



PARKS ADVISORY COMMITTEE



AGENDA

Monday, March 12, 2018

5:30 pm
6:00pm

Dinner (Committee/Staff) – Breakroom
Public Meeting Session - Goodpasture Rm.

Customer Service Center
3050 N. Delta Hwy., Eugene, OR 97408

PAC Meeting

- I. Public Comment** – (up to 10 min.)
- II. Assignment Review** – All (5 min.)
- III. Review of Meeting Summary** – All (2 min.)
 - 1) February 12, 2018 meeting summary
- IV. Parks Division Manager Update** – Dan (10 min.)
- V. Update on Cash Audit Implementation** – Dan (10 min.)
- VI. HBRA Habitat Management Plan Presentation/Discussion** - Ed Alverson (30 min.)
- VII. Parks Master Plan Update/Discussion** – (15 min.)
- VIII. Staff Updates/Reports** – Various (20 min.)
 - 1) North Trailhead Parking Lot
 - 2) HBRA Fee Machine
- IX. Old Business:** - All (20 min.)
 - 1) Parks funding/budget discussion
- X. New Business:** - All (15 min.)
 - 1) Summer Schedule
- XI. Open** – All (5 min.)
- XII. Operations Report** – (5 min.)
- XIII. Meeting wrap-up/assignments** — (5 min.)
- XIV. Adjourn**

2018 Meeting Dates:

| | | |
|-------------|-----------|--------------|
| JANUARY 8 | MAY 14 | SEPTEMBER 10 |
| FEBRUARY 12 | JUNE 11 | OCTOBER 8 |
| MARCH 12 | JULY 9 | NOVEMBER 12 |
| APRIL 9 | AUGUST 13 | DECEMBER 10 |

Lane County Parks Advisory

February 12, 2018

Meeting Summary

**This written indexed summary of minutes is provided as a courtesy to the reader.
The recorded minutes created pursuant to ORS 192.650(1) are the official minutes of this body under Oregon law.**

The recorded minutes are available on the Parks Advisory Committee website:

<http://www.lanecounty.org/Departments/PW/Parks/Pages/pac.aspx>

Members Present: Carl Stiefbold, Pat Bradshaw, Jim Mayo, Greg Hyde, Kevin Shanley
Members Absent: Wayne Lemler
Staff Present: Dan Hurley, Lance Englet, Devon Ashbridge, Todd Bowen, Ed Alverson,
Sam Fox
Guests Present: None

Vice Chair Mayo called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

00:00:00 Introductions

00:01:10 Public Comment

- Kurt Yeiter, Scott Coleman

00:18:30 Agenda Additions/Changes/Modifications

- None

00:18:45 Assignment Review

- None

00:19:00 Review of January 8, 2018 Meeting Summary

- No changes

00:19:25 Parks Division Manager Update

- Hurley gave an update on the hiring process for the vacant Parks Manager position. Members were advised that none of the candidates who were interviewed were chosen to fill the vacancy and that the Division plans to reopen the recruiting process again for this position.

00:23:45 HBRA Habitat Management Plan

- Alverson provided a presentation detailing the process for the upcoming Open House in Harris Hall on February 15, 2018 seeking public input on the HBRA Habitat Management Plan.

Lane County Parks Advisory

February 12, 2018

Meeting Summary

00:53:10 Parks Master Plan Strategies Discussion

- Hurley reviewed information and received input from members on various strategies gathered from the Master Plan Task Force meeting held January 29, 2018.

01:09:55 Staff Reports

- **PAC Vacancy:** Hurley confirmed that member Alan Bennett has resigned from the committee. Bennett was recently appointed by Commissioner Williams. Staff plans to reach out to Williams for direction on filling the vacancy.
- **Harbor Vista Campground:** Bowen reported that construction permits are in place and the contractor will break ground February 20th. Parks maintenance staff has been working in various areas of the park in preparation of the sewer installation and electrical upgrade. The campground and park is currently closed during construction and the project is to be complete in time to accommodate Memorial Day campers.
- **North Trailhead Parking Lot:** Construction is on schedule at this location with County Road Maintenance staff performing a good portion of the work. Final grade work should be completed later this week, with project completion in the next couple of months.
- **HBRA Fee Machine Installation:** The new (HBRA) Mt. Pisgah fee machine will be installed this week. The new machine will accept credit/debit cards only and will not accept or dispense cash, helping to reduce service calls by park maintenance staff and will also help reduce theft and vandalism.
- **Mobile Parking App:** Hurley reported that staff has interviewed vendors for a parking app which will make it easier for park users to pay for day use parking using their mobile device. Staff is considering using a product known as Passport and hope to be bringing this feature live in the near future.

