18	Willamette Narrows	Metro	439
19	Clackamas River Sites	Metro	430
20	Tualatin River Access	Metro	384
21	Multnomah Channel/	Metro	326
22	Linnton Park	Portland	278
23	Columbia River Shoreline	Metro	271
24	Cooper Mountain	Metro	256
25	THPRD Nature Park	THPRD	196
26	Larch Mountain Corridor	Metro	171
27	Stonegate	Clackamas County	162
28	Oak Bottom	Portland	154
29	Mt Talbert	NCPRD	149
30	Newell Creek	Metro	149
31	Mary Young State Park	State of Oregon	149
32	Metzler Memorial	Clackamas County	138

	Park		
33	McCleay Park	Portland	136
34	Willamette Narrows	Metro	135
35	Barton Park	Clackamas County	125
36	Canemah Bluff	Metro	129
37	Dabney State	State of Oregon	110
38	Rock Creek Greenway	Metro	109
39	Rock Island Landing	State of Oregon	103
40	Terwilliger Parkway	Portland	100
41	Kelley Pointe Park	Portland	96
42	Holman Property	Portland	95
43	District Park?	NCPRD	95
44	Marquam Nature Park	Portland	74
45	Fairview Creek	Fairview	70
46	McKay Dairy	Metro	62
47	Wilderness Park	West Linn	48
48	Brown's Ferry Park	Tualatin	47
49	Durham City Park	Durham	46
50	Lewis and Clark State Park	State of Oregon	44
51	Willamette Cove	Portland	43
52	Hogan Cedars	Metro	40
53	Noble Woods	Hillsboro	40

DISCUSSION DRAFT

OUTLINE OF SALMON SAFE CERTIFICATION SYSTEM FOR CITY OF PORTLAND PARKS

Prepared for:
Dan Kent, Salmon Safe

Prepared by:
Peter Bahls, Northwest Watershed Institute

November 9, 2001

Process Overview

The evaluation process is based around the structured judgements of a qualified, independent, and credible expert who is asked to evaluate the extent to which a candidate Park's management practices are consistent with best management practices for avoiding harm to stream ecosystems, and, where appropriate, enhancing or restoring the health of stream ecosystems.

From the standpoint of adverse impacts to salmonid stream ecosystem health, park operations must address the principle forms of impact. These impacts can be summarized as:

1. *Water Quality* - Introduction of sediment, energy (temperature), or chemicals and nutrients from surface or sub-surface runoff.

2. *Water Quantity* - Increase in the magnitude and frequency of peak flows from natural soils and vegetation types converted to impervious surfaces; or reduction in instream flows due to surface or sub-surface water withdrawal for irrigation

3. *Instream habitat* - Direct alternation of in-stream habitat or streambank conditions through bank armoring, channelization, removal of instream wood.

4. *Riparian habitat* – Elimination or reduction of riparian vegetation that provides numerous stream habitat functions including shade, bank protection, source of instream cover (large and small wood) and nutrients.

5. *Fish passage* - Poorly designed or inadequately maintained stream crossings that are barriers to passage by adult or juvenile fish.

The expert evaluator employs a scoring protocol that is structured around a set of management practice categories or elements. Each element is comprised of several specific management practices that are considered to be most important in terms of potential impacts (both negative and positive) on stream ecosystem health.

Scoring Elements

The field evaluation of each Park is organized around 6 park management elements that collectively address the impacts that can occur:

1. Instream habitat protection and restoration
2. Riparian and wetland protection and restoration
3. Water use management (irrigation activities)
4. Surface water runoff management
5. Erosion control
6. Pesticide and nutrient containment

Standards by Park Type

Management criteria for different types of parks will be reflected in different standards for the following park types:

1. Natural areas
2. Urban parks
3. Neighborhood parks, gardens, and sport sites
4. Golf sites

Field evaluations for each park type will be based on the same 6 park management elements with standards corresponding to the range of environmental performance achievable within diverse management systems.

