

CITY OF CORVALLIS
MINUTES OF THE PARKS, NATURAL AREAS AND RECREATION BOARD
AUGUST 7, 2012

Attendance

Betty Griffiths, Chair
 Lynda Wolfenbarger, Vice-Chair
 Jon Soule
 Marc Vomocil
 Nick Castellano
 Phil Hays
 Ed MacMullan

Absent/Excused

Carolyn Ashton
 Randy Willard
 Joel Hirsch, City Council Liaison
 Kevin Bogatin, 509-J District Liaison

Staff

Karen Emery, Director
 Steve DeGhetto, Assistant Director
 Jackie Rochefort, Planner
 Mark Lindgren, Recorder

Visitors

Liz Frenkel
 Patricia Benner
 Tom Penpraze
 Tony Howell

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Agenda Item	Information Only	Held for Further Review	Recommendations
II. Introductions	X		
III. Approval of Minutes	X		
IV. Visitor Propositions	X		
V. CIP Plan			Motion passed to move the CIP Plan forward as presented.
VI. Orleans Natural Area Water Reclamation Project			Motion passed 5-2 that the board recommend to continue to support the existing master plan (that the land be used in the future as a riparian forest); and not turn the area into a constructed wetland.
VII. Adjournment	X		The next Parks, Natural Areas and Recreation Board meeting is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., August 23, 2012 at the Downtown Fire Station, 400 NW Harrison Blvd.

CONTENT OF DISCUSSION

- I. CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Betty Griffiths called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.
- II. INTRODUCTIONS.** New member Ed MacMullan introduced himself.
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.**
 Lynda Wolfenbarger moved to pass the June 21, 2012 minutes as presented; Phil Hays seconded; motion passed.

IV. VISITOR PROPOSITIONS. None.**V. CIP PLAN.**

Rochefort stated she would be presenting a condensed report on the CIP Plan; she related that requests for projects had been reviewed by a subcommittee. That subcommittee consisted of representatives from this board (Jon Soule and Lynda Wolfenbarger), CBUF and staff. She highlighted the recent arrival a spreadsheet that showed some changes in the projects listed year by year. Those changes mostly related to moving projects sooner or later. She said she would only highlight five standout projects and then ask for a board motion to move the CIP Plan forward to the CIP Commission. She said that given the current economy, priority projects include those that replace deteriorating facilities that may be unsafe or a burden; projects that could potentially provide revenue; and those that provide or increase accessibility.

She highlighted the project to look at acquiring the CH2M Hill building to be used as a Senior Center, recreation center, gym, and many other possibilities. She noted that although it may seem a pipe dream, it actually was within reach; there have been initial conversations. The current Senior Center may no longer be in the right place, given the university expansion. The proposed CH2M Hill site has a lot of parking and it is worth exploring.

Another proposed project is a bike pump track course and there was another request to improve the BMX track. There were several requests for different activities at Shawala Point; the CIP subcommittee agreed a master plan was needed for the site first.

She said permanent restrooms system-wide need to be an agenda item for the board to address, whether they be flushable, vault, portable, etc. The “dinosaur bones” in Avery Park are in disrepair; she has been looking at ways to fix them more permanently than has been done in the past; if they can’t be fixed, they may have to be removed.

She related a neighborhood group has formed in the Harding School District, and already a parcel of land may be donated, so the City needs to be ready to accept the land, if it becomes available and the Council approves. She noted the “Lincoln Street new partnership” also listed was actually the same project and she will correct the wording; Emery explained that it is on Lincoln Street, in the Harding neighborhood.

She stated the City received FEMA money for the Mary’s River Natural Area boardwalk.

Marc Vomocil asked about the owner of the parking lot at the end of 29th Street; Rochefort replied the current owner is the Brandis family. The Timberhill Natural Area land was accepted with a commitment for half-street improvements. There is a need for parking and representatives from the family would like a partnership with the City to make a parking lot available and alleviate the burden of half-street improvements.

Hays asked where the money for acquiring the CH2M Hill building would come from; Rochefort replied that there were several options, like partnerships, leases, long-term loans, and other real enough options that it is worth looking into. Emery added that the department was exploring feasibility with Benton County, which is looking for a location for its Public Health Clinic and its Health Department. Rochefort said the building is large, at 80,000 square feet, for just Parks and Rec use, but going in on it together with the County could be a great partnership.

