



meeting notes

project River View Natural Area Management Plan

date 10/08/2013

time 5:30 pm – 7:30 pm

subject PAC Meeting #2

location: Gregg Pavilion,
Lewis & Clark College

Project Advisory Committee (PAC) Attendees	
Brian Baumann, Northwest Trail Alliance	Steve Manton, River View NA neighbor
Sarah Bice, Sellwood resident	Chris Sautter, South Burlingame resident
Corrina Chase, Tryon Creek Watershed Council	Jennifer Seamans, SW Watershed Resource Center
Michel George, Lewis & Clark College	Chad Sorber, OHSU natural area management
Michael Karnosh, Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde	Charlie Sponsel, Professional mountain biker
Marci Krass, Willamette Riverkeeper	Mauricio Villarreal, Parks Board member
Fran Laird, Collins View Neighborhood Association	Jay Withgott, Portland Audubon Board Member

Meeting Attendees, Including Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	
Paul Agrimis, Vice President, ESA VA	Kendra Petersen-Morgan, Natural Resources Ecologist, PP&R (TAC)
Shannah Anderson, Land Acquisition Specialist, BES (TAC)	Sheri Ann Richards, public attendee
Mary Bushman, Environmental Specialist, BES (TAC)	Steve Roelof, Project Manager, ESA VA
Greg Hawley, Trail Program Coordinator, PP&R (TAC)	Emily Roth, Project Manager, Natural Resource Planner, PP&R (TAC)
Dave & Dixie Johnston, public attendees	Maija Spencer, Public Involvement Specialist, PP&R
Elizabeth Kennedy-Wong, Community Engagement Manager, PP&R	Doug Zenn, Public Involvement Facilitator, Zenn Associates
Susie Mattke-Robinson, Landscape architecture Staff, ESA VA	

1. Introductions

The Project Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #2 attendees met at the Gregg Pavilion on the campus of Lewis & Clark. The meeting was attended by fourteen of the fifteen PAC members, members of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the consultant team, and members of the public. Public involvement facilitator Doug Zenn began the meeting by welcoming the group. Doug asked attendees to provide brief introductions and share one opportunity and one concern they have for the River View Natural Area (RVNA) site.

The PAC noted the following Opportunities and Concerns for RVNA:

Opportunities:

- Increase presence of fir trees (historically present), by replacing big-leaf maple w/fir on site
- Create a diverse use site with more hiking and biking trails
- A comparable natural area precedent could be Woods Memorial Natural Area in SW Portland
- Preserve the unique large forest in an urban area
- Wildlife corridor potential across Highway 43 – to connect wildlife to the Willamette River and create a bridge for pedestrians to Powers Marine Park
- Close part of the park to humans to provide wildlife habitat
- The large parcel has a complete functioning ecosystem, enhance to establish connectivity
- Enhance presence of native western hazelnut shrub, which has many Native American uses (weaving, food, medicine)
- Provide a recreation place that people don't have to drive to access
- Important place to bring children
- Create balanced use for both active and passive recreation on site
- Provide more sustainable uses on trails, consider a run and ride section and cross-grade trail
- Provide a solution for mountain bikers, hikers, wildlife, and natural ecology
- Protect very important existing bald eagle and chinook habitat and provide connectivity
- Officially identify wetlands on-site for future protection
- Protect water quality of streams – importance of naming streams
- Collaborate with property neighbors, Lewis and Clark College (who currently plans to remove ivy throughout their campus) and River View Cemetery on invasive removal
- The site can be a living laboratory for nearby schools to engage students and neighbors
- Maintaining the neighborhood site as natural area rather than developed for soccer fields

Concerns:

- Stormwater management, with increased stormwater flows from site development
- Recreation impacts on neighborhood and ecological services on site
- Bicycle use – need to honor terms of the purchase agreement to protect natural resources
- Highway 43 is a barrier to wildlife connectivity
- Invasive species seed bank on adjacent properties (River View Cemetery and Lewis and Clark College) encroaching back onto RVNA
- Invasive management continuing success - assurance of budgeting in place for future success
- Invasive plant treatments types trade-offs
- Getting user groups to work together on site
- Provide access to different areas while not damaging the ecosystem
- Access will be limited, similar to other park properties with less recreation access
- Losing investment of ivy & clematis invasive vine eradication with encroachment from neighboring properties
- Coming up with the best use for the site with access while preserving natural resources assets

Members of the TAC and consultant team introduced themselves and project manager Emily Roth noted the PAC meetings are an important opportunity for input on the project.

2. Ground Rules and Protocols:

Doug stated the ground rules and protocols for the PAC meetings. He clarified the role of the advisory committee as a team to advise the city as they move forward with the plan. He noted the importance of representing the views of all PAC members during the meetings.