Outline of Certification Scoring System

The following outline lists elements and sub-elements, and considerations for scoring under each sub-element. For example, under the 1.i.b. of the stream crossing sub-element, if all stream crossings in the Park meets ODFW fish passage design standards, that consideration would be scored at maximum points.

1) Instream Habitat Protection/Restoration
    i) Stream crossings
        (a) Number of crossings
        (b) Fish passage
        (c) Flood conveyance
        (d) Restoration effort
    ii) Stream channel modifications
        (a) Type of bank protection
        (b) Channelization
        (c) Artificial ponds
        (d) Large wood management
        (e) Restoration effort

2) Riparian and Wetland Protection/Restoration
    i) Riparian condition
        (a) Buffer zone width
        (b) Native and non-native species present
        (c) Inventory effort
        (d) Restoration effort

3) Water Use Management (irrigation activities)
    i) Source selection
        (a) Surface or groundwater
    ii) Water conservation measures
        (a) Use of native, low-water use landscaping
        (b) Efficiency of irrigation system
        (c) Zoning plan for water use
        (d) Water use per acre
    iii) Water use monitoring

4) Surface Water Runoff Management
    i) Infiltration
        (a) Soil infiltration levels (concrete, grass, shrub, forest)
        (b) Restoration effort
    ii) Routing
        (a) Drainage system in park
        (b) Off-park destination (City sewer, direct to stream)
        (c) Restoration effort
    iii) Treatment
        (a) Type of on-site treatment (natural, detention pond)
        (b) Restoration effort

5) Erosion Control
    i) Stormwater drainage system
    ii) Trail systems
    iii) Vegetative cover
    iv) Surface erosion areas
    v) Stream bank erosion areas
    vi) Restoration effort

6) Chemical and Nutrient Containment
    i) Pesticides (Pesticides and herbicides)
        (a) Type of pesticides
        (b) Water course buffers for pesticide use
        (c) Timing restrictions
        (d) IPM program to reduce use
        (e) Pesticide applicator licensing
        (f) Pesticide storage
        (g) Pesticide tracking system
        (h) Water quality monitoring

ii) Fertilizers
    (a) Types of fertilizers
    (b) Amount and rate of use
    (c) Soil testing
    (d) Soil fertility practices to reduce use
iii) Other Contaminants
    (a) Dog waste control
    (b) Wildlife waste control program (geese, ducks)
    (c) Hazardous waste spills/dumping
    (d) Misc. chemicals

7) Add stewardship/ Education?

3rd DISCUSSION DRAFT CONCEPT

WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO BE INCLUDED IN THE REGIONAL SYSTEM?

Background:
The Greenspaces Master Plan (1992) envisions a cooperative regional system of natural areas, open spaces, trails, and greenspaces for people and wildlife. The Master Plan is not a regulatory plan, but was written to implement this vision through cooperation between local park providers and cities, counties and citizens.

It has been nearly a decade since the Greenspaces Master Plan was adopted by Metro with support and encouragement from local partners. Since that time great progress has been made in implementing the vision of the plan. Chapter 3 (Parks, Natural Areas, Open Spaces, and Recreational Facilities) of the Regional Framework Plan (1996) directs Metro to reinventory parks, natural areas and trails in the metro region and to cooperatively develop policies to protect and manage these areas. The draft Greenspaces Regional System (a network of parks, greenspaces, trails, and wildlife corridors) was identified in 2000 and was based on an inventory of natural resources areas, parks, greenway corridors and trails.

The draft Greenspaces Regional System consists of both public and private components. A major component of the public ownership consists of federal, state and local park providers that manage both "natural resources anchor sites" as well as other recreational parks. The strategies outlined below are only applicable to publicly and non-profit owned parks and natural areas included in the draft Regional Greenspaces System and outlines three voluntary scenarios for natural resource protection. The implementation of these strategies is dependent upon availability of funds for all park providers included in the draft Regional Greenspaces System.