01:23:10 Old Business

- Hurley will bring copies of the performance audit for committee members to next month's meeting.

01:24:00 New Business

- None

01:24:25 Open

- Shanley – Park funding for HBRA, parking revenue
- Bradshaw – Maintenance plan

01:39:05 Operations Report

- Bowen reviewed an updated list of projects worked on and completed since the last meeting.

01:47:26 Adjourn – Meeting ended at 7:57 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for March 12, 2018.

Topics of Conversations, February 15th 2018 HBRA Habitat Management Plan Open House

Overview: The Open House ran from 5 to 7 PM, was well attended, with between 50 and 100 participants (44 people signed the sign-in sheet) over the two hours. Attendance was probably boosted by media coverage leading up to the Open House in the Register-Guard and on KLCC radio. A substantial number of attendees (but still less than half of the audience) identified themselves as having provided comments on the Draft HMP in 2016. Attendees were provided with comment cards upon arrival; 9 people provided written comments at the Open House on the comment cards. These comments have been provided along with e-mail comments that were submitted subsequent to the Open House.

At 5:30, Ed Alverson gave a presentation on the Habitat Management Plan (HMP) process and how the comments received during the 2016 review of the draft HMP were incorporated in to the proposed HMP that was released earlier in February. The presentation was followed by a lengthy group question and answer period.

The remainder of the open house was spent in on-on-one or small group conversations between staff and members of the public. After the open house, Parks and Friends staff who were present sent Ed some bullet points characterizing their conversations with Open House attendees, which are summarized below.

General Comments: There was lots of positive feedback and praise for the work being done in the park. Many expressed positive support for habitat management efforts, such as oak savanna restoration. A few people voiced concern about numbers of park visitors, which seems to be on the increase. Although the displays that were laid out on the walls and tables focused on conservation targets, and included enlarged versions of maps included in the Proposed HMP, we did not hear very much about habitat goals or targets. We also did not have many specific questions about how specific comments received in 2016 were incorporated in to the Proposed HMP.

Comments/Questions on Specific Topics: A few attendees inquired about the diversity of wildlife present within the park, they were generally interested in the charismatic megafauna ie. bear, beaver, cougar, elk river otter, etc. One participant asked about the ability to use remote cameras to document wildlife species present in the park. A few people asked about management of feral animals.

The majority of the conversations touched on the interface between habitat management goals and strategies and visitor experience conservation goals. For example, the use of herbicides for habitat management was raised, in part around the issue of use of herbicides along and near trails.

Dogs in the park were a major topic of conversation. The Proposed HMP identifies a set of projects to gather public input and other data to identify the portions of the park that are appropriate for off-leash dogs. One person asked if we had data/documentation of negative impacts to wildlife/ visitor experience attributed to dogs. People representing all sides of the dog/leash issue were represented at the Open House, including those who appreciate having parts of the park where they can hike with their dogs off-leash, others who think dogs should be on leash throughout the park, and others who think that dogs should not be allowed in the park.

Horse riders who ride on trails at HBRA were also represented. The Proposed HMP does not address horse use within the park. Off-leash dogs and horses are a point of conflict on trails, but some horse riders also bring their dog off-leash when they ride.

A few people also expressed concern about approving a plan that did not have specific funding attached to it.

HMP approval process: Several people asked about the difference between approve/adopt as it relates to the PAC recommendation and the subsequent BCC action. They were concerned that an “approve” outcome would not satisfy potential donors (foundations as well as individual donors) as it would offer no assurance that investments in conservation and recreation would be sustained in perpetuity. One person suggested that if approve is the preferred outcome, then the County should consider granting a conservation easement for the balance of the natural area to ensure subsequent boards or administrations did not simply throw out the plan, write a new management plan and pursue a program of intensive development.

Comment Cards filled out during the February 15th HBRA Habitat Management Plan Open House

COMMENT CARD
Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan
February 15, 2018 Open House

1) What do you like most about the Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan?