Griffiths asked about the Timberhill Park Storm Water Gardens; Rochefort explained that the project was brought forward by former Public Works Director Steve Rogers. The project would be a demonstration storm water “garden” project on the west side; Public Works has money available for it and some construction could be donated. Griffiths noted the east side is more heavily used, especially by users with dogs off leash or playing games, while the west side is often extremely wet.

Griffiths asked when a master plan for Shawala Point would be developed; Rochefort said was not appropriate for the CIP but developing a master plan was an excellent winter project and is a high priority.

Vomocil commented that covered bike shelters were unnecessary in parks; there were three listed on the spreadsheet. Rochefort replied that one of those was for the Senior Center and includes a seating area and is a special situation, given the difficult parking situation there. The other is for the Osborn Center, and people have asked for it. Emery said the third was for the Administrative Building in Avery Park; Rochefort said there are code requirements for two spaces there. Rochefort noted that they are not in the current year, though the one at the Senior Center has already been approved; Griffiths suggested having further discussion on funding the other two in the future.

Vomocil moved to move the CIP Plan forward as presented from the CIP subcommittee; Wolfenbarger seconded; motion passed unanimously.

VI. ORLEANS NATURAL AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT.

Public Works Department Utilities Division Manager Tom Penpraze introduced project manager and chief engineer Preston Van Meter from Kennedy/Jenks Consultants; Mary Steckel, Public Works Director; and Dan Hanthorne, Waste Water Operations Manager. He said his goal tonight was to answer questions raised from the previous meeting’s minutes and from Griffiths’ memo in the board packet. He said he would address the plan’s conceptual layout, outline the Orleans Natural Area Site, and describe proposed site amenities and state agency interactions.

He displayed an aerial site photograph and showed site elements. He displayed the park master plan, noting there were parts of the master plan in the packet; he said the project would be close to, and consistent with, the MLK Park and Berg Park Master Plans. He highlighted trails through the site, the historic Orleans town site and the highway bypass. The park master plan calls for it to be a natural area, replanted with native species. He displayed the proposed facility’s conceptual layout, with trails, perhaps a boardwalk, plantings, and protection of the current riparian vegetation. He said planted tree cover would shade and cool the ponds, provide aesthetic value and help fulfill the master plan for the area. He explained treated water would flow through wetlands and infiltration basins into the river.

He said the wastewater treatment plant should really be thought of as a resource recovery center. It cleans up water (4 billion gallons of water last year); generates millions of cubic feet of methane gas via the treatment process with an anaerobic digester, which is used to heat the facility buildings; and also generates 870 tons of fertilizer, used on local farmland within ten miles of the plant. He noted effluent is de-chlorinated before it is released into the environment.

Penpraze said 28 acres on City property, not within the ODOT easement, were available for the project. He said the proposed facility offered amenities of interest to the board and the public.

Rochefort said the board needed to look at amenities listed in the site master plan that make this a park. She highlighted the recently developed Sunset Park, noting that it incorporated recreation, environmental stewardship and education; these are included in this proposed plan, too. It includes

walkways, interpretive signs, recreational use of trails and bikepaths, wildlife habitat and viewing. She highlighted photos of the similar "Talking Waters" facility in Albany. The board, in looking at the proposal, needs to look at how the proposal addresses recreation, environmental stewardship and education; these elements are outlined in the master plan.

Penpraze highlighted proposed interpretive signage, a linear waterfall (which adds oxygen to the water), bird watching, and about a mile of aesthetically pleasing trails and pathways intended for both walking and maintenance. The plan calls for about twenty acres of wetlands and six acres of ponds. He displayed several renderings of the proposed project, which included entry areas, signage, benches, bird watching and wetlands. He said the wetland plantings plan would include native plants in several zones, including emergent marsh, scrub-shrub wetlands, and upland prairie.

He stated that State agency interactions include the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), which is mandating reducing the temperature of wastewater discharge. He related that the DEQ evaluated citizen suggestions regarding the project, but the DEQ stated that none of these met regulatory certainty that they would meet the requirements within the five-year timeline that has been set. Substantial progress toward meeting temperature TMDL must be shown during this window.

He said there was some testimony from an ODOT employee last month; since then, staff met with ODOT. He highlighted a letter from ODOT, addressing how issues would be met. The facility would be allowed to build a trail and plantings through an ODOT easement, entering into an intergovernmental agreement. That agreement would address ODOT concerns by stipulating that if and when ODOT fully builds its highway, then the facilities would be removed at the City's expense, and that if there is any encroachment of wetlands into the easement, creating an environmental condition that ODOT would have to mitigate for, the City would bear that burden.