Goals:
- To create a cooperative regional system of natural areas, open spaces, trails and greenways for fish, wildlife and people.

- To protect the region's biodiversity, improve air and water quality, provide buffers between communities, and create opportunities for citizens to enjoy nature close to home.

Objectives:
- To further implement the Greenspaces Master Plan (1992) and the Regional Framework Plan (1996) by developing strategies for a coordinated, cooperative and collaborative effort between local governments and other managers of natural areas to protect and enhance natural resources.

- Metro will work through the Greenspaces Technical Advisory Committee to protect and manage components of the Regional Parks and Greenspaces System by using an

incentive based strategy to achieve the goals. Incentives range from technical to financial assistance.

Strategy:

- To cooperatively develop Inter Governmental Agreements (IGA) between Metro and individual local agencies to protect and manage lands included in the draft Regional Parks and Greenspaces System.

SCENARIO 1

Assumption: No level of regional funding available

At a minimum, parks and greenspaces components in the Regional Greenspaces System owned and operated by non-profits and publicly owned agencies would meet the following standards and receive the following benefits:

Standards met:

ALL PARKS:

- New trails will be sited according to local government standards that are compliant with Title 3 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan- ordinance (Appendix A).
- Riparian restoration will be encouraged according to Title 3 model ordinance standards (see Appendix A), according to Clean Water Services requirements and Metro's fish and wildlife habitat conservation standards to be adopted by Metro *or a local restoration plan that complies with Title 3 model ordinance.*
- Local level GIS data (if available) on new acquisitions of parks and natural areas will be provided to update Metro's database.
- *When* master plans *are developed they* will address at a minimum, Section 4 (b) of the draft Master Planning Guidelines developed by GTAC, with Metro technical assistance available on an as needed basis (see below).
- Signage will be posted *at parks that are open to* the public stating that the facility is part of the Regional Greenspaces System

4(b). MASTER PLANNING –
Assure Resource Protection

1. Inventory existing site conditions in context of the surrounding landscape and the overall Regional System. At a minimum, describe and map existing conditions including natural, cultural, scenic, and recreational resources, ownership, zoning, land use regulations, topography, infrastructure and easements. If applicable, "existing conditions" shall also include park facilities, visitation, budgetary and operations information.

2. Assess the occurrence, value and sensitivity of the site's natural, cultural, recreational and scenic resources.

3. Identify strategies to protect and/or enhance natural and cultural resource values.

4. Identify and evaluate issues and needs and constraints and opportunities.

5. Identify management practices to protect natural, cultural and scenic resources from appropriate use and development.

6. Identify strategies to avoid or mitigate significant impacts from adjacent land uses on site uses, facilities and resources.

7. Identify strategies to avoid or mitigate significant impacts from part use on adjacent lands.

Benefits received:

ALL PARKS:

- Technical support for *siting or planning* trails will be provided by Metro, upon request.
- Signage will be developed in collaboration with GTAC and provided by Metro. *The signage will depict the concept of the "Regional Greenspaces System" and not bear any agency logo.*
- The local parks and greenspaces that are open to the public will be included in a Regional Greenspaces System Map published by Metro *and the owner and/or manager* will be referenced as a cooperator in appropriate publications.
- Metro will support grant applications that assist in implementing Scenario 1 components.
- Cooperating agency activities such as habitat restoration projects, volunteer workdays *and environmental programs*, will be promoted in the GreenScene, Metro's calendar of nature-related activities and events.

SCENARIO 2:

Assumption: Limited regional funding available for planning, restoration and monitoring.

At a minimum, parks and greenspaces components in the Regional Greenspaces System owned and operated by non-profits and publicly owned agencies would meet the following standards and receive the following benefits:

ALL STANDARDS AND BENEFITS OF SCENARIO 1 APPLY TO SCENARIO 2

In addition, SCENARIO 2 includes the following:

Standards met:

ALL PARKS:

- Cooperators will agree to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs), to improve water quality, and protect biodiversity. These BMPs will be recommended by GTAC.

