



meeting notes*

project River View Natural Area Management Plan

date 04/08/2015 time 5:30 pm – 8:00 pm

present See below location: The Watershed's Community Room

subject PAC Meeting #4

Project Advisory Committee (PAC) Attendees	
Brian Baumann, Northwest Trail Alliance	Steve Manton, Park neighbor
Adam Clinton Baylor, Mazamas Stewardship Manager <i>(absent)</i>	Chris Sautter, South Burlingame resident
Sarah Bice, Sellwood resident	Jennifer Seamans, SW Watershed Resource Center
Michel George, Associate VP of Facilities, Lewis & Clark College	Chad Sorber, OHSU natural area management <i>(absent)</i>
Michael Karnosh, Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde <i>(absent)</i>	Charlie Sponsel, Professional mountain biker
Marci Krass, Willamette Riverkeeper <i>(absent)</i>	Mauricio Villarreal, Parks Board member
Fran Laird, Collins View Neighborhood Association	Jay Withgott, Portland Audubon Board Member
Torrey Lindbo, (alternative for PAC Member Corrina Chase, Tryon Creek Watershed Council)	

Meeting Attendees, Including Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) *Continued next page	
Mike Abbaté, PP&R Director	Paul Ketcham, Willamette Watershed Manager, BES (TAC)
Paul Agrimis, Vice-President, ESA VA	Susie Mattke-Robinson, Landscape Planner, ESA VA
Shannah Anderson, Land Conservation Specialist, BES (TAC)	Steve Roelof, Project Manager, ESA VA

Mary Bushman, Environmental Specialist, BES (TAC)	Emily Roth, Project Manager, Natural Resource Planner, PP&R
Astrid Dragoy, City Nature Natural Resource Zone Manager, PP&R	Maija Spencer, Public Involvement Specialist, PP&R
Rachel Felice, Natural Area West Supervisor, PP&R (TAC)	Janelle St. Pierre, Natural Resource Ecologist, PP&R
Jim Hagerman, BES Interim Director	Doug Zenn, Public Involvement Facilitator, Zenn Associates
Kate Holleran, Natural Resources Scientist, Metro (TAC)	Members of the public
Jeff Hough, Trail Program Coordinator, PP&R (TAC)	

1. Introductions

Attendees of the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #4 met at the Watershed’s Community Room. The meeting was attended by eleven of the fifteen PAC members, members of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), city staff, the consultant team, and members of the public. Public involvement facilitator Doug Zenn began the meeting by welcoming the group and attendees briefly introduced themselves. Doug noted this meeting will provide the PAC the opportunity to review the Access and Management Concept and make recommendations to the Directors on what will be presented to the public at the Open House in May.

2. Introductory Comments

Portland Parks & Recreation (PP&R) Director Mike Abbaté and Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) Interim Director Jim Hagerman welcomed the group and provided an update of the current planning process. The 146 acre parcel at River View Natural Area (RVNA) was acquired by two city bureaus, BES and PP&R, in partnership with the Trust for Public Land and Metro. The bureaus have made a substantial investment in restoring the natural area. The Commissioners’ policy restricting mountain biking on the site cannot be addressed at this time. Director Abbaté recognizes there is a demand for mountain biking and funding for a city-wide off-road cycling Master Plan has been requested by PP&R. During this meeting, PAC members will continue the planning process that protects the natural resources of the site and identifies compatible recreational uses.

3. Overview and Updates

Emily Roth, PP&R Project Manager, reviewed the TAC’s progress since the PAC last met in January 2014. The TAC has continued to work on the Ecological Prescriptions and has drafted site-specific Design Criteria. A parking concept has been developed for half-street improvements along SW Palatine Hill Road. Parking will not be available at Lewis & Clark. An Access and Management Concept has been developed and recommended by the TAC. This is the same concept that was developed before mountain bikes were restricted on the site. If RVNA is selected in the city-wide off-road cycling plan, the access concept would remain the same. The PAC is an advisory body, not a decision-making body. This meeting provides the PAC with the opportunity to discuss the Access and Management Concept, suggest changes for the PAC to discuss, and make recommendations to the Directors for the Open

House. The PAC will also discuss management decisions (e.g. whether dogs will be allowed in the natural area) and determine what will move forward to the Directors and the Open House. **(Note:** Management recommendations were not discussed at the meeting due to time constraints). Emily also thanked all staff and volunteers for restoration that has improved the ecological health of the site.

