

Summary of Comments from Integrating Native American Voices in the River Plan/South Reach PSU Native American Student and Community Center – November 21, 2019

About 33 people attended the Discussion Draft open house, at Portland State University, which featured 6 display stations: 1) Aspirations, 2) Big Idea for 2040, 3) Tribal and Urban Native Community Engagement, 4) Riverfront Communities, 5) Recreation & Scenic Resources, and 6) Watershed Health and Resilience. There was also a table with maps of information covering scenic resources, natural resources inventory, and recreation and trails (*the archaeological site indexed map is currently missing*). Each information board listed the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability goals and action items. Comments were written on sticky notes, the information displays, additional station sheets, and on an evaluation. Comment cards were also available, but none were submitted.

Below are the comments arranged by display with the evaluation commentary statement:

Good conversations & delicious food! Appreciate having the Discussion Draft Volume 1 in addition to the posters. Thank you!

TRIBAL AND URBAN NATIVE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Information Board Comments

- (Added action bullet under goal: “Coordinate with tribal nations and the urban Native community to:”)
 - Investigate impacts of herbicides on soil, plants & wildlife
- How will these goals connect with initiatives that already exist?
 - For example, “investigate a citywide...first foods....”
 - There are already initiatives around first foods in Portland
 - How does this align?
 - Should it be “collaborate on a citywide...”?
 - Rewrite! Rethink!
 - Funding
 - Manage
 - Misuse
- Some of the goals seem to be in conflict w/each other, e.g., how can we “enhance natural areas...” and also increase motorboat traffic?

Additional Comments

- The City needs to develop ways to identify and compensate leaders to take the time to review and comment on voluminous plans
- There needs to be one intentional planning document to visually and textually explain water-based restoration + wildlife access plans, in detail; with marked creeks/streams/springs and sites identified with/by co-managed/ownership/easements from different agencies or orgs
- Why is Laura John the only source the City can cite to validate tribal official input and city planning?
 - Her work ≠ your work.
- What steps are in place to add tribal cultural knowledge to the archaeological map?
 - How would this look?
 - The City needs to acknowledge the knowledge as equal to that of scientific findings
- It would be great to see a Native Engagement Specialist for Portland community
- Find funds to do survey work

- Oregon Lottery
- Federal
- Respect an Indigenous value:
 - We respect the land
 - We respect the peoples of the land
 - Relational world view
- There needs to be space to put Indigenous canoes in the water
 - Consult on best practices, different than just a cement boat ramp for boaters
- (Reference to Information Board Comments)
 - Crap to look at that set of language

RIVERFRONT COMMUNITIES

Information Board Comments

- (Reference to goal: “Continue the City’s compliance with Statewide Planning Goal 15 by protecting, conserving, enhancing, and maintaining the natural, scenic, historical, economic and recreational qualities of lands along the river.”)
 - What is [are] the priorities?
- (Reference to action: “Support the work of the Joint Office of Homeless Services and strengthen coordination among public entities to minimize the impacts of transient boaters and campers, while providing needed services to the homeless population.”)
 - Minimize by kicking out without giving a place for them to go?
 - That’s been the go-to for years, time for a change
- (Reference to goal: “Develop and implement up-to-date design standards and guidelines for riverfront development.”)
 - Gentrification concerns
- (Reference to action: “Work with TriMet to improve the frequency of bus service on both sides of the river.”)
 - Pedestrian safety for crossing the river

RECREATION & SCENIC RESOURCES

Information Board Comments

- How will the City provide transportation to Ross Island?
 - How will the pollution of water transport be mitigated?
- Ross Island cannot handle hundreds of people per weekend leaving waste
 - Even with rules, how would they be enforced?
- What conflicts will increase by promoting and increasing motorboat activity in plan?
 - What goals are infringed on by increased motorboat activity?
- Concern with part of river being a superfund site and pollution from upriver coming downstream
 - Swimming in downdraft from pollution isn’t that healthy
- (Reference to action: “Complete a public swimming beach study that considers site and other characteristics and looks at potential conflicts with boating and natural resources.)
 - Water is too often not safe

- Pollution issues won't be solved for decades, if ever, due to cities and agriculture being riverside
- Waste of resources for study
- (Reference to action: "Allow a limited amount of retail at three mapped park sites to serve recreation users.")
 - ?? What retail???
 - Which model of recreation
 - Western?
- (Reference to action: "Explore public-private partnerships for new recreational opportunities (e.g. Oaks Amusement Park).")
 - Who gets to profit from natural features and who does not?
- (Reference to action: "Rezone the northern tip of Ross Island from Commercial Mixed Use 2 (CM2) to Open Space (OS).")
 - ** 😞 **
- (Reference to action: "Implement actions to reduce conflicts between different types of boaters and impacts on natural resources, riverbank erosion and existing development.")
 - Are natural resources or recreation the priority?
- (Reference to goal: "Ensure safe and seamless pedestrian and bicycle connections to and along the riverfront.")
 - Springwater Corridor connecting through Dunthorpe to Lake Oswego