REGIONAL NATURAL AREA SITES:*

- *When cooperators gather trend data on wildlife and plants in the region, they will share it with Metro.*
- Standard rules and regulations that are consistent with natural resource protection goals will be encouraged.

Benefits received:

ALL PARKS:

- Metro will provide technical and financial assistance in implementing the recommended Best Management Practices (BMP's) such as trail planning, habitat restoration and enhancement.
- Metro will promote local cooperator projects to the media.

REGIONAL NATURAL AREA SITES:

- *Metro's environmental education and interpretive programs will be made available to cooperators in the system.*
- Metro's volunteer project management assistance will be offered to cooperators in the system.
- Metro will provide technical and financial assistance for planning, habitat restoration and monitoring of natural resources to cooperators in the system.

SCENARIO 3:

Assumption: Supplemental regional funds are available for select activities related to natural resource management such as planning, education and interpretive signage, operations and maintenance.

At a minimum, parks and greenspaces components in the Regional Greenspaces System owned and operated by non-profits and publicly owned agencies would meet the following standards and receive the following benefits:

ALL STANDARDS AND BENEFITS OF SCENARIO 1 AND SCENARIO 2 APPLY TO SCENARIO 3

In addition, SCENARIO 3 includes the following:

Standards met:

REGIONAL NATURAL AREA SITES:

- Master plans will address all the draft Master Planning Guidelines, as developed by GTAC, with Metro technical help available on an as needed basis (see Appendix B-guidelines developed by GTAC).
- Reciprocal fee structure will be considered, where appropriate. For example, Metro's annual park pass will be good for entry at other "fee entry" facilities and vice versa.
- When local system master plan are developed or being updated, local partners should consider linking local trails to regional trails and consider acquiring and or protecting privately owned components of the Regional Greenspaces System.

Benefits received:

REGIONAL NATURAL AREA SITES:

- Funds will be available for regional trail development, operation and maintenance.
- Subject to availability of funds, supplemental financial resources will be available for master planning.
- A limited level of operational and maintenance funds, to be determined, would be provided.
- A revolving loan fund for natural area acquisition will be created.
- Metro will offer technical assistance for acquisition of natural areas.
- Funds will be available for *environmental* education and *natural history* interpretive outreach opportunities.

* See attached list of proposed Regional Natural Area Sites

PACIFIC RIVERS COUNCIL/CITY OF PORTLAND
SALMON-SAFE PARKS CERTIFICATION

THE NEED

With the recent listing of steelhead trout and chinook salmon as threatened species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the city of Portland is now working with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to develop a program to restore salmon and steelhead habitat in the Willamette River and its tributaries within the city. These restoration efforts will be backed by public education and citizen involvement.

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

Salmon-Safe will collaborate with the city of Portland to develop and implement a parks and greenspace certification program that contributes to salmon habitat restoration while recognizing the realities of urban environments.

Objectives during the first year of project implementation include:

- Develop a comprehensive urban parks certification framework oriented towards reducing water quality and fish habitat impacts from park operation and management.
- Gain broad support from scientific community and public for urban Salmon-Safe guidelines.
- Test the effectiveness of the urban Salmon-Safe guidelines and certification protocol through a series of test site assessments.
- Develop a plan for a comprehensive public education campaign to build citizen support for the parks and other urban restoration efforts.

PROJECT SCOPE

The long-term scope of the certification project will be citywide with the eventual assessment of all 240 sites within the park system. limited number of public school yards within Portland may also be certified under the same guidelines in a cooperative effort with Portland Public Schools. Urban parks and greenspace certification may be exported beyond Portland to other cities in the Metro region and elsewhere in the Pacific Northwest in the future. The first year project scope includes a series of test site assessments only.

