
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. - 7:00 p.m., Tuesday, September 24, 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

Critical updates

5:35 - 5:40 pm

Preliminary concept design - recreational facilities

5:40 - 7:00 pm

**Smith & Bybee Lakes Management Committee
Summary Meeting Notes
September 24, 2002
5:30 p.m.**

In attendance:

Elaine Stewart	Metro Regional Parks & Greenspaces (RP&G) Wildlife Area Mgr.
Nancy Hendrickson *	Portland Bureau of Environmental Services (BES)
Bill Bach	Port of Portland (Port)
Jay Heidenrich	Multnomah County Sheriff Office (MCSO)
Bob Nilsen	MCSO
Troy Clark *	Portland Audubon Society
Emily Roth *	The Wetlands Conservancy
Stephen Hayes **	Regional Arts & Culture Council (RACC)
Kristin Calhoun **	RACC
Douglas Macy **	RACC
Ray Piltz *	St. Johns Neighborhood Association
Jim Morgan *	Metro Executive Office
Kurt Lango	Lango Hansen Landscape Architects
Bob Grummel	Grummel Engineering
Nanda D'Agostino	Design team artist
Valerie Otani	Design team artist
Patt Opdyke *	North Portland Neighborhoods
Denise Rennis *	Port
Susan Barthel	BES
Gerry Meyer	Port
Dan Kromer	Metro RP&G
Loralie Sinnen	Port
Gregg Everhart	Portland Bureau of Parks & Rec (Ptld Parks)
Jim Sjulian *	Ptld Parks
Frank Opila *	Friends of Smith & Bybee Lakes
Lora Price	Metro RP&G
Pat Sullivan	Metro RP&G
Juli Killgore	Port
Bill Briggs *	Merit USA

* denotes voting SBLMC member
** denotes voting RACC member

Updates

Hendrickson passed around a simulation of the North Lombard overcrossing that will be constructed in the next couple of years. Design work is proceeding on that project. Clark emphasized the importance of providing input to that design work to ensure the wildlife corridor in that area is preserved.

Preliminary concept design - recreational facilities

Again this month the meeting consisted of the Smith & Bybee Lakes Management Committee (SBLMC) combined with three representatives from the Regional Arts and Culture Council (RACC) to form the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) for the Smith and Bybee Lakes facilities project.

Discussion of canoe launch site options

Price distributed a summary of comments on the canoe launch site received from the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) members in the interim between the August 27 and September 24 meetings. Price also provided the results of the email vote on launch sites: 7 for the old launch site and 4 for the triangle site. The group continued discussing the launch sites and chose to vote again. Comments included:

- Are sufficient funds available for both of the options at the triangle site? (Macy) [Answer: no funding for the triangle site work (dredging or a dock) is currently in the budget. It would require additional fundraising.]
- Is the triangle site nearly impossible then as a canoe launch site? (Hayes)
- To be fair, there are not only tree impacts to cutting the regenerating willows at the triangle site; use of the old launch site would be a lost opportunity for restoration along Old Marine Drive between the triangle piece and the old launch site. (Roth)
- Are bank improvements (grading etc.) within the project budget if the triangle site were chosen? (Rennis) [Answer: yes, but only the bank.]
- Concern about budget if triangle site used for canoe launch, and questions regarding the quality (or value) of the upland restoration work that would occur along Old Marine Drive if the triangle site were selected. (Opdyke)
- Has the new water regime been considered in this choice of launch sites? (Sjulin) [Stewart reviewed the management plans for water levels and their impacts on vegetation.]

A vote was taken on a preference for the canoe launch site. The PAC chose to have members who were present re-vote on the launch site, while counting email votes for those who were absent from the meeting. There were 4 votes for the triangle site (three tonight and one e-mail prior to the meeting) and 9 votes for the old launch site (seven tonight and two e-mails prior to the meeting.) The old launch site received the most votes.