Before & after photos are very useful

2) Do you have any concerns about the Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan?

Correct spelling under 18 (1, 2, 013) when "and" is used instead of "an"

Lack of clarity around dogs on leash & off leash continues to be an issue on trail use. Just last week 2 large off leash dogs approached us & our leashed dog on trail. Having been brutally attacked by a dog this affects my park use. These dogs were not under voice control. No apologies from owner of dogs. Owner had 1 leash (which he eventually used after our reaction) & was not prepared to have both leashed.

Please do not keep a loophole that says "voice control" on dogs is a substitute for leashing dogs. Maybe the dog/dogs come back to the owner after they have charged & confronted leashed dogs & their owners but numerous dog owners call their dogs to "come" as they charge leashed dogs & then proclaim aggressively how "friendly" their dogs are & by implication how unfriendly leashed dogs (& their owners) are.

Name and e-mail address: _____
(Optional, if you would like to be added to the e-mail contact list for the HMP)

COMMENT CARD
Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan
February 15, 2018 Open House

1) What do you like most about the Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan?

Not much! I liked going to Buford Park years ago before all these "improvements" were done & my enjoyment has very much decreased over the years. I am also very frustrated with the process & doubt that my comments will make any difference.

2) Do you have any concerns about the Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan?

I only just heard about this through an email a few days ago. I usually go to the north trailhead & never saw a sign or anything asking for comments. I am very upset about the proposed changes to dog leash rules. It is cruel & inhumane to force big energetic dogs to walk on a leash!!!! I will never go to buford park again if I can't have my dog running free! The only way I could be ok with it is if dogs can be off leash AT LEAST on the north trail head loop (trails 3 & 7) including swing hill & areas around there (at the VERY LEAST!!!)

The other solution I would suggest & would be ok with would be to have (for example) odd-numbered days for dogs-must-be-on-leash, & even-numbered days for off-leash. Already dogs can't go to the summit, people who don't like dogs can feel "safe" on trails 1 & 2 already. PLEASE CONSIDER THIS IDEA!

This feels to me like just about the last straw, if I can't take my dogs off leash-after banning concerts & festivals (like faerieworlds) at emerald meadows, & rerouting & putting gravel on all the trails so I can't go barefoot, charging \$ to park (& now you can't even pay with cash!), & also closing access to glassbar island (by far the best swimming hole for miles around). All of these gentrifications (so-called "improvements") have made me not ever want to go there again. At least (so far) I can still (I hope) take my dog off leash & go barefoot along the trails that go down to & along the river from the north trail head parking lot. But that's not enough trail for a good workout, especially in winter when the river is high.

Name and e-mail address: _____
(Optional, if you would like to be added to the e-mail contact list for the HMP)

COMMENT CARD
Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan
February 15, 2018 Open House

1) What do you like most about the Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan?

Restoring savanna & open oak woodland

2) Do you have any concerns about the Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan?

Not concern per se, but a major advocacy that some areas of the park remain off leash areas.

Name and e-mail address: _____
(Optional, if you would like to be added to the e-mail contact list for the HMP)

COMMENT CARD
Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan
February 15, 2018 Open House

1) What do you like most about the Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan?

2) Do you have any concerns about the Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan? _____

No, but suggest a strategy of working with U of O Environmental/Biology Studies to study impact of dogs on native habitat & other subjects for which there is inadequate finding.

Name and e-mail address: Patty Shemkus

(Optional, if you would like to be added to the e-mail contact list for the HMP)

COMMENT CARD
Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan
February 15, 2018 Open House

1) What do you like most about the Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan?

Appreciate the acknowledgement of complexity of "off leash issues"

What % of human users have at least 1 dog?

2) Do you have any concerns about the Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan?

Possible consideration of seasonal differences is good. How about some trails (so many options) being off leash? Higher utilized perhaps not?

Name and e-mail address:

(Optional, if you would like to be added to the e-mail contact list for the HMP)

COMMENT CARD
Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan
February 15, 2018 Open House

1) What do you like most about the Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan?

Thank you!!

Restoration work on the former Wildish Property
Blackberry removal
Native species planting & preservation
Preservation & endangered plants & sensitive habitat

2) Do you have any concerns about the Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan?

