
Coordinated by:

**Smith & Bybee Lakes Wildlife Area
Management Committee**
Nancy Hendrickson, Chair

Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232
(503) 797-1870

Smith & Bybee Lakes Management Committee Meeting

5:30 p.m. - 6:30 p.m., Tuesday, March 26, 2002
Metro Regional Center, Room 270
600 N E Grand Ave.
Portland, Oregon 97232

AGENDA

Welcome and introductions/ 5 min.	5:30 - 5:35 pm
Approve January and February 2002 meeting notes/ 10 min.	5:35 - 5:45 pm
Update: Water control structure design and operation/ 30min. <i>(Stewart and John Axford, Ducks Unlimited)</i>	5:45 - 6:15 pm
Discussion: Integrating St. Johns Landfill with wildlife area/ 40 min. <i>(Hendrickson)</i>	6:15 - 6:45 pm
Updates/ 10 min.	6:45 - 6:55 pm
Setting April agenda/ 5 min.	6:55 - 7:00 pm

Smith & Bybee Lakes Management Committee
Summary Meeting Notes
March 26, 2002
5:30 pm

In attendance:

Troy Clark *	Portland Audubon Society
Jim Morgan *	Metro Executive
Dennis O'Neil	Metro Regional Environmental Management
Denise Rennis *	Port of Portland
Pat Sullivan	Metro Regional Parks & Greenspaces
Nancy Hendrickson *	Portland Bureau of Environmental Services
Holly Michael *	Oregon Dept of Fish & Wildlife
Elaine Stewart	Metro Regional Parks Wildlife Area Mgr
Frank Opila *	Friends of Smith & Bybee Lakes
John Axford	Ducks Unlimited
Emily Roth *	The Wetlands Conservancy
Merle G. Rosier	Oregon Bass and Panfish Club
Patt Opdyke *	North Portland Neighborhoods
Gregg Everhart *	Portland Bureau of Parks & Recreation

* denotes voting member

Review January and February 2002 meeting notes

The meeting notes were approved with the inclusion of a reference in the January notes to the dike stabilization project and the letter from the Metro Chief Financial Officer Jennifer Sims regarding the increase in overhead costs. The vote for approval was unanimous for the January meeting notes. It was also unanimous for the February notes with the exception of Patt Opdyke's abstention due to her absence from that meeting.

Update: Water control structure design and operation

John Axford, the project manager from Ducks Unlimited and Elaine Stewart reported on the status of the new water control structure. It will consist of four box culverts each fitted with an assembly for placing wooden stop logs for water level control and a fish passage structure. It will be located in the same location as the previous structure and be managed by Stewart. The purpose of the structure is twofold: 1) to attempt to restore historic hydrology to the wetland and 2) to control reed canary grass and other pest plants. The permitting process is well under way and ground breaking should take place in August. Axford distributed copies of: 1) the Construction Management Plan, 2) the Proposed Development Plan and 3) the Existing Conditions Site Plan. Also provided were cross section and end section drawings.

Questions and discussion followed including:

- the operation of the stop logs; how and when to remove them
- another objective of the structure is to allow unimpeded water flow as much as possible between the slough and the lakes, how often will this be possible
- there is no plan for a standing stock of fish in the lakes
- use by coho and chinook salmon is anticipated

- fish will be able to move in and out because of openings
- the habitat should be very beneficial to water fowl
- to what height will the water be able to be raised
- committee members were hopeful that one of the culverts would be passable by canoe or kayak or that there will be an opportunity to create passage

Discussion: Integrating St. Johns Landfill with the wildlife area

The question was raised as to what SBLMC's recommendations should be regarding the integration of the landfill with the wildlife area. Did the group want to respond to the basic principles on interim and long-term use of the landfill and adjacent property (which were recently defined in a document from Metro's Executive Officer, department directors and legal counsel)? Some of the guidelines that were listed in that document included:

- No public uses should be permitted on the landfill until DEQ and Metro have agreed that is safe to do so and a master plan has been adopted.
- Master planning for the landfill should begin no earlier than 3 years before the site is suitable and safe for public access.
- No public trail should be permitted on the south side of Smith or Bybee Lakes unless access can be regulated.

Among issues raised and discussed were:

- The Consent Decree issued as a result of the Jones v. Thorne, et. al suit includes construction of part of the 40-Mile Loop Trail inside the wildlife area, to the confluence of North Slough and Columbia Slough.
- Impacts of this trail on the rest of the wildlife area.
- The City and Metro have been working on an agreement to examine alignments.
- Can funding for the Port's portion be placed in escrow until the alignment discussion is completed?
- The Land Use Review for the Port's section of the trail will be out for public comment soon. Does the SBLMC want to comment?

One additional observation summed up the comments of several committee members. There is a larger issue than trails that needs to be considered; the focus needs to be on planning for the entire site. The committee requested additional information be brought to the next meeting for further discussion of the landfill issue. Dennis O'Neil was asked to provide material on the regulatory constraints imposed by DEQ. Elaine Stewart will investigate options concerning enhancement of wildlife habitat on the landfill. Stewart will also research the work being done at other closed landfills.

The next meeting will be May 28th at 5:30 pm.

Nancy and committee members,

I am unable to attend the March meeting, so I am happy to see that Nancy's expectation is that the discussion should continue into April. I ask that you honor that and, frankly, this is a big issue for us and it deserves ample time.

I am still amazed that Metro administrators developed this policy statement with no input from the Management Committee.