The Department of State Lands made a site visit, performed a wetlands assessment, and determined that there were no jurisdictional wetlands to be mitigated. Staff met with the Oregon Water Resources Department, and they will grant the necessary water permits and water rights requirements. The Department received a permit from the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Ground penetrating radar work was done last week to evaluate the entire site for subsurface artifacts and test plots will be dug on a grid approved by SHPO to look for artifacts later this week. He said the project was awarded a roughly \$38,000 State Water Resources Commission grant. He related that the WRC deemed it an outstanding project, which fits in with its recently adopted Integrated Water Resources Strategy, which looks for opportunities to solve multiple regulatory problems, conserve water, protect natural resources and provide community amenities. The WRC suggested the project be considered as a state model.

He highlighted the master plan in the packet, saying this project was consistent with that plan. It is a significant wooded riparian corridor along the Willamette River, and returns the site to a ten-year floodplain natural condition; he said the proposed facility does that. He said staff was having difficulty finding the MLK Jr. Memorial Grove; Rochefort explained that the grove was moved to the Riverfront Commemorative Park, because there was very limited access to what was formerly MLK Park. Director Emery said Parks and Rec staff would get back to Public Works on that.

Penpraze noted there had been little progress on implementing the 1994 master plan for the site since 1999. Griffiths noted some of the listed master plan elements were regarding Berg Park, as well. Emery explained that usually things don't go forward until funding is available; just because there has been no progress doesn't mean that a master plan is not viable, nor does it mean that staff or the board are not interested.

Penpraze said the Linn County states that no vehicular access is permitted on the site except for emergency or service vehicles. Access will be limited to bicycles and pedestrians coming across the Van Buren Street Bridge on the existing bike path, named Wilkins Way.

Marc Vomocil asked if ammonia would be dissipated in the waterfall; Penpraze said he anticipated little or no ammonia would be emitted; nutrients would get soaked up by plants. Preston Van Meter clarified that oxygen would be added in the waterfall system.

Ed MacMullan asked whether the trails would be all-year trails; Penpraze replied that like other parks in the system, there are seasonal closures during high water. Penpraze added that while it would vary each year, they should be open most of the time.

MacMullan asked if there would be any significant change in the type of usage of the site from that listed in the original master plan; Penpraze replied that it would be a low-impact use of the site, with "passive recreation" use. Emery said the significant changes include that the trails in the conceptual plan for the former MLK Park, now Orleans Natural Area, were probably a little longer than is proposed for this facility. When the time comes that ODOT wants its easement back, then roughly half of the trails in the original concept would be reduced. Another element of the original conceptual plan that could still happen with this model is that there is a boat launch. The original conceptual plan specified interpretive signing related to the City of Orleans former town site and restoring the woodland and riparian vegetation.

Griffiths added that the trails in the original plan were conceived as narrower. Rochefort added that any time that there is an ODOT easement, there is a degree of risk. The original trails were planned to be about 5' wide and these would have to be at least 8' wide in order to accommodate maintenance vehicles. Griffiths said they were originally conceived as natural, not constructed trails.

Jon Soule asked if the facility was installed as envisioned, whether it would still be under Parks and Recreation purview. He said that anything there would periodically get wiped out by flooding, and asked whose budget would fix that. Director Emery said the Parks and Recreation budget could not afford restoring trails annually; there would have to be agreement between the two departments, approved by the City Council. Rochefort added that getting plant materials established requires a great deal of management in the first several years. Emery estimated it would require at least one full-time person to manage that kind of landscape.

Soule asked whether purview would be transferred; Emery said that remains to be determined. Griffiths said if management was transferred to another department, the other department would have to find comparable acreage for a park. Rochefort highlighted today's newspaper, noting that having it well maintained would make it inviting to the public, as well as homeless camps; it would require management. Emery noted a number of people always live in the Orleans Natural Area; the more people use a park, the less likely that is to continue, so that is an advantage of developing this project.

Vomocil asked whether and how the department would be compensated; it is an important aspect. The project is a way to help achieve part of the master plan for the site. He cautioned that flooding would wipe out signage and docks; rebuilding it every year is an issue that could be very expensive and damaging. Penpraze said high water on the site would not be all that frequent. He related that high water last March would not have wiped out the site or the proposed sturdy, engineered paths; high water would not be a regular occurrence. Griffiths asked if it was in the flood plain; Penpraze replied that it

was. Griffiths noted that the Crystal Lake Sports Field master plan requires that elements be removed in winter due to flooding.