Recent girdling of (old?) Maple trees

Potential dog policy – “dog under voice control” is my preferred rule.

Concerns about too much fir tree removal

Name and e-mail address: Deborah Noble

(Optional, if you would like to be added to the e-mail contact list for the HMP)

COMMENT CARD
Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan
February 15, 2018 Open House

1) What do you like most about the Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan?

Restoration of habitat. Addressing the dog issue

2) Do you have any concerns about the Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan?

1. Funding this important work is my first concern.
People do not pay fees on the east side trailhead. Needs a Kiosk – I know that's a management plan issue, but the \$ is needed.
2. Trails are crucial to preserving habitat. If trails are not maintained or added, people will stomp all over the parks. It's a habitat issue

Name and e-mail address: Julie Daniel

(Optional, if you would like to be added to the e-mail contact list for the HMP)

COMMENT CARD
Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan
February 15, 2018 Open House

1) What do you like most about the Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan?

Restoration of Oak Woodlands and Savannah

Just give me a chain saw and I'll take care of those pesky Doug firs for you

2) Do you have any concerns about the Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan?

Name and e-mail address: _____
(Optional, if you would like to be added to the e-mail contact list for the HMP)

COMMENT CARD
Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan
February 15, 2018 Open House

1) What do you like most about the Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan?

Conservation & restoration of identified habitats – riparian, wet prairie, oak savanna, oak woodlands, etc. and concurrent preservation of threatened species

2) Do you have any concerns about the Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan?

1. Parks are for people – I am concerned about the possibility of providing sufficient recreational opportunities for the exponentially growing number of visitors, who are primarily hikers/walkers.
2. How will you prioritize limited resources?
3. How will you maintain restored areas – where will resources come from? Restoration without maintenance seems pointless.
4. How will you achieve goal 4 in regards to the conservation target of visitors? Specifically, minimizing use of herbicides & limiting visitor/herbicide interaction?

Name and e-mail address: Anne Forrestel

(Optional, if you would like to be added to the e-mail contact list for the HMP)

Habitat Management Plan correspondence received during February and March 2018

ALVERSON Edward R

From: Ellen Otani
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2018 8:53 AM
To: ALVERSON Edward R
Subject: HBRA HP public comment
Attachments: HP Otani Comments Feb 2018.doc

Morning Ed,

Attached please find my public comment on the proposed HBRA Habitat Plan. I am very pleased with the document as a whole. The fact that I only have one issue left is a credit to your's and Jason's conscientious efforts.

--

Ellen Otani

Over all, I am very pleased with Version 3 of the HBRA Habitat Management Plan and feel most issues have been addressed. However, I am still concerned about the document's status as, essentially, an unofficial set of guidelines. In my opinion, the Plan should "adopted" as part of the process of amending the Rural Comprehensive Plan, not simply approved or recognized as the technical administrative guide described on p. 5-6 1.6 and p. 19 3.3.3.

Underlying reasoning:

1. The Board of County Commissioners adopted HBRA MP as a refinement of the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan in 1994, a land-use plan acknowledged by DLCD (Department of Land Conservation and Development).
2. The 1994 HBRA Master Plan called for wildlife and vegetative management plans, now combined into a single proposed habitat management plan, establishing that the HBRA HP is intended to be an integral part of the HBRA MP, and as such, adopted, not merely approved or accepted.
3. The 2011 Draft HP stated on p.12 that the HP did not require an amendment to the Lane County Comprehensive Plan, but provided no authority for that statement; however, p. 16 still provided for the HP's adoption, presumably as a refinement of the Metro Plan.
4. In 2013, HBRA and the HBRA MP were removed from the Metro Plan when the Metro Plan Boundary east of I-5 was made contiguous with the Springfield UGB, further east; the Board of County Commissioners neglected to re-adopt the MP into the RCP, an oversight they justified by asserting the issue would be corrected concurrently with the adoption of the 2018 Parks MP as an amendment to the Rural Comprehensive Plan.
5. The HBRA HP has historically been considered an integral part of the HBRA MP, and both must be enforceable by virtue of their inclusion in the RCP in order to prevent incompatible, unauthorized use of HBRA that could have unintended consequences. An adopted Plan also provides park owners (i.e., the general public), grantors, donors, volunteers, park users, neighbors, and other collaborating entities assurance that the expectations enumerated in the paired documents will be upheld.

