

From: Jerry Herrmann

To: Natural Resource Committee Members, Pete Walter (Planner), and copied to Bob Mahoney at his request.

My thanks to Pete Walter for researching the Type III decision that led to the change of a 250 foot set back to the 50 foot set back in Clackamette Cove. I reached out to some planning commission members (present commission) to find out if they knew of this change. They had not heard of it. Pete further told me this Type III decision was done when Nancy Kreshaur was in a different role and Tony Konkol was planner. That is the history and I do not disagree with it.

Overall here are my thoughts (not necessarily the thoughts of the Natural Resource Committee) (I cannot be at our January 9th meeting to due eye problems I am afflicted with so I am putting these thoughts in writing).

1. The Cove is obviously a salmon and steelhead bearing body of water. More than that, it is a recognized spawning area and rearing area for Pacific Lamprey. Three years ago, a tracking system was installed at the River Resource Museum and operated by a National Marine Fisheries contractor. Data showed that lampreys, salmon, and steelhead are routinely in-migrating and out-migrating from the Cove. Importantly, lampreys are rearing and feeding off detritus for up to 7 years that is abundant in the Cove. This information, especially the information regarding lampreys was not required to in previous studies. (I believe the NRC Committee should speak to this issue).

2. Eight years ago, habitat assessments were done of Cove vegetation. That vegetation had not yet diversified as has now occurred around the bulk of the Cove edge. Thus the Cove is developing (through natural succession and infill) a more diverse habitat zone. plants now routinely encountered (but not in the past), include Scouler Willow, Lasiandra Willow, Red Currant, Oregon White Ash, Western Spirea, Ninebark, and a number of evergreen tree species including Hemlock, Douglass Fir, and Western Red Cedar (the Natural Resource Committee should consider referring to this improvement in riparian corridor).

3. The quality of the developing habitat zone is markedly improved except on the eastern shore, where many of the referred to species were routed out around 2007 (why this was done is not clear, but NRC chairman Betsy Tarrel and I raised the issue, met with the Parks Landscape Architect, and fundamentally asked the question: "Why do your design drawings for the east side specify route-out and clear vegetative corridor to river's edge?"

4. David Fraiser (then City Administration) sought to resolve a conflict among his commissioners (Nicita, and Roth) by having David Evans and Associates design plan-view and elevation drawings that depict a way of "laying back the shoreline" with a diversified approach" including downed woody material, stumps and rootwads etc that would be removed on the eastern shore. That design still has current value and should be considered. It cost the City approximately \$20,000 for that design work. The Natural

Resource Committee and the City ought to take into consideration that design work and integration of downed woody material/rootwads/etc that certainly is on-file for review and reconsideration.

5. Whether there is a 50 foot or 250 foot set back is not the primary issue. I know the City and the Cove developer wish to do the right thing in regards to Cove development. I also believe many people feel that the nature of the Cove (being a former quarry with over-steepened banks) is the reason to make major changes. I would challenge any member of this committee or planners and others to look at the nature of the Clackamas River as it carves and cuts its bank to over-steepened condition. It is the nature of the river to do this. **(Trying to reconfigure the Cove to gentle slopes throughout the edge could be very damaging to habitats that have become installed. It should be approached carefully.)**

Lastly, if too much disturbance occurs, it may forgo opportunities for integration of mitigation strategies. Those strategies can and will be funded through outside resources. When the Natural Resource Committee met in December, I and others asked the question: "Is the intention to clear most of the banks of the Cove such as what is planned on the east side?" I believe the answer was "That's not the intent yet."

I think the NRC as a recommending body has the obligation to encourage habitat improvement wherever practical and possible, through a "reasonable approach to disturbance."

These are my comments and I hope the committee will include them. I have always supported the Cove developers and the, City, and development of this brownfield area. I am sorry I cannot be with you. My heart is really in this project.

-Jerry Herrmann, President, Rivers of Life Center