Public Testimony

Griffiths highlighted written testimony submitted from former board member **Kent Daniels**; she summarized that he concluded that this was not the right site for the project for a number of listed reasons.

Liz Frenkel said she'd attended almost all the public meetings regarding meeting TMDL requirements, but she'd heard little regarding Parks and Recreation or PNARB in the process. The use of Orleans Natural Area as a park is germane to this discussion. She said City Council's Resolution 94-13 supports use of the site for parks *only*, as does the 1994 master plan. She stated that the board's only responsible decision for the site was to protect values for park, natural area and recreation use; water treatment was not the board's responsibility or charge. She clarified that she was not opposing the plan, only that the board has a mandate to do what it must.

Emery commented that the Council's adopted Resolution 94-13 restricts this kind of project for the site, which is listed as "for park use only". For the board to recommend that the Council move forward on the project, that Council resolution must be changed.

Patricia Benner stated that in addition to her written testimony, she said that since ODOT easement access will go away in the future, the project is inappropriate. She stated that she was involved in the master plan process. She related that the master plan did not call for a wetland; the soil is not wetland soil. The purpose of the original master plan was to restore the native floodplain forest. If there are wetlands in a bottomland floodplain like this, they are narrow, long and linear, with a lot of edge and shade cover, not round. There is very little of this native floodplain forest left. She said that this proposal is not what the master plan had in mind; the proposal is for a facility that requires a lot of ongoing maintenance, contrary to maintaining a sensitive area.

She said she was willing to raise money again for reforesting the rest of the riparian area there. She said there has been no assessment of the impacts of flooding or calculation of the velocity of the current through the Orleans Natural Area during floods. She said the flood last winter was a three-year event; even the 1996 flood was a relatively minor, 14-year flood. She submitted an aerial photograph of the Orleans Natural Area taken during the 1996 flood that showed that there was current through the site. She anticipated that the proposed facilities would create areas of scouring during flooding; flood plains are intended to be open space and passive recreation park areas, not functional areas. This is why the current, adopted master plan is a good match for the site. She stated that the board must abide by Resolution 94-13 until the City Council changes it, as well as the current master plan. The site is not large enough for the purposes of this facility; there are other areas that would work better.

Tony Howell said he'd submitted written testimony for the June meeting. The concept of treating water like this has a number of positive benefits; however he'd prefer having a surface cooling facility, like Talking Waters, rather than an infiltration model. It is not consistent with the master plan for the site or the Parks and Rec Facilities Plan and calls for eliminating the reforested plantings. The current master plan calls for returning the land to a natural condition, with gradual removal of land from agricultural use, and hundreds of volunteers planted trees there with donated materials and there are some very nice 10 to 15-year old trees there now of various species. That planting ceased when the City needed contract farm income from the site and so further planting efforts were suspended. Further plantings could be done at low cost to continue implementing the master plan.

He said that contrary to the claim of the proposed facility matching the master plan, constructed wetlands are *not* a natural feature in a non-wetland site; it is originally a floodplain forested area. He related that there was excitement during Riverfront planning process about providing riparian forest there for passive recreation. It is the only natural area close to downtown. The Council can modify the Master Plan resolution; if it is done, he hoped the board would ask the site be replaced and paid for as part of funding for the facility.

Howell said it has been part of the inventory and is the only open space park that is likely to be found downtown; he asked whether it was appropriate to lose this. Griffiths asked whether it must be replaced by another site on the river; Howell replied that an adequate inventory analysis would be needed.

Griffiths highlighted a two-page memo from the League of Women Voters, material from ODOT, an email from Kent Daniels and a three-page document from Rana Foster with a number of questions including funding; a document from the Airport Commission; and testimony from Benner.

She emphasized that the board's focus should be not on the technical aspects, but rather on parks and recreation issues. Nick Castellano asked about different development standards in Linn and Benton Counties, since the site is in Linn County; Griffiths replied that there were different setback standards. Emery added that the project must follow Linn County standards; and the City may follow a higher standard if it wishes to. Rochefort added that it would require a Conditional Use Permit, with a set of requirements that must be followed. The City Council could choose to follow a higher standard. Emery said there is already a Conditional Use permit as part of the master plan. Griffiths asked if Linn County had been consulted; Penpraze replied that they had been consulted. Griffiths noted the Council has not established a policy of following higher standards outside the City.