The HP must be included along with the HBRA MP in the currently planned RCP amendment process to protect the integrity of both Plans.

Questions:

1. Why would "lack of financial commitment" disqualify the HP from being adopted into the RCP? Many plans have project lists that are unfunded in the near term.
2. Why would the "technical nature" of the HP disqualify the HP from adoption? Most Plans have a foundation of technical analysis.
3. What valid reason(s) would there be for not adding the HP as a refinement or component of the HBRA MP when the MP is given its rightful place in the RCP?
4. How can the Large Event Task Force expect its policies to be enforced if the document referencing its report is itself unenforceable?

5. What would you say to The Nature Conservancy, whose methodology was the basis for the HBRA HP, to explain why the plan is being given such little credence?
6. Why should Lane County, which appears unwilling to grant enforcement status to a habitat plan governing property it owns, be trusted to abide by conservation easements on adjacent property the county may seek to acquire?
7. What do you say to the US Fish and Wildlife Service, whose Oregon Conservation Strategy Implementation Grant provided the first \$40,000 to develop the Plan?
8. Why should anyone continue to contribute to HBRA management efforts when all actions actually carried out can be at the whim of changing county administrators, park directors, etc?
9. From beginning to end the Habitat Management Plan is a land-use Plan. That is a good thing. What is the basis of your hesitation to refer to the Plan as such?

ALVERSON Edward R

From:
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2018 11:12 AM
To: ALVERSON Edward R
Subject: HBRA HP adoption by RCP

Hello Ed,

As someone concerned about maintaining and retaining the ecological integrity of Howard Buford-Mt. Pisgah, as a member of the Lane County Parks Master Plan Task Force and as President of LandWatch Lane County, a non-profit working for over 20 years to protect the county's farm and forest lands, natural areas and open space, I wholeheartedly support fellow Task Force member Ellen Otani's comments urging the adoption of the HBRA HP into the Rural Comprehensive Plan.

Howard Buford-Mt. Pisgah is a gem whose luster must be protected by solid, dependable oversight. Thanks for your work in making that happen.

Robert Emmons, President
LandWatch Lane County

ALVERSON Edward R

From: John K
Sent: Wednesday, March 07, 2018 12:33 AM
To: ALVERSON Edward R
Cc: Lane County Parks
Subject: HBRA Habitat Management Plan
Attachments: Comments on Proposed HMP.docx

Hello Ed,

I have attached my comments in support of "adoption" of the HBRA-HMP as a component of the HBRA-MP. Please include these comments with others to be considered by the Lane County Parks Advisory Committee for recommendation of approval by the Board of Commissioners. Thank you.

-John Koenig

*Please add me to the e-mail contact list for the HMP

John O. Koenig

Eugene, Oregon 97405

5 March 2018

Lane County Parks
Attn: Charlie Conrad
3050 North Delta Hwy.
Eugene, Oregon 97408

Subject: HBRA Habitat Management Plan

I am a long time HBRA park user, hiking the parks trails at least several times each week. I am also an active member of Friends of Buford Park and Mt. Pisgah, a member of the Stewardship Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) and volunteer at the Friends on-site native plant nursery.

Please consider this as my letter of whole-hearted support for the Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan (HMP) as published on 7 February 2018. The issues and concerns that had been raised with the release of the original draft HMP have, in my opinion, been effectively addressed and incorporated into the present revised proposed HMP.

I particularly appreciate the clear definition of the ten HBRA Conservation Targets (what the Plan seeks to improve) along with the 15 Habitat Management Goals and Strategies that provide measurable markers for progress in achieving the Conservation Vision as defined by the Conservation Targets.

However I am concerned about the document's status as a technical administrative guide, essentially an unofficial set of guidelines rather than being "adopted" as a land use document as part of the process of amending the Rural Comprehensive Plan (RCP). The 1994 HBRA Master Plan (HBRA-MP) required the development of wildlife and vegetative management plans which have now been consolidated into the single proposed HMP. This establishes that the HBRA-HMP is intended to be an integral part of the HBRA-MP and as such, adopted as a land use plan, not merely approved or accepted. Without question, the HMP is a "land-use plan". An "adopted" Plan will provide park owners (the public), grantors, donors, volunteers, park users and neighbor's assurance that the expectations enumerated in the paired documents (MP and HMP) will be upheld. It gives the document legal clout. Therefore, the HBRA-HMP must be included along with the HBRA-MP in the currently planned RCP amendment process in order to protect the integrity of both plans.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments.