3. Site and Work Plan Review:

Steve Roelof, RVNA Project Manager at ESA Vigil-Agrimis, reviewed the work plan schedule for the RVNA including major meetings and deliverables. Emily Roth, Project Manager, noted that PP&R and TAC solely review deliverable documents such as the Relevant Information Memo, and documents are posted online when they are finalized. She encouraged the PAC members to attend upcoming RVNA community events as representatives for the project. Emily responded to a question about capital funding for the project, and noted operations and maintenance money is allocated by the city. Funding for the management plan and invasive removal is funded by the Sellwood Bridge Project. Once the plan is finalized, the team can seek financial support for capital to build trails.

Steve reviewed the handout site maps including: Corridor Analysis, Aerial Photograph, Waterways and Wetlands, BES Tributary Conditions, Existing Vegetation, Soils, Topography & Slopes, Zoning, and River View Natural Area trails map by PP&R.

Emily Roth asked if there is a known ideal temperature to maintain in streams, to determine whether existing stream temperatures should be lowered or maintained. A BES TAC member stated that 16 degrees Celsius is considered cold, and 21 degrees Celsius is a temperature in which salmon start to die. The stream temperatures are moderated at the confluences of the seven streams on-site with the Willamette River. The Willamette can be warm during summer months, and keeping the RVNA streams as cold as possible is optimal. Emily responded to questions regarding the nearby Sellwood bridge on-site protections, stating that on-site protections are being checked by Multnomah County.

A PAC member posed the question on the Waterways and Wetlands map about the presence of several culverts being offset from the streams under Highway 43. Steve responded that some culverts are offset from the natural channels and field verification will be required. Emily responded that RVNA is in a natural slide area and culverts have potentially offset as a result of landslides. The PAC member noted that correcting culvert offsets could improve water temperature and connectivity.

A PAC member asked if existing vegetation surveys were completed outside of RVNA, and a PP&R TAC member responded that they are completed on PP&R lands, and not on adjacent properties outside of the RVNA boundary. Another PAC member asked for clarification of soil types and slopes and asked if certain soil types support wetlands. A member of the consultant team responded that soils plus vegetation and topography were a complete indicator for wetland areas.

While reviewing the zoning map, Steve noted the RVNA is primarily zoned for open space with a conservation zone or protection zone. Developing in these zones has different cost implications for permitting. Emily noted that open space zoning designation is put over most park areas. Conservation zones are associated with forest land and connectivity, while protection zones are associated with creeks and streams. A PAC member asked why the southeast corner of RVNA is designated Residential, and Emily responded the zoning is relic, and Parks will change the zoning in the future

when applying to implement the plan/construct trails. Emily added that Powers Marine Park may be managed in the future together with RVNA.

Steve noted the consultant team's task of overlaying site components including waterways, trails, and slopes to provide the best concept that is compatible with protecting natural resources at RVNA. A PAC member asked if the concept was determined yet. Steve responded that the concept had yet to be determined (as the site analysis will take place next), and the concept will incorporate feedback received from the PAC and TAC meetings. Emily noted that the consultant team is responsible for providing one concept that is compatible for the site, and they are tasked with addressing access, stormwater, trails (to be constructed to PP&R guidelines), hiking and mountain biking, all ecological prescriptions (including stream restoration, etc), and interpretation and placement.

A PAC member asked for examples of possible difficulties in the planning process, and Steve responded that slopes on the site were challenging, as well as providing for multiple activities on site. An obvious area for recreation is not present, as streams are spread through the site. Steve also mentioned complex connections with neighboring sites. Another PAC member asked about measured examples of trail erosion, and a PP&R TAC member noted no quantified measurements are available, only visual estimates.

A PAC Member explained that mountain bike trail design is nuanced, and noted existing PP&R trail guidelines are good for hiking trails, and not for mountain biking. He stated the need to look at innovative designs for mountain biking trails that are sustainable. Another PAC member noted the Cape Alava trail in the Olympic Mountains as a good example for innovative boardwalk systems. A PAC member also noted protection for RVNA and potential limited parking access from a new west side parking lot and access to Powers Marine Park.

4. Development of Guiding Principles

Doug Zenn asked the PAC members to list guiding principles for RVNA.

Draft Guiding Principles will be developed from the following concepts:

- Provide access to a diversity of populations and recreation opportunities
- Innovate
- Consider impacts on neighborhood
- Look elsewhere (at studies or precedents on other sites)
- Maximize the variety of uses while protecting habitat
- Enhance habitat conservation and protection
- Provide bike connectivity
- Create a collaborative model
- All users including wildlife are safe and welcome in the park
- Educational goals to engage as learners and participants
- Be an inclusive body
- Protect existing natural resources

5. Wrap-Up

Doug thanked the group for attending, and noted the next PAC meeting will be January 7, 2014. Emily thanked everyone for attending, and stated the project team will look to the guiding principles as a measure of success for the plan. Emily reiterated that she and Maija are available to meet with any of the PAC team's groups that have questions, and handouts from this PAC #2 meeting will be posted

online to the PP&R website <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/parks/62001>. She reminded the committee about the community meeting in November to review the site analysis. She encouraged the group members to consider how a compatible plan would look that addressed opportunities, concerns, and guiding principles stated today.