Additional Comments

- Retail stores
 - In 3 parks
 - Could be developed by Parks, private or combo
 - Concern: Staff Jennings site
 - Traffic issues – could be costly
- Ross Island
 - When rezoned, how will people get there?
 - Card people
 - Wants options to get people out there
- What about no wake zones?
 - Seasonal no wake zone near cold water refugia near Stephen's Creek
- What about funding the actions?
 - Can we have a community collaborative process?
 - Good to have lots of actions – some specific
 - Flexibility to respond to a changing landscape
- Investigate the IPM chemicals used on plants for use of first foods?
- Plan says access to the river but is there a threshold to prevent degradation?
- Renamed Ross Island?
- Online open house

Maps

1. BIG IDEA FOR 2040:

- Where do animals get habitat space and connectivity without being an education's "experience" always?
- Make autumn no wake zone
 - Stephens Creek to S. Riverview Natural Area
- IDEA: More wildlife areas; Less people areas
- Develop vetting process that includes community feedback for the development of retail businesses

2. SCENIC RESOURCES

- (Reference to New Viewpoints SR-SW08, SR-SW09, SR-SW10, and SR-SW11.)
 - Adding new viewpoints for private landowners vs. poorest folks
 - Arrow drawn from Dunthorpe to Brooklyn Central City Viewpoints CC-SE29 & CC-SE30 with question mark

3. RECREATION AND TRAILS

- Need to incorporate Native place names and Native input in naming protocol for new parks, etc.
- Need to balance recreation (esp. boating) with habitat enhancement and protection
- (Reference to four shoreline areas along Powers Marine Park and upriver to Elk Rock Island.)
 - Call out cold water fish refugia along the river and protect areas from motor boating
- Multiple people offering this feedback
 - Mitigate dog activity along water
 - Possible to move dog park?
- Threshold of boating activity?
- Cleanness of river – is a real question!
- (Reference to existing & potential public access for swimming/boating; arrows pointing to south end of Hard Tack/Ross Island, Oaks Park and areas surrounding Waverly Marina.)
 - How clean is adjacent river?
 - Which fish are caught?
 - Do [Are] these populations healthy/abundant?

WATERSHED HEALTH AND RESILIENCE

Information Board Comments

- Can the City acknowledge the inherent right of land to exist, even outside our uses for it?
 - New Zealand has personhood status for certain lands – a precedence has been set
- (Reference to action: "Establish a minimum river setback of at least 50 feet.")
 - What does that mean for land owners?
 - Imminent domain?
- (Reference to action: "Apply standards to minimize the effects of site and building design on fish and wildlife, including new standards for bird-safe glazing, riverbank landscaping and exterior lighting.")
 - Light pollution, reduce upward lighting
 - (night/dark sky project)

- (Reference to action: “Update the River Environmental overlay zone to allow for the creation of mitigation banks.”)
 - Should we be creating mitigation areas?
- (Reference to goal: “Protect and enhance in-river, riverbank and upland habitat to improve conditions for native species and strengthen habitat corridors to the Willamette River.” **AND** Reference to action: “Regulate the removal of all trees greater than 1.5 inches diameter in the river setback and 6 inches diameter elsewhere.”)
 - How will salmon survive without shading and cooler water?
 - Re-evaluate IPM program and herbicide usage impacts on native plants & wildlife
 - Example: spraying teasel and impacts on native frogs
 - What about the creatures who utilize those smaller trees and bushes?
- (Reference to action: “Add a standard to limit the size of residential docks and locate them away from shallow water habitat.”)
 - Will the size limits be retroactive?
 - What about cumulative effects of many small docks!?
- Regulations for styrofoam docks
- (Reference to action: “Continue to evaluate options for minimizing harmful algal blooms in Ross Island Lagoon.”)
 - What do you mean?
- (Added action bullet under goal: “Identify priority areas for future in-rive and upland habitat restoration.”)
 - Protect microhabitat cold water refugia for migrating salmon along west side – no wake zone!
- (Reference to action: “Require non-river-dependent development in floodplains within 170 feet of the river to improve floodplain habitat function.”)
 - Is there already a process for this?

Additional Comments

- Identify cold water micro-climates along the river!
 - Protect from disturbance during fall migration!
- How are low-income communities beyond the riverfront being factored into the conversation?
- Are wealthier private land owners’ “concerns” being balanced with houseless and low-income access needs?
- How will public access to Ross Island look?
 - Will it strictly be Jennings landing & a boathouse for those who own them?
 - How will/can the City respond to the disparity between those who do not own their own boat?
- If you want to minimize impacts of houseless people, give them a place to go, don’t just kick them out, they’ll just come right back
- Update Sellwood Pool who [which] is used to the max [maximum]
- Show areas of oak savanna and plan to restore oak habitats
- How are you revitalizing habitat for native flora and fauna when you are opening the area up for human recreation?
- Treaty obligations

- Unclear what role these play within plan
- What should be expected of city?
- Consider wildlife in addition to tree-cutting regulation
 - (The idea that land is our mother)
- The more dense the forests and brush are, the higher the wildfire risk due to denser fuels
- Why doesn't the City want to invest in restoration without private/mitigation benefits
 - (City devotes resources to positions, why not actually planning long term land care?)
- Centering Indigenous values
 - Make this the central guide to this work & implementation
 - Repatriation to uplift Native communities and traditional cultural practice related to the lands/water = As sacred

Map

4. NATURAL RESOURCE INVENTORY
 - (Reference to West shore the along Butterfly and Powers Marine Parks.)
 - Protect cold water for migrating fish
 - Protect and restore oak woodlands
 - 🤔 but then eliminate Doug Fir?