John O. Koenig

From: Tom Holloway
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 8:55 AM
To: ALVERSON Edward R
Subject: RE: Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan - public release

Hi Ed,

Thanks for the notice regarding Pisgah's comprehensive management plan. I did give some feed back earlier and have recently submitted a proposal and wasn't sure who to send it to. If you have already received this proposal, thanks for your consideration, if not, maybe you are someone who can review the merits. The below email was sent to the Pisgah business office;

My name is Tom Holloway and I live less than a mile from the SE entrance to the park. We love to walk our two dogs at Pisgah and have enjoyed doing if for the past 25 years. Many of us especially enjoy the off leash allowance on many of the trails on that side of the mountain. One concern that I have is the pressure on the South side of the mountain in the first 1/3 of a mile with the amount of dog pooh. This area seems to be a rather sensitive area since it is flat with a lot of water collection that appears to drain towards the Willamette river. From my observations as well as understanding dog habits, they (dogs) will typically poop in the first quarter mile of the gate for several reasons. They smell other dogs pooh which acts as a trigger, and most dogs when they first jump out of vehicle seem ready to pooh from the excitement of the hike. That said, I make the following proposal;

1. Place a plastic bag dispenser at the entrance which can be used for dog pooh collection
2. Place a waste disposal receptacle at the fork of trails 2 and 6 where the gazebo sign board is located which has stated purpose for dog pooh only.

The reason for the waste disposal a quarter mile down the trail is to discourage abuse of trash receptacles with easy access at the trail head. Additionally, if people understood that they could pick up pooh and drop it 150 yards ahead it would encourage them to carry it to the receptacle and they wouldn't have to hike with it nor would they have to carry it home. There would need to be signage stating a receptacle ahead as well as a reason for the plastic bag dispenser (sensitive area, if that is the case) for dog waste only. Usage of bags would be high at first and hopefully people would keep them for the next trip if they didn't use them the day of grabbing a bag. This would really help clean up the area if people were made aware of the impact and made an effort to use the bags.

Since I live close by and would like to support Pisgah. I would like to volunteer to collect the waste once a week – assuming it is not filled with other garbage to the point of being hard to carry. I am a wood worker and would be willing to make a holder for a plastic bag dispenser. In my absence, I would find others who would help collect the waste. My credentials as a volunteer are that I am retired (big credential) and have time to help, and would like to give back to Pisgah. We want to keep it dog friendly and we are donors to Pisgah (under the name of Jane) as well as the McKenzie River Trust. Many who frequent the South side of the mountain see my family and I there all the time. If they see us engaged in this, there is a chance it may gain acceptance and viewed as being supportive rather than restrictive.

Last week a sign was posted regarding the dog leash law. Personally, I was sad to see the sign posted at the gate and it seems others were even more resentful by removing it. I recommend if you really want to enforce the leash rule, have some "nice" people with dogs explain the rule to others but have a good list of reasons. I don't agree with the rule because my dogs are well behaved and I control them whenever I see other people (grab them by the collar) regardless of the trail. My fear is the park will become more restrictive to the point of losing it's appeal to many who love it for exercise and the dog friendly access.

Let me know if any interest in the dog pooh idea.

Respectfully,
Tom Holloway



The Nature Conservancy in Oregon
87200 Rathbone Road
Eugene, OR 97402

tel 541 343-1010

fax 541 343-1737

nature.org/oregon

Lane County Parks
ATTN: Charlie Conrad
3050 North Delta Highway
Eugene, OR 97408

Re: Howard Buford Recreation Area Habitat Management Plan

Dear Mr. Conrad,

The Nature Conservancy's Oregon Chapter would like to offer our support for the Howard Buford Recreation Area Habitat Management Plan. The Conservancy successfully partners with Lane County on many projects that support the Conservancy's mission of conserving the lands and waters on which all life depends.