Refined concept plan

The design team reviewed the refined concept plan for the PAC, incorporating the old launch site as the canoe/kayak launch location. The soft surface trail concept along Old Marine Drive was discussed. Roth asked that any development south of Old Marine Drive be removed from the conceptual plan and that the 40-mile Loop Trail be the route taken for visitors to access the Interlakes Trail. She pointed out that the soft surface trail presented a people management problem, and that experience has shown that any conceptual trails on plans seem to become requirements to be built. Concerns expressed by other PAC members included negative impact from bicyclists and dogs. Everhart suggested that only one driving lane be considered between the triangle and canoe launch; two lanes were unnecessary. Roth requested that a gate be at the triangle parking lot to close off road to canoe launch in off-season. Concern was also expressed about aesthetics and vulnerability of the divider between the bike path and driving lane beyond the triangle.

Discussion of art design

Artists Fernanda D'Agostino and Valerie Otani turned the discussion to the art design. A conceptual design report titled "Flows and Eddies - Public Art for Smith & Bybee Lakes" was presented. Major design principles were outlined including elements of dynamic change, the interweaving of art and landscape, incorporating gathering places and teaching about "time and timelessness" as it relates to the Wildlife Area. Gathering stones will incorporate a creation story that is part science and part myth, depicting the birth or creation of species native to the site.

The subject of the three floating sculptures received considerable discussion. The artists modified their previous proposal to construct permanent features of artificial materials. They described the new concept as twig "habitat islands" floating on the lake, made of wood found in the area and held together with dowels, string or other biodegradable material. Some committee members emphasized their strong opposition to the intrusion of floating art on the lake itself. The fact that in one or two seasons the islands, made of natural materials, will disintegrate into woody debris, was objected to by Heidenrich who preferred that art funds be spent on more permanent structures (although the structures represent 4.5% of the art budget, it was not considered a good use of that funding). Others felt the artists' approach to be a good response and reasonable compromise to the previous meeting's input or wished there was more of it.

Other comments related to the art and path at the detention ponds, asking if there were another suitable location for the canoe shapes [the artists felt that there was not another good location]. Roth mentioned that she liked the teaching landscape at the ponds but that the bus stops at the Interlakes Trail entry; kids would miss this site anyway. Can the ponds be built somewhere else such as the triangle piece or closer to the wildlife area entrance? The artists replied that the school groups will also be walking past the ponds to the parking area at the triangle piece, and that the detention ponds and path are already there – people will probably walk around them whether or not art is located there. Macy stated the art at the ponds took good advantage of an existing site and was a critical piece. Hayes stated the art concept helped the progression from parking lot to the head of Interlakes Trail.

A motion was made to include a trail around the detention pond and have the soft surface trail from the detention ponds to the Interlakes Trail removed from the plan and any map of the plan. The vote was 9 in favor, 0 opposed and 2 abstentions.

Members of the group revisited the floating sculpture discussion:

- This art on the water is a stunning idea, very interesting (Macy)
- Extremely uncomfortable with sculpture on the lake (Clark)
- This is a wildlife area and art does not belong on the lakes (Opila)
- The sculpture speaks beautifully to habitat (Hayes)
- Can find art on the water in cities, but this is not an urban landscape (Morgan)
- The function of art is to draw people's attention – people may notice changes in the lakes more with art there (D'Agostino)
- Lack of permanence is offensive to him; use of public funds for something that would disappear, not good stewardship of funds (Heidenrich)
- Many construction projects include spending on temporary structures and use of funding for them is not questioned (Calhoun)
- This concept is fine - "art visits the lakes", just as people do (Sjulin)

A motion was passed to endorse the design concept with the changes just voted on (re the soft surface trail) and to request that consideration be made of all the earlier committee comments. The vote was 7 in favor and 4 opposed with no abstentions.

**Notes from discussion on preliminary concept design – recreational facilities
Project Advisory Committee meeting, August 27, 2002**

Soft surface trail – what is the elevation? May flood in winter and spring. (Roth)

Maintenance – what will the costs be? Need to pare project down to the minimum to avoid costs that we can't afford on our lean budget. (Clark)

Soft surface trail – is it in sensitive habitat? (Opdyke) [ems – no]

Willow “weaves” – can you describe more fully? (Roth) [Nanda described them]

Art on the lakes – does not like the idea, recommends that art on the south side of the 40-mile Loop Trail be minimized, because the natural area is art in itself. (Opila)

Viewing blinds are located along the interlakes trail, are there plans for any wildlife viewing areas along the trails here? (Opdyke) [not at this point but may have an opportunity along the soft surface trail]