4. Natural Resource Presentation and Discussion

Emily next presented the Natural Resources Map. She reminded attendees that during the January 2014 PAC meeting, the PAC approved the goals and guiding principles for the Management Plan. The Natural Resources Map includes two important ecological features, TEES (Terrestrial Ecological Enhancement Strategy) Interior Forest Habitat and Aquatic Function Areas. The TEES Interior Forest Habitat identified on the map fits the City of Portland definition for this special status habitat as described in the TEES document. The habitat is described as an interior forest patch greater than 30 acres and more than 300' from the nearest forest edge that is important for wildlife. The Natural Resources Map also includes an Aquatic Function Area (buffers around the streams and wetlands) in areas that influence the aquatic habitat of the site. The Aquatic Function Area filters water, shades streams, and contributes cold water to the Willamette River in a key area for salmon. The city is continuing to monitor streams through the Portland Area Watershed Monitoring and Assessment Program (PAWMAP) at three locations near RVNA. The Ecology Group (within the TAC) will meet again to finalize the RVNA Ecological Prescriptions document. The Ecological Prescriptions are a set of steps to move the condition of the site toward the Desired Future Condition (DFC) over the next 25 years. Once the Ecology Group finalizes the Prescriptions document, it will be posted on the project website.

PAC member questions and discussion about the Natural Resources Map included:

- Would trail buffers be required in the TEES Interior Habitat? Emily clarified that per the TEES document, a small trail does not constitute an edge condition, and mapping trail buffers would not be required.
- Are there specific species the Management Plan is being designed for? Emily clarified the Ecology Group did not have enough information at this time to select specific focal species, and an Ecological Prescription will recommend further study to determine focal species.
- Are wetlands now officially defined on site? City staff clarified wetlands have been delineated along Stream 6, and a technical determination has been completed in the rest of the site. At this time, the technical determination has not been finalized and sent for review to the Department of State Lands.
- An Ecological Prescription will address developing an inventory of the wildlife at RVNA (request to put this inventory on the website when completed). Although focal wildlife species have not been selected for the site, the City has conducted multiple wildlife surveys to date and also prior to acquisition. A list of approximately 75-100 species is continuing to be developed for wildlife seen on the property.
- Has there been progress on exploring whether River View and Powers Marine Park will be managed together (connectivity to Willamette River; potential spread of ivy between sites).
- Clarification that stream and wetland buffer size is 200 feet per City of Portland Natural Resource Inventory maps.
- Do areas that are covered by both TEES Interior Habitat and Aquatic Function Area receive more protection/have higher value? City staff clarified the Ecology Group did not discuss one ecological value as higher or lower; the entire 146 acre parcel is valuable habitat.
- The Interior Forest Habitat should be the primary driver for planning, rather than the focal species. The Ecological Prescriptions address the riparian and forest species as a whole.

5. Access & Management Concept Presentation and Discussion

Steve Roelof, Project Manager with ESA Vigil-Agrimis, presented the Access and Management Concept. The trail layout incorporates feedback from previous TAC meetings, and features one large and one small loop trail. Trails include switchbacks to create shallow, sustainable grades of less than 10 percent. This planning-level concept will be influenced by existing natural features. The concept has two phases. The first phase includes a trail at the accessible upper loop and a south trail to move people through the south of the site (incorporating trail access points from Lewis & Clark). The second phase includes the remaining trail to the north and east. The concept minimizes stream crossings, and proposes bridges at crossings to allow the natural movement of energy and materials through the site. Two overlook areas and a portable toilet at the west side of the site are shown. Parking is proposed for the east side of SW Palatine Hill Road, and would be completed as part of half-street improvements subject to PBOT requirements. The half-street improvements include parking for up to 35 cars, stormwater management for existing and proposed features, sidewalk, bicycle parking, sharrows for road bicycle traffic, and new street trees where needed.

PAC member comments/discussion included:

- How long would half-street improvements take to construct, and would alternate parking be available at Powers Marine Park during construction? City staff clarified that improvements would likely take less than one year, and portions of the area would be closed off during construction as required. The only parking at Powers Marine Park is at a small lot west of Highway 43.
- Location of the portable restroom should shift closer to Lewis & Clark, so it is not seen from SW Brugger Street.
- How would the proposed half-street improvements be funded? Emily clarified improvements would be proposed as part of a funding package for the entire site.
- Will new parking attract Lewis & Clark students to parking these spaces? Potential for two competing interest groups that want these spaces. Response that L&C currently patrols the neighborhood area and enforcement is effective with ticketing.
- Why is the trail concept phased? Proposed phasing will provide more time to better understand the uses at the site. The team will be able to gather more information at Streams 2 and 3, per a TAC recommendation. The larger loop trail would not be connected until Phase 2.
- Do cyclists and hikers have different needs? It would be difficult for hikers to give up nice trails to accept bicycles later. Phase 2 could be completed after city-wide off-road biking assessment.
- The layout significantly cuts down the length of time of trail and difficulty compared to existing trails on site. Possibility of expanding trails after Phase 2?

Steve explained the Design Criteria that informed trail layout. He noted the intent to locate trails in the outer 200 feet from the boundary of the property. Two exceptions are the top loop (to the west of the site) that provides an accessible trail to a broad user group, and section of the trail at the southeast that has switchbacks over a ridge due to steep terrain. Stream crossings were minimized, using short, direct riparian crossings. Bridges will meet P-zone (Protection Zone) bridge requirements to protect stream system functions. The layout avoids wetlands as much as possible, while balancing the need to stay out of the Interior Preserve.