Soule asked if Planner Rochefort recommended the project; Director Emery replied that staff cannot answer that, since they cannot have bias. Vomocil said several people have noted that it is too small for the project; Penpraze said staff had a professional disagreement and had evaluated four different sites. Following community meetings, the department settled on this one. Three of the four sites met the technical requirements. Hays noted that there are 39 acres of ponds on 50 acres at Talking Waters, with twice the pond acreage as this site. Griffiths said it is hard to compare them, for a number of reasons.

Hays highlighted his map. He said he didn't oppose the TMDL process, but opposed it on this site. He said that the Talking Waters facility was pretty, but there are very few natural areas left along the river. Few of these are in public ownership, so it is important to keep it as a natural area. The current master plan is to restore it back to a riparian woodland, shown on early survey maps of the area. The City Council resolution discusses public amenities for Berg Park, but lists none for what is now Orleans Natural Area. The master plan does not include constructed water facilities; the plan was to restore it to riparian forestland.

He said Linn County 1995 decided on uses for the site, including Exclusive Farm Use; parks may be put in EFU land, but not wastewater treatment plants. He said Orleans is a bad choice for the facility. He said it has been shown at Willamette Park that vegetation channels water flow during flooding there, and trails there turn into flow channels. In contrast, much of this site is still open area. He said he was concerned that periodic repair will be needed due to flooding. Periodic flooding will channel down paths; last year's flooding at the west end of Avery Park removed long-established gravel a foot deep; here, that would end up filling the ponds.

Hays said he had a problem with any use of this site other than park use. He said he hoped that at some point there would be another access to the south. The plan involves ODOT easements that will go away as soon as ODOT decides to build a highway. He observed that on the riverfront, you can hear the traffic; on the Orleans site, traffic noise will be much louder and it would not be pleasant.

He highlighted his map of the site. He noted that no one has ever clearly defined the area of the Orleans historic site. If you remove that historic site survey area, the ODOT's 16.7 acres, and 9.25 acres of existing vegetation, that leaves 22 central acres. Linn County has a 100' setback for the Willamette River Greenway; that leaves 4 acres of existing riparian woodlands that would be cut (43% of the existing natural woodland). Griffiths noted that not all that was planted. Hays showed the planted trees' location on his map.

He said one major issue was procedural: how the site was chosen in the first place. He noted that 44 acres of ponds was the alternate that went through the public process, and Orleans was originally found to not be suitable. He noted that Public Works discovered the presence of the Roche Road landfill at Berg Park two years ago, rendering it unsuitable. He asked why the other sites were deemed unsuitable. Penpraze replied that the department was in error in thinking the landfill was on Orleans Natural Area, rather than Berg Park. It didn't want to put a wetland on a dump, so that went into the report. It then disclosed this to the City; the alternative a year ago became the Orleans site. He estimated the project would last well beyond twenty years.

Griffiths said that the process issue is why she asked how long the Orleans Natural Area for the site had been chosen. She said it felt like the process had gone far forward before the board became involved. If the board is to be considered advisory, it must be involved much earlier, and that must be discussed. She said maintenance costs to the department must be considered, as well as paying for costs of vegetation. She said the board hadn't seen a final plan; it had only seen pictures. Typically, a good deal more information is available to the board. Also, the agreement between the two departments must be clarified, including the conflicts of interest, especially in terms of use, and mitigating those problems. The board hadn't heard about the amount of time the area would be closed to the public for maintenance. There are no exact answers on flooding. There also needs to be a management agreement and a lease agreement. She said perhaps Public Works should buy another park elsewhere for this facility and deed it to Parks and Recreation.

Hays added that there is a possibility that project could fail, since no other projects cool water like this; infiltration like this has never been done elsewhere. He related that the Lancaster report characterized it as a \$16 million dollar experiment. He asked if it failed, who would get stuck with managing it; noting that that failure would burden future taxpayers.

Emery said there were two main discussion issues. She said the board must consider whether to implement the master plan to restore it to a natural area riparian woodland as stewardship, which is what the community wanted in the 1990's, and was adopted; or whether the board wanted a water treatment facility. That facility would create a park-like atmosphere, though not natural. She said she believed that staff can bring the costs to the Council, which can decide how it is funded. She stated that the Parks and Recreation department cannot fund it; the current farming on the site helps pay for site maintenance and management.

Rochefort said the two departments would have to work together to bring something to the Council, if that is what the board decides. She added that the term "natural area" is understood differently among people; Griffiths said there is a good definition on the department website and in the packet.