Does not want to see art on the lakes, wants the other installations to be more permanent and not transient/ephemeral. (Bob Neilsen)

Interested in art on the water, idea of vertical change. (Ian)

No opinion on whether art should be on water, but concept seems disparate with rest of art proposed for site, is more apparently man-made. (Steve)

Why not pull out the dozen or so bird blinds abandoned in the lakes and use them to make a sculpture on the shore? (Clark)

Less is better – feels that perspective from the Friends of Smith and Bybee Lakes is being left out here. (Clark)

Reference sculpture in lakes could incorporate large woody debris, which would also serve habitat functions. (Morgan)

Native American references – this area not used for major boat launches or fish weirs, but first peoples did build ovens for baking wapato; fire-cracked stones have been found there. (Morgan)

Use of very large stones – these large rocks are generally erratics deposited during Missoula floods and tend to be located on higher sites, not at low elevations like the lakes. (Morgan)

Parking – may also have to mitigate for parking at old canoe launch site if that is final selection. (Morgan)

Willows – will lose a lot to beavers, and shape of the walls will be lost to observers as trees grow, damage occurs, etc. (Morgan)

Soft surface trail – is going into a wetland area, and there may be permit challenges to building it. (Morgan)

Entry – habitat trees need to be integrated into the restoration work. Otherwise, if cottonwoods are planted around them the habitat trees will soon be covered up. (Morgan)

Agree with Opila to keep develop on north side of road. (Morgan)

Has the railroad's access to their rails been dealt with? (Clark) [yes]

Earlier plans had an interpretive center in the southeast corner of the wildlife area, is this now abandoned? [yes, current plan is new approach]

Stormwater outfall – need to ensure it's only stormwater and not full of pollutants. (Roth)

Feasibility analysis did not address all the pros and cons of the canoe launch, two things in particular are 1) operational concerns from cars (surface pollution), 2) look at the water levels and how they compare at the sites. Need to weigh environmental impacts of the two launch sites. (Rennis)

Picnic tables – should we have them? (Davis)

Canoe launch – east site allows for getting boat further into lake even as it dries because of sand substrate. (Opila)

Art in the lakes – not necessarily opposed to it but issue of scale – prefers a more intimate experience. (Michael)

Habitat trees – intended to be symbolic or functional? (Michael) [Nanda – goal is to be useable but depends on siting]

Bat houses close to people are often vandalized because a lot of people still do not like bats. Maybe do installation in more distant location. (Michael)

Vandalism – is there a contingency for repairs? (Michael)

Like a lot of the art, will there be interpretive signage? How will people learn about the art? (Michael) [Calhoun – RACC is moving toward more descriptive identification. Nanda – likes the model of descriptive writeups at a central location but not necessarily right next to art where it may interfere with experience]

Soft surface trail – hesitant about more human intrusion next to habitat. (Michael)

Endorses focusing art on north side of the road. (Michael)

Trail width – the section of the 40-mile Loop Trail along the wildlife area was narrowed from 12' to 10' as part of the North Marine Drive widening project, to avoid encroaching further into wildlife area. Can we do the same here? (Hendrickson)

First concept (using old canoe launch) will have many places where people will cross the road, this is a safety issue. (Everhart) [Kurt – design elements will direct people where to go]

North Portland Rd. entrance – Port is not interested in conveying message about navigation, wants to stress the naturalness of the area and blend it with the wildlife area. (Rennis)

Prefers not to have art installed in the lake. (Rennis)

Likes continuity of art from BES facility to N Portland Rd to Marine Dr entrance. (Roth)

Bioswales – not a fan of their use for parking lots (Rennis) [Bob G. – would use trap basin/catches; Rennis OK with this]

Where kids will eat – big rocks will be good for low picnics. (Clark)

Kurt summarized:

- 1) Soft surface trail concerns include elevation and wildlife impacts.
- 2) Canoe launch – general preference for the old boat launch site
PAC disagreed with this point, does not feel issue is settled.

Show of hands – how many need additional analysis/information to feel comfortable providing direction to design team about canoe launch location? 4 need more, 2 OK

Straw vote – 7 favor old launch site, 1 favored triangle site, 1 abstained (2 had left earlier).

Next steps: provide additional information to PAC, they will ask questions, those will be answered, then PAC will vote. All to be done via email, about a week for each step.