
**Smith and Bybee Wetlands Natural Area
Management Committee**

Larry Devroy, Chair



METRO

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Smith and Bybee Wetlands Management Committee Meeting

5:30 p.m. - 6:30 p.m., Tuesday, May 23, 2006
Metro Regional Center, 600 N E Grand Ave., Room 270
Portland, Oregon 97232

AGENDA

Welcome and introductions	(Devroy)	5:30 – 5:35 pm
NRMP review – recreation	(Devroy)	5:35 - 6:20 pm
Updates	(All)	6:20 - 6:30 pm
Adjourn		6:30 pm

Summary Meeting Notes
Smith and Bybee Wetlands Management Committee
May 23, 2006

In Attendance:

Larry Devroy (Chair) *	Port of Portland
Troy Clark (Vice Chair)*	Audubon Society of Portland
Brenda Hanke *	St. John's Neighborhood Assn.
Nancy Hendrickson *	Portland Bureau of Environmental Services
Dan Kromer *	Metro Parks and Greenspaces
Jim Sjulín *	Portland Parks & Recreation
Dale Svart*	Friends of Smith & Bybee Lakes
Vickie Eldredge	Metro Parks – Committee Recorder

* Denotes voting SBWMC member

The meeting was called to order at 5:47 p.m.

NRMP REVIEW

- Elaine Stewart Submitted 2 handouts for the meeting. The first one was a letter from the City of Portland, Bureau of Planning. The letter is an update on a recent effort undertaken by City of Portland staff, in collaboration with the Multnomah County Drainage District and other agencies, to scope a potential future project in the Columbia Corridor. The second handout was a List of Criteria Used in the Trails Feasibility Study she thought might be helpful in stimulating thoughts and ideas for the NRMP review (evaluating future recreational uses at Smith and Bybee). Elaine was unable to attend due to an illness.
- Larry Devroy began the meeting by passing out a list of recreational activities to consider for Smith and Bybee. He posed the questions: How do we address this? How do we simplify this process?
- It is not Smith and Bybee Park. It is Smith and Bybee Wetlands Natural Area. We need to take a look at the goals of the Wetlands and build the criteria based on these goals. Activities contrary to the original goals should not be allowed. These activities could be cut off the list of allowable activities. Activities need to be structured around the goals and original uses of the Park. *natural area*
- Some of the things that we should consider in evaluating criteria for the NRMP are: Seasonal limits, geographical limits, consumptive use. What ordinances already exist, (city, state, Metro). Some of the activities may be limited to state and local ordinances in place.

- If an activity is determined to be unacceptable, how do you state why? It needs to be based on already existing State and local ordinances and on the criteria that we put in place in the NRMP. One of the activities that was discussed was equestrian activities. Are they allowed in other parks and trails? Do we have adequate facilities to sustain this kind of activity? What kind of damage to trails would horse-back riding cause? If we do allow this kind of activity, then we needs to be spelled our very clearly.
- If we have the criteria in place, then the reasons why certain activities are not permitted are already in place. It was suggested that using a matrix still might be useful in working through this process of determining a workable criteria.
- The terms “passive” activities and “mainstream” activities were mentioned and the question asked, what is the definition of passive activities? What are mainstream activities? Are there limited kinds of activities? We need to start the process of writing this out. We need to test it and have explanations of why we allow certain activities or exclude certain activities.
- Larry will work on the matrix and work on grouping activities. He will focus on the impact on wildlife and habitat, based on the kind of activity – competitive events, passive events, and mainstream activities. Is Smith and Bybee set up with the correct kind of facility appropriate for the activity? Should we allow projectile activities, such as archery, firearms shooting practice? Frisbees, baseballs etc.
- We need to refine the criteria – throw everything out there. It will help define the criteria. The common thread for this should be taken from the goal statement with the habitat and wildlife always the motivating factor. There must be consistency across the board that makes sense. We need to be clear on what is allowed and what is not and with what conditions.

Update

Nancy Hendrickson brought up the question of where are we going for our yearly field trip? She suggested that we tour the Ramsey refugia project for our July or August meeting.

Dan Kromer informed us that the Metro Parks staff would update the Metro Council on the Smith and Bybee trail study project at its Tuesday, June 13th work session at 3:00 p.m. These work sessions are working meetings for the Council and not public hearings, so public testimony is not solicited. But it is a public meeting and you are welcome to attend and observe the discussion.

Adjourned: 6:45 p.m.

List of Criteria Used in Trails Feasibility Study

The following list was developed for evaluating potential trail segments during the feasibility study completed in 2005. Many of the criteria will not apply to the present task of evaluating potential future recreational uses at Smith-Bybee, but the list may stimulate thoughts and ideas.