Since 2005 The Nature Conservancy has worked directly with Lane County and Friends of Buford Park staff on the acquisition, planning, funding and restoration of our Willamette Confluence Preserve located adjacent to Howard Buford Recreation Area. The Preserve falls within the Mt. Pisgah Conservation Opportunity Areas in the *Oregon Conservation Strategy*, prepared by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (2005). Recommended actions for these areas include ensuring habitat complexity, maintaining and restoring riparian habitat and ecological function, enhancing and restoring wetlands, and restoring the river and floodplain interactions. The Preserve also overlays two portfolio areas identified in The Nature Conservancy's 2004 Willamette Valley Ecoregional Assessment: Mt. Pisgah, including Howard Buford Conservation Area, and Coast Fork/Middle Fork Willamette Riparian. Both of these portfolio sites contain habitat for numerous high-value target systems and species.

The Habitat Management Plan utilizes both a collaborative approach for developing the basic elements of the plan with the Technical Advisory Group and the Nature Conservancy's Conservation Action Planning process. Conservation Action Planning is a relatively simple, straightforward and proven approach for planning, implementing and measuring success for conservation projects. The methodology was developed by conservation practitioners working in real places. It has been tested and deployed successfully by hundreds of teams working to conserve species, sites, ecosystems, landscapes, watersheds and seascapes across the globe.

Where property boundaries are shared and conservation targets align, The Habitat Management Plan matches up with The Nature Conservancy's existing Willamette Confluence Preserve Management Plan. Developed in 2011, The Willamette Confluence Preserve Management Plan serves as the guiding document for all management and restoration of the Preserve. The Howard Buford Recreation Area Habitat Management Plan will greatly enhance the conservation values and services as well as public experience of the greater area.

Sincerely,

Jason Nuckols
Willamette and Restoration Program Manager

ALVERSON Edward R

From: Maeve and Dick
Sent: Monday, February 19, 2018 2:49 PM
To: ALVERSON Edward R
Subject: RE: Proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan - public release

Hello Ed,

At this time the best way to reach Audubon is at the address you use for me, _____ . Maeve is still President but the old address at laneaudubon is not working.

We are glad that you are working on this plan for the County. It appears to me that wildlife, habitat and outdoor activities will be in the plan in many places. That is good!

Dick

ALVERSON Edward R

From: Lane County Parks
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2018 8:23 AM
To: ALVERSON Edward R; BOWEN Todd J; CONRAD Charles S
Subject: FW: HBRA Habitat Management Plan

Ed, would you be the right person to contact the person below about her concerns? Or, do I need to reply from the general email box? Please advise. Sam

From: Alice Stroud
Sent: Monday, February 19, 2018 2:03 PM
To: Lane County Parks
Subject: HBRA Habitat Management Plan

I would like to communicate with the person or persons who will be proposing changes to the dog off-lease policies at Buford Park. I was not aware that changes were going to be made and so was unable to comment during the public comment period. This is a very important issue to me, and I would like to speak with someone to offer my suggestions and preferences. Please let me know how to contact the person or persons who will be making the decisions.

Thank you,
Alice Stroud

Lane County Parks Natural Areas Operations Report for February 2018 - Ed Alverson

-The proposed HBRA Habitat Management Plan (version 3) was posted on the Parks web site on February 4th, in advance of the public Open House, which was held on February 15th. Public outreach in advance of the Open House included an interview on KLCC radio news, an article in the Eugene Register-Guard, posting flyers at HBRA trailheads, and e-mail notices sent to all of the people or organizations who had submitted comments on the previous draft of the HMP in 2016.

-Met with McKenzie River Watershed Council staff to discuss a possible habitat restoration project in Vickery Park which would be funded by an Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board small grant

-Completed a preliminary draft of the wetland fill permit for the Zumwalt Park shoreline stabilization project. The draft was sent to several Corps of Engineers staff for review and input; hopefully the completed permit application will be submitted in March.

-Issued an SUP to Friends of Zumwalt Park to cover volunteer invasive vegetation management projects in the park during the 2018 calendar year.

-engaged with broader sets of Willamette River partners on several topics: 1) attended a half-day workshop to provide feedback on a monitoring framework for habitat restoration within the Willamette River floodplain; 2) had a phone meeting with OPRD staff to identify a process for providing feedback on the update to the Willamette water trail; 3) talked to City of Eugene staff about their recent park acquisitions along the Willamette River in Santa Clara