On Trails:

I think that it's fair to say that while we weren't looking forward to the conflicting sides of the trail discussion, we were indeed looking forward to resolving the specific questions about where and under what conditions could a recreational trail work with the least impact. Assuming feasible, to be followed by a discussion about when a trail might be implemented and at what (order of magnitude) cost. I can see no reason that this discussion and more specific trail planning should be held up. Metro was in the process of preparing an IGA with the City for many months. What's different now?

On Other Recreational Uses:

I do think that Mike Burton made the right decision to exclude model airplanes at this time. This has always been a questionable recreational activity for the wildlife area, but it made it into the plan because of the advocacy of the enthusiasts. At least since the late 1980's, no other recreational uses have been contemplated for the landfill other than trails and model airplane. I feel that the Management Committee would effectively resist other potential recreational uses. Identification of another, more suitable site should be a priority for Metro. (It's only fair that Metro have its very own version of Portland Parks' dogs off leash area issue.)

On Habitat:

The landfill certainly has its constraints. But that's exactly why the idea of an open meadow habitat was suggested by the NRMP. Some shrub-scrub habitat has also been envisioned by the Management Committee over the years. I cannot see any reason to hold up habitat enhancement work based on what's currently happening at the landfill.

I hope this helps. Anxious to hear other thoughts. I think that Gregg Everhart will be able to attend next week's meeting.

Keep up the good work!

Jim Sjulín

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Hendrickson, Nancy

> Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2002 12:26 PM

> To: Bill Briggs; Denise Rennis; Elaine Stewart; Emily Roth; Frank Opila;

> Frank Opila 2; Holly Michael; Jim Morgan; Pam Arden; Pat Sullivan; Pat

> Opdyke; Peter Teneau; Sjulín, Jim; Troy Clark
> Subject: Landfill Planning
>
> Dear Committee Members:
>
> I am starting a conversation, as we discussed last meeting, regarding
> future planning for the Landfill. At the last meeting, we received a copy
> of a memo dated October 2001, from Metro managers regarding landfill
> planning - or lack thereof. This memo sparked off a discussion of
> integrating the Landfill into the rest of the Wildlife Area, which we have
> been talking about for some time already. Since this is rather a large
> topic, we need to be thinking about it before the March meeting. The idea
> is to discuss this at the March meeting (but we do have other agenda
> items), continue the discussion at the April meeting, and possibly make
> some recommendations at that time about where we want to go with this.
>
> Here are some things to consider, but please chime in with your own.
> What values and constraints does the landfill site have in connection with
> the rest of the Wildlife Area?
> What information does the SBLMC need to develop recommendations for the
> landfill site, for now, and for the future? For example:
> * what type of habitat is out there now or could be developed
> * what species of wildlife should we target in terms of developing
> habitat
> * what intensity of recreation activity should be encouraged and when
> * etc etc etc
>
> Thanks everyone,
>
> Nancy Hendrickson
> Chair, SBLMC
>
>
> Nancy Hendrickson
> Columbia Slough Watershed Manager
> Bureau of Environmental Services
> 1120 SW Fifth, Room 1000
> Portland, Oregon 97204
>
> 503-823-6001 (phone)
> 503-823-5344 (fax)
>
> NancyH@bes.ci.portland.or.us
>
>

memo

date: March 26, 2002
to: file
from: Nancy Hendrickson
subject: Smith & Bybee Lakes Management Committee meeting today

Water Control Structure

- please look again at canoe access (maybe have the 8x10 box culvert go upright, and put only one I-beam in it – then it would be both taller, and wider for the canoes)
- please look again at building the structure higher, to be able to hold more water back. The current height was a convenience height. It is Jim Morgan's belief that a foot or two higher would give us more management options.
- Need to get vertical datum figured out: NGVD or CoP.

Landfill Integration

Long wandering discussion on this one –

- What's driving this? Oct. 9th memo, PAMAA's attempt to gain access to the Landfill, and the Port's building of the trail which pushes the alignment of the Landfill trail
- Don't want people on the Landfill (on trails or otherwise) until it is safe. This could be 20 years or so.
- Given there are regulatory and liability constraints, what can we do now to move towards wildlife habitat, trails, etc. Since habitat takes so long to get established, maybe we should be actively pursuing that at this time.
- The most productive thing we could offer at this time would be habitat enhancement. There is research going on all over the country about the unique habitat landfills have to offer. Also the nature of the landfill closure work doesn't totally exclude access. Interim access is possible in terms of guided tours, selected viewpoints, etc.
- We need three areas of information for next time:
 - constraints (Dennis O'Neill)
 - habitat opportunities (Stewart?, Michaels?)
 - what's going on at other landfills (Morgan)

Trails

- Why wouldn't this committee respond to the managers' memo dated 10/9/01? Rex Burkholder mentioned that he would refer the matter – to make policy on it – to the Natural resources Subcommittee of Metro Council.
- Quite a bit of discussion about not doing the Port's trail until the mini-master plan alignment had been worked out. Maybe the money the Port would spend on the trail could be put into escrow, or into the SBL Trust Fund, and earmarked for building a trail at a later date, concurrent with the Landfill Trail.
- A big problem with the landfill trail is that the Landfill is a liability in terms of allowing people on it (subsidence, explosions, methane gas concentrations). It's possible to fence it off from the trail – it's just a matter of how much 20 years or so of recreation is worth. Is it worth the price of a fence?
- Nancy will follow up with Denise Rennis (who had to leave early) about the possibility of an escrow fund, building the trail later, and how that works in with the Consent Decree, if indeed it does.