URBAN CERTIFICATION

Like the Salmon-Safe agricultural guidelines, our Portland park guidelines will focus on reducing water quality impacts from each particular site, rather than applying an identical approach throughout the system. The focus of the certification will be management practices and the degree to which a park's operations are compatible with best management practices for avoiding harm to urban stream ecosystems and, where appropriate, enhancing or restoring the health of aquatic ecosystems. Diverse management practices for different types of parks will be reflected in specific criteria for natural areas, urban parks, neighborhood parks and gardens, and sports and golf sites. The evaluation process will employ a scoring protocol that is structured around a set of key management categories that may include riparian and wetland management, water use management, erosion and sediment control, chemical use management, and other elements. Certification will be conducted by an independent assessor that will assign scores based upon field observations and the scoring guidelines developed in collaboration with the city and other program partners.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

The first year of program implementation will focus on the development of the certification system :

A. Standards Development Working with the city's implementation committee and others, Salmon-Safe will develop a certification system including certification guidelines and a scoring framework for urban parks and greenspace certification. Certification guidelines, whenever possible, will be based on existing parks management programs, including Portland's Integrated Pest Management (IPM) program.
   1. Scientific input: Salmon-Safe will seek outside technical expertise to direct the scientific component of guidelines development.
   2. Scientific review: Salmon-Safe will seek extensive scientific review of the guidelines and scoring system to ensure broad support from the scientific community and others.
   3. Public input: Salmon-Safe will seek broad public input into the Salmon-Safe standards and scoring framework through a series of professionally conducted public meetings coordinated by the Sustainable Portland Commission.

B. Parks Assessment & Certification Salmon-Safe will test the urban parks certification guidelines at a limited number of locations to refine the certification process, before expanding the project citywide in subsequent years.
   1. Contract certifier: Salmon-Safe will hire and train a professional third party certification organization to conduct certifications under the guidance of Parks and Salmon-Safe.
   2. Certification training: Salmon-Safe will work with Parks to ensure that parks operation personnel understand the management practices needed to meet the certification guidelines.

C. Public Education and Outreach Salmon-Safe will develop a plan, in cooperation with the city of Portland and a hired or pro bono ad agency, for a public education campaign to build support for urban parks restoration efforts. This campaign will be coordinated with the city's existing public education efforts around salmon issues such as the "Fish Friendly Pledge" and other initiatives. Implementation will take place in the second year of the project.

PROJECT PARTNERS

Project partners in the development of the urban Salmon-Safe include Parks, the city of Portland's Endangered Species Act (ESA) Program, and the Sustainable Portland Commission. Portland Public Schools, Metro Regional Services, the Urban Watershed Institute, and other public and nonprofit organizations have also indicated strong interest in participating.

December 12, 2001

GREENSPACES TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

please sign in . . .

name	organization
Scott Talbot	City of Hillsboro
Valerie Lantz	City of Troutdale
Jayne Cronlund	Three Rivers Land Cons.
Deborah Lev	City of Portland
Jim Sjulin	"
Barbara Fryer	Beaverton
Dee Crocker	City of OR City
Ric Catron	City of Gresham
Dick Reynolds	City of Cornelius

December 12, 2001

GREENSPACES TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

please sign in . . .

name	organization

December 12, 2001

GREENSPACES TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

please sign in . . . (if you haven't yet)

name	organization
BOSDIC	THPRD
Joanne Rice	Washington Co.
Don Barlett	SCUTRHG.
Jennifer Thompson	U.S. FWS
Mel Huie	Metro Parks & Greenspaces
Lora Price	Metro Parks & Greenspaces
Veronica Smith	C. of Beaverton, alternate
SEAN LOUGHRAN	OPRD
DONNA STUAR	FRIENDS OF WESTSIDE TRAILS

December 12, 2001

GREENSPACES TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

please sign in . . .

name	organization
Mike Houck	Coalition For A Livable Future Audubon Soc. of PDX