Castellano said the board needs to come to consensus on what model it wanted to follow. Ed MacMullan said he was wrestling with the uncertainty about amending the master plan, including the degree in change of use. He said there would be a restriction in access, with reduced amount of trails compared to the master plan, and the concern with ODOT eliminating access to facility trails in 20 to 30 years. Regardless of use, it will flood; he was not sure if this facility would increase flooding impacts to the site; and if so, whether Parks would be responsible for increased maintenance.

Jon Soule said the board must look at what it is asked to do, including throwing out the current master plan and changing Resolution 94-13; and at a minimum, would have to lease the land to Public Works. However, his experience was that a lease would not work, and the department would have to walk away from a unique piece of land. Given the site's location, the board must walk away from its mandate in order to do that, and all of these steps would be to build a facility whose approach was experimental.

Lynda Wolfenbarger said the flooding is a concern, the ODOT easements are questionable, and the City would need a permit from Linn County for the change of use. She objected to disturbing the Orleans historic site and removing the trees that have been planted by many volunteers to create the park it was supposed to be.

Vomocil stated that the master plan in the 1990's was a good one, but times and need and opportunities change. The need was not foreseen. The proposed use is reasonable and realistic and meets city needs. Another piece suitable for riparian forest could be found. He said he was willing to modify the master plan and transfer it to another piece of property.

Griffiths summarized the options were to uphold the current master plan and not recommend the proposal for a constructed wetland; or to recommend modifying the master plan, transferring the property to Public Works for this constructed wetland facility, and possibly implementing the master plan elsewhere. Vomocil said it would be better if the project went forward for Parks and Rec to remove itself and have Public Works build and manage the project.

Director Emery clarified that the City owns the property and the Parks and Recreation Department manages it. It is not about departments; it is about community; this department manages parks. This proposal releases management of the water reclamation project to Public Works and defines who maintains it, which is a positive thing. Part of the accommodation is that the community would lose a park; one proposal could be to change management to Public Works for a water reclamation area open to the public, like many others, and purchase park acreage elsewhere, that would be available to the community as a park.

Vomocil noted that if Public Works managed it as it proposes, it would function as a park and be open to the public. Rochefort said a partnership is a possibility, but it would be a departure from parts of the current master plan.

Hays said you are not going to go out and find another 36-acre riparian forest. He said he has been on the Greenbelt Land Trust board since its founding in 1990; the group has been looking at such lands in detail for years. Such sites relatively near Corvallis are owned by the State, and the remainder were south of Corvallis, outside the city limits, and are not close to town. Rochefort asked if properties along the Mary's River were a reasonable alternative; Hays agreed there were some nice properties along the Mary's River.

Griffith summarize that option #1 was to uphold the current master plan, and keep it the way it is. Option #2 was to modify the current master plan, so that it would include a constructed wetland, as

described this evening. Option #3 would add the request that Public Works purchase other land as close to this as possible in exchange for taking over the responsibility for this site. The second and third options would have the same result for this property.

Vomocil asked representatives of Public Works their reactions; Penpraze replied that they would not like to see Option #1 happen. Vomocil asked if Public Works was willing to totally take over the site administratively and not work with Parks and Rec as a management partner; Penpraze replied that a practical approach would be to enter into an agreement with Parks and Rec; the Council would have to determine that, and who pays for what. He said Parks and Rec's expertise is in maintaining parkland and trails.

Castellano asked if Option #3, with Public Works taking full control of the site, would make that department's life easier administratively; Penpraze replied not necessarily. The property is already under City ownership. This site rated highly on the economic site, since it is already owned by the City. Purchasing another equivalent site was estimated to cost \$24 million to utility ratepayers.

Hays said he would want Parks and Recreation to manage public access, since that is its business and expertise; it would be strange to ask Public Works to do that for this. Park-like amenities should probably be managed by Parks and Recreation, regardless of who manages the site. Emery said a funding source would be needed for that staff and materials. Soule questioned if it was the board's place to walk away from an existing park with an existing master plan; if the city wants to go a different direction, then the city should do that, not the board.

Hays moved that the board recommend to continue to support the existing master plan (that the land be used in the future as a riparian forest); and not turn the area into a constructed wetland; Soule seconded. Five voted in favor (Griffiths, Wolfenbarger, Soule, Hays, MacMullan); two voted in opposition (Vomocil and Castellano); motion passed.

Griffiths noted that the Urban Services Committee or the City Council could change this recommendation; the board is only advisory. She said she hoped those groups would consider the issues raised in this discussion.

VII. ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 8:52 p.m.