Safety

- Road crossings
- Railroad crossings
- Proximity to landfill facilities
- On-road distance
- Commercial driveway crossings

Environmental

- Habitat impacts
- Loss of existing and potential riparian area
- Proximity to bald eagle nest
- Proximity to great blue heron colony
- Proximity to painted turtle habitat
- Wetland impacts

Cost

- Bridges
- Fencing needs
- Grading needs
- Acquisition needs
- Arterial road crossing
- Railroad crossing
- Funding opportunities
- Maintenance cost
- Mitigation cost
- Easements

User experience

- Foreground views
- Background views
- Sounds
- On-road distance
- Trail closures (frequency, duration)
- Wildlife viewing opportunities
- Interpretation opportunities
- Flood potential

Permitting/approvals

- Corps permit
- NOAA Fisheries/USFWS
- Railroad
- DEQ
- DSL fill/removal permit
- ODOT
- E-zone review
- Other Portland permits

Management

- Disrupts landfill operations
- Ease of patrol
- Emergency services access
- Utility access

Trail connectivity

- Neighborhood
- Port of Portland trail
- Peninsula Crossing Trail
- Regional



CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON
BUREAU OF
Planning

Tom Potter, Mayor
Gil Kelley, Director

1900 S.W. 4th Ave., Ste. 4100
Portland, OR 97201-5380

Phone 503-823-7700
FAX 503-823-7800
TTY 503-823-6868
Email pdxplan@ci.portland.or.us
www.portlandonline.com/planning

May 10, 2006

Greetings,

I would like to update you on a recent effort undertaken by City of Portland staff, in collaboration with the Multnomah County Drainage District and other agencies, to scope a potential future project in the Columbia Corridor.

I want to start with a big thank you: you were one of the many individuals who provided your valuable time and energy to this scoping effort last summer and fall. I genuinely appreciate the input you provided through interviews and subsequent conversations. Through these instructive interviews, we learned a great deal about your interests, concerns, issues and goals related to conserving and restoring high value natural resources in the Columbia Corridor area – a part of the city that also contains some of the region's most valuable industrial and employment land and transportation facilities.

The Columbia Corridor scoping effort was initiated with the idea that there are challenges and opportunities that could be addressed constructively through a future Columbia Corridor project. Before formally launching a new project, however, staff believed it was vital to do the legwork necessary to determine the following:

1. Are there common themes, issues and challenges expressed by diverse stakeholders?

Our interviews with stakeholders revealed a number of common themes which have helped to frame this scoping effort. From the interview results we derived a set of desired outcomes and a list of criteria that any future planning project in the Columbia Corridor should meet in order to be successful. Summarized interview results, desired outcomes and criteria for success can be found at <http://www.portlandonline.com/planning/index.cfm?c=39983>.

2. What are the elements of a potential workplan that could address these issues and challenges?

Our staff team, in collaboration with staff from other bureaus and with input from several stakeholders, drafted a proposed scope of work consisting of a regulatory improvement effort, an innovative site design demonstration project, and a trail alignment and refinement project. These elements were selected to be included in a core work program because we determined that they would provide the greatest benefit for the investment, best reflect input from stakeholders, and would be manageable within a relatively short period of time. A set of potential add-on options were also considered; these are tasks that could be added to the core program in various combinations, or in phases, to achieve additional benefits and address a broader range of issues raised by stakeholders.

3. Recognizing the interdisciplinary nature of the problems to solve in the Columbia Corridor area, is there interest and commitment within different City of Portland bureaus to carry out these workplan elements in a collaborative fashion?

Our inter-bureau staff discussions concluded yes, subject to budget and staff capacity.

An initial scope of work was drafted for consideration in the upcoming City of Portland budget for Fiscal Year 2006-07, and was evaluated along with numerous other Bureau of Planning workplan alternatives through a process that included the participation of bureau employees, the Planning Commission, and a stakeholder-based citizen budget group. Conclusions included:

- Proposed Columbia Corridor project elements would advance the *River Renaissance Strategy* and help implement the recently adopted *Portland Watershed Management Plan*; further, the project elements would help achieve City compliance with Metro's Nature in Neighborhoods program and contribute towards meeting Clean Water Act requirements.
- Due to other bureau commitments that will continue into next fiscal year (including the multi-objective River Plan and other large projects now underway), funding and staff capacity will not be available to initiate a project in the Columbia Corridor at this time. However, the Bureau of Planning's 3-year workplan includes a multi-objective planning effort for the Columbia Corridor to start up in 2007. The products we have produced for this initial scoping effort (issues analyses, draft workplan and summary report) will provide a starting point for this larger effort. Other recent City work products such as the *Industrial Districts Atlas (2004)* and *Portland Watershed Management Plan (2005)* also provide a foundation for the effort.

The significant investment of citizen time, City of Portland staff time, and other agency staff time committed to this effort – identifying challenges and opportunities, brainstorming and evaluating possible management approaches, and testing concepts – is all time well-spent. A summary report will be wrapped up in the next few weeks to document this work. Not only will this report serve as a starting point for the Columbia Corridor project, it will help inform the Bureau of Planning and other City bureaus as we initiate and continue a variety of projects, programs and activities in the Columbia Corridor area.

I will let you know how to obtain a copy of the summary report once it is complete. If you have questions about the next steps of this effort, please contact me by phone at 503/823-6991 or by email at dstein@ci.portland.or.us.

Thanks again for your contribution to this effort. I look forward to building on the conversations we have started about the future of the Columbia Corridor area, and I hope you are interested in continuing to provide your opinions and insights when we move into the next phases of this effort.

Sincerely,



Deborah Stein
Environmental Planning Manager

cc: Gil Kelley, Director of Planning
Bob Eaton, Executive Director, Multnomah County Drainage District