PAC member comments/discussion included:

- Existing trails would be decommissioned once plan is adopted and funding is finalized.
- Concern about people cutting across switchbacks. Response that good trail design will obscure desire lines with boulders and vegetation, and desire lines are an ongoing management issue.

- Any suggested upgrades for stormwater management from two outfalls on site? Response that Lewis & Clark College is working on upgrades for their outfall and BES is identifying best treatment practices to improve quality of water before it reaches the outfall.
- Homeless camps are a current issue, and concern with blocking off a large part of the site without trails. How will this be patrolled? Response that camps are an ongoing maintenance issue and there would be a ranger enforcement patrol. Rangers would be proposed with the funding package that goes before City Council. Researchers and environmental education groups would also access the interior of the site to perform studies.
- There needs to be double the amount of rangers to patrol the site. Leaving volunteers to clean up homeless camp debris is not appropriate.
- Recommendation to include language in the Management Plan to have the possibility for more trails in the future. If the document does not have this language, it will be very difficult to consider additional trails.
- The absence of trails in the interior of the natural area was discussed. A PAC member asked why there were no trails in the interior of the site. Emily responded that it is important to have a large block of habitat not affected by human use. This concept has approximately 87 acres that will not have consistent human use. The TAC wants to keep a large interior area to preserve stream quality and habitat value. Aquatic function is a high priority at this site, with streams delivering cold water to the Willamette River.
- Are natural resources and recreation equal in value? Response that natural resource protection is the primary driver of the Management Plan, with compatible recreation.
- In an era of infill development, this is an unprecedented opportunity to protect interior habitat.
- Clarification that the City does not have permission to build any trails at River View Cemetery. Discussions have been limited and the cemetery may allow a hiking trail in the northwest corner adjacent to RVNA.
- Metro and other agencies have also had access discussions about other natural areas. Preference to avoid losing access to the site, and this concept is a decent compromise to get the community to see and use the site.

Doug polled the PAC on approving the concept to go forward to the Directors. PAC members provided the following comments and recommendations:

- Planning document language needs to be developed stating at a future time there may be an opportunity to design future trails. Several PAC members suggested this language needs to be added. PAC member wants to review the language before approving the concept plan. A member prefers to not add this language.
- Preference for PAC member to talk to Collins View Neighborhood Association before approving the parking concept.
- Do different user groups need different management decisions? Emily responded that the TAC examined techniques to share trails.
- Were alternatives developed? Emily clarified this is the best trail plan suggested by the TAC that meets most of the design criteria, and no alternatives were developed.
- Recommendation to discuss adding one more trail.
- One member noted there is a greater good of not putting a trail through the middle of the site, and another member disagreed stating lack of mountain biking trail opportunities in the city.
- Opportunity to link to more trails at Powers Marine Park and improve connectivity with other Willamette Greenway trails.
- Not comfortable endorsing a concept that does not include any mountain biking.
- Would there be issues with one trail down the middle, meaning two core habitats of half the size? Staff replied that there are concerns about disturbance from human use.

6. Management Recommendations: There was not enough time to discuss this at the PAC meeting.

7. Public Comments (there was only time to take questions and comments and not for the Project Team to respond)

Doug invited public attendees of the meeting to share comments in the remaining time. The public provided the following comments and questions:

- Under what authority are you operating to develop the Management Plan?
- There is an abundance of information about trails and wildlife not being mutually exclusive.
- More discussion about trail widths is required.
- Do any other natural areas in PP&R's portfolio allow biking? Response that Powell Butte is an example.
- Spending an hour to drive to a location where I can mountain bike is not appropriate when there are 7 miles at this site. This is not sustainable.
- Lack of use in the interior of the site will allow homeless camps to spring up.
- If this is a natural area where no dogs are allowed, who will enforce this?
- Thank you for planning efforts to protect urban wilderness and I hope that my family can hike there in the future.
- Thank you for presenting a positive and proactive support of watershed health.
- Has Metro been involved in the process? Emily clarified that Kate Holleran of Metro is a TAC member for the project.
- Has the city examined the potential impacts of trail users on the site's ecology?
- If this area is off limits to mountain bikes, where is my daughter going to ride her bike?

8. Next Steps / Closing

Emily reviewed next steps for the project, noting that the group won't have time to hold the Site Management discussion tonight. The Open House will be held on May 4th at the Multnomah Arts Center, with a 2 week public comment period. The intention for the next PAC meeting was to have a draft of the plan for review, but there may be one more meeting needed. The draft plan is scheduled to be done by July. The PAC will review and submit comments to staff, and the plan will be finalized at the end of September. Project staff will write a recommendation to the Directors on the plan. The Directors will then make a decision at the end of November and present it to City Council at the end of the year.

Emily and Doug adjourned the meeting, thanking the PAC for their participation and input, and thanked the community attendees for providing comments.

* Meeting Notes capture the essential information of the meeting – basic information, decisions and next steps. These notes are not an exact recording of everything that